R
282.03
Add/Cat
67497

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 27 November, 2018

A
CATHOLIC DICTIONARY

A

CATHOLIC DICTIONARY

CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT OF THE

DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, RITES, CEREMONIES,
COUNCILS, AND RELIGIOUS ORDERS
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

WILLIAM E. ADDIS

SOMETIME FELLOW OF THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND

AND

THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A.

FELLOW OF THE SAME UNIVERSITY

REVISED WITH ADDITIONS

BY

T. B. SCANNELL, D.D.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

NINTH EDITION

67497

δέ οὐνιν
θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων
ἔτικτεν, οὐδὲ μήν ποτε λάθα κατακοιμάσει·
μέγας ἐν τούτοις θεός, οὐδὲ γηράσκει

SOPH. *Œd. Rex.* 868–871

A-l-27

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO. LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE, 68–74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1917

NIHIL OBSTAT.

F. THOMAS BERGH, O.S.B.,

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

10 *Dec.*, 1916.

IMPRIMATUR.

EDM: CAN: SURMONT,

VIC. GEN.

WESTMONASTERII DIE 14A DECEMBRIS, 1916.

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.)

PREFACE

TO

THE NINTH EDITION

THE years before the beginning of the present great war were a time of considerable activity in the Catholic literary world. Two great Encyclopædias—one in English and one in German—were completed. A third—in French—was carried to an advanced stage in the theological department, and to a less degree in some others. Particulars of these are given on p. xi. Many other able works have also been published, the results of which, or references to which, will be found in the present edition.

1917.

PREFACE

TO

THE FOURTH EDITION

In the present edition the whole work has been revised; most of the articles formerly contained in the Appendix have been inserted in their proper places in the body of the volume; a considerable number of new articles and headings have been added; and the statistics and other information have been, as far as possible, brought up to date. The services of one of the original authors being no longer available, his place has been taken by the Rev. T. B. Scannell, B.D. The American editor, the Rev. T. F. Galwey, and the Rev. Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., have also contributed articles.

February 1893.

PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST EDITION

THE WORK here submitted to the public is intended to meet a practical want which has long been felt among English-speaking Catholics—the want, namely, of a single trustworthy source of information on points of Catholic doctrine, ritual, and discipline. All existing English works of a similar character—such as Hook's "Church Dictionary," Blunt's "Dictionary of Theology," Blunt's "Dictionary of Sects," &c.—were compiled by Protestants, and it is scarcely possible to turn over ten pages in one of them without meeting with some more or less open attack upon Catholicism. To this censure the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," conducted by Dr. Smith and Professor Cheetham, is not open; but the large scale of that work, and the fact of its stopping short at the age of Charlemagne, are sufficient of themselves to prevent it from meeting the need above indicated.

Their Eminences the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal Newman have been pleased to express their approbation of the undertaking. Cardinal MANNING wrote: "I am very glad to hear that it is proposed to publish a 'Dictionary of Catholic Theology and History.' It will supply a great want in our English literature. Such works exist in French and German, but we have nothing worthy of the name." Cardinal NEWMAN, after saying that such a work had been long "a desideratum in our literature," added: "Our doctrines, rites, and history have been at the mercy of Protestant manuals, which, however ably written, and even when fair in intention, are not such as a Catholic can approve or recommend. So much have I felt the need that once, many years ago, I began such a work myself, though I was soon obliged to give over for want of leisure."

The Rev. W. E. ADDIS, of Lower Sydenham, and THOMAS ARNOLD, Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, have written nearly the whole work. They are indebted, however, to American contributors for a certain number of articles; to the Very Rev.

Father BRIDGETT, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, for the article "Redemptorists"; and to the Rev. S. H. SOLE, Missionary Rector of Chipping Norton, for the article "Plain Chant." As a rule, the articles on dogma, ritual, the ancient Church, and the Oriental rites, are by Mr. ADDIS; those on mediæval and modern history, the religious orders, and canon law, by Mr. ARNOLD. Theological subjects have been regarded chiefly from an historical and critical point of view, and questions of School theology avoided as far as possible. In almost every case the quotations of Scripture are made from the original texts, and not from the Latin Vulgate.

In conclusion, the Authors offer their best thanks to many kind friends who have helped and encouraged them in their labour. Their gratitude is due in a very special degree to the Rev. Father KEOGH, of the London Oratory. The office of Censor which he undertook was in itself a tedious one, but besides this, and on points which did not concern him in his official capacity, he furnished the writers with many valuable suggestions and corrections. At the same time it is right to add that the "Nihil obstat" appended by him certifies indeed that the limits of Catholic orthodoxy have been observed, but by no means implies the Censor's personal agreement or sympathy with many of the opinions expressed.

November 3, 1883.

ABBREVIATIONS

Cath. Enc.
The Catholic Encyclopaedia, ed. by CHARLES G. HEBERMANN and others. Fifteen volumes and Index volume, New York, 1907–1912.

Chardon.
Histoire des Sacrements. In MIGNE'S *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, vol. XX. Paris, 1874.

DACL.
Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, publié par le R.P. DOM FERNAND CABROL, avec le concours d'un grand nombre de collaborateurs. Paris, 1907. (In course of publication: three volumes (A–Dece) have appeared.)

DAp.
Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique. 4ième édition entièrement refondue sous la direction de A. D'ALÈS, avec la collaboration d'un grand nombre de Savants Catholiques. Paris, 1913. (In course of publication: ten parts (A–J) have appeared.)

DThC.
Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, commencé sous la direction de A. VACANT, continué sous celle de E. MANGENOT, avec le concours d'un grand nombre de collaborateurs. Paris, 1903. (In course of publication; five volumes and a half (A–Gu) have appeared.)

DHGE.
Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques, publié sous la direction de A. BAUDRILLART, A. VOGT, et U. ROUZIÈS. Paris, 1912. (In course of publication: two volumes (A–An) have appeared.)

Ducange.
Lexicon Manuale ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis. In Compendium redactum. Ed. MIGNE. Paris, 1890.

Ferraris.
F. Lucii Ferraris Prompta Bibliotheca Canonica, Juridica, Moralis, Theologica. Ed. MIGNE. Eight volumes. Paris, 1866.

Hélyot.
Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Religieux et Militaires &c. Eight volumes. Paris, 1714–1719.

Kirchenlex.
Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon. Zweite Auflage, begonnen von JOSEPH CARDINAL HERGENRÖTHER, fortgesetzt von FRANZ KAULEN. Twelve vols. and Index volume, Freiburg, 1886–1903.

Hefele-Leclercq.
Histoire des Conciles d'après les Documents originaux, par C. J. HEFELE. Nouvelle traduction française faite sur la deuxième éd. allemande, corrigée et augmentée de Notes critiques et bibliographiques, par Dom H. LECLERCQ. Paris, 1907–1914. (In course of publication; six volumes have already appeared.)

PL.
Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus. Ed. MIGNE. 221 volumes. Paris, 1844–1864.

PG.
Patrologiae Graecae Cursus Completus. Ed. MIGNE. 166 volumes. Paris, 1857–1866.

Rock.
The Church of our Fathers as seen in St. Osmund's Rite for the Cathedral of Salisbury. By DANIEL ROCK. New ed. by G. W. HART and W. H. FRERE. Four volumes. London, 1905.

St. Thom.

S. Thomae Aquinatis Summa Theologica. (It is divided into three parts, the second part being subdivided into two parts; each part is divided into questions; each question into articles; *e.g.* 1ª 2æ, q. 6, a. 5, means: the first of the second part; question 6; article 5. When any other of St. Thomas's numerous writings is referred to, the work is specially mentioned; *e.g.* Cont. Gent.; In IV. Sent. &c.)

Taunton.

The Law of the Church: A Cyclopaedia of Canon Law for English-speaking Countries. By ETHELRED TAUNTON. London, 1906.

Thomassin.

Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina circa Beneficia et Beneficiarios. Three volumes. Venice, 1766. (The original ed. was in French—*Ancienne et Nouvelle Discipline de l'Eglise touchant les Bénéfices et les Bénéficiers,* Paris, 1725—but the Latin is better.)

A CATHOLIC DICTIONARY

A

ABBACOMITES. The *abbacomites* or *abbates milites*, count-abbots or noble abbots, were lay intruders, to whom courts gave abbacies for pecuniary profit. Thus Bernard, the youngest of Charles Martel's six sons, was lay abbot of Sithiu or St. Quentin. Sons, daughters, wives, &c., were thus benefited before the time of Charlemagne, who, however, effected a reform and made monasteries the seats of schools and literature. In latter days other princes, claiming the right of investiture, reintroduced similar abuses; secular priests were often made *commendatory* abbots. (See ABBOT; Ducange.)

ABBESS, from *abbatissa*. The superior of a community of nuns, in those orders in which convents of monks are governed by abbots. The dignity of an abbess cannot be traced back so far as that of abbot; it appears to have been first regularly instituted about 591, in the time of Pope Gregory the Great. Regulations touching their election, powers, and rights were gradually framed, and incorporated in the canon law. The electors must, as a general rule, be professed nuns. The age at which a nun can be elected abbess has been variously determined at different times; finally the Council of Trent[1] fixed it at not less than forty years, of which eight should have been passed in the same monastery. The voting is secret; generally a simple majority of votes is sufficient for a valid election, but in the convents depending on Monte Cassino a majority of two-thirds is required. In the case of a doubtful election, the Ordinary intervenes, and selects the nun whom he may think most suitable for the office. The benediction of an abbess, a rite generally but not always necessary, may be performed by the bishop on any day of the week. When elected, the abbess has a right to the ring and staff, as in the case of abbots. [See CROSIER.] In certain orders where there were usually double monasteries, one for monks the other for nuns, as in the Brigittines and the order of Fontevrault, the monks were bound to obey the abbess of the related nunnery. An abbess, moreover, could, and often did, possess and exercise large ecclesiastical patronage, subject to the approval of the Ordinary. These powers are included within that capacity of ruling and possessing property which every truly civilized state has recognized in woman no less than in man; but when the power of the keys, or even any exercise of authority bordering on that power, is in question, the abbess is no more than any other woman. Thus she cannot, without the bishop's sanction, choose confessors either for herself or for her nuns; nor can she dispense a nun from the obligations of the rule of her own authority, nor suspend nor dismiss her. In some religious orders, notably among Franciscans, abbesses are chosen for a period of years only and lack the privilege of ring and staff, &c., of which indeed no mention is made in the benediction rite described in the Roman Pontifical. In England abbesses attended ecclesiastical councils, *e.g.* Whitby in 664 and Beconfield in 694, where five were present. (Ferraris; Taunton; Gasquet, "English Monastic Life," viii.; Langogne in DThC.)

ABBEY. A monastery governed by an abbot. [See ABBOT.]

ABBOT. The "father" or superior of a community of men living under vows and according to a particular rule. The transference of the idea of fatherhood to the relation between the head of a congregation or a religious community and his subjects is so natural that already in the apostolic times we find St. Paul reminding the Corinthians[1] that they had not *many* fathers in Christ ("for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you," &c.), notwithstanding the apparent prohibition in the gospel of St. Matthew.[2] But it was customary to call bishops by the Greek word for father; hence the corresponding designation for the head of a community of monks was taken, to avoid confusion, from the Chaldaic form (*abba, abbas*) of the word

[1] Sess. xxv. c. 7, De Reg. et Mon.

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 15. [2] xxiii. 9.

which means "father" in the Semitic languages. Haddan, in the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," enumerates at least a dozen transitory uses of the word Abbot, in ancient times alone. But these are of little or no importance. The true Abbot, being a natural outgrowth of the Christian doctrine and spirit, comes into sight in the third century, and still fulfils—though under a variety of designations—his original function in the twentieth. The name imports the rule of others, but as the essential foundation for such rule it implies the mastery of self. The monk was before the abbot. Eusebius has no mention of monks as such in his "Ecclesiastical History"; but when he tells us of persons, male or female, living austere lives and aiming at perfection, when he notes that Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem at the end of the second century, retired into the desert on account of difficulties arising in his diocese, and lived there for many years as a solitary contemplative, we see already the germs of the monastic life. St. Antony (250–355) is usually regarded as the patriarch of the monks. But if we hear much in his later years of the numbers and the reverent devotion of his disciples, we know that for twenty years after his first quitting the world he lived in nearly absolute solitude, conversing with God and taming his own spirit. The clamours of persons desiring to see him and ask counsel of him forced him at last from his cell; and he, who in conflict with his own lower nature or with evil spirits had attained an unwonted spiritual strength and a vast breadth of spiritual experience, consented now to take upon him the direction of a number of men of weaker will and less regulated mind. If he was to do them any good, they must place themselves in his hands, and do exactly what he bade them. That mastery of the passions, and subjugation of the natural man under the yoke of reason, which he, aided by the Holy Spirit, had worked out for himself, they, following his directions, must win through him. Hence we find the principle of unquestioning obedience—what Gibbon calls the "slavish" spirit of the monks—laid down from the first. St. Poemen, a famous Egyptian abbot of the fourth century, said to his disciples, "Never seek to do your own will, but rather rejoice to overcome it, and humble yourselves by doing the will of others." And, "Nothing gives so much pleasure to the enemy as when a person will not discover his temptations to his superior or director." Induced partly, no doubt, by the confusions and oppressions of the empire, but chiefly by the haunting thirst to know the secret of the perfect life, and solve the riddle of existence, great numbers of men towards the end of the fourth century sought the deserts that hem in the valley of Egypt, and were formed into monastic communities under abbots. Great captains of the spiritual life arose, such as Pachomius, Hilarion, Pambo, and Macarius. Speaking of the effect produced by Antony in Egypt even in his lifetime, St. Athanasius says: "Among the mountains there were monasteries as if tabernacles filled with divine choirs, singing, studying, fasting, praying, exulting in the hope of things to come, and working for almsdeeds, having love and harmony one towards another." For full information on these "fathers of the desert," the reader should consult the celebrated work of the Jesuit Rosweyde, "Vitæ Patrum."

The status of these early abbots, as of the monks whom they governed, was a *lay* status. In the great monastic colonies of Palestine and Egypt, each containing several hundreds of monks, there would be but one or two priests, admitted in order to the celebration of the divine worship. But the proportion of ordained monks gradually increased, the bishops being generally glad to confer orders upon men, most of whom were of proved virtue. For abbots ordination before long became the rule: yet even in the ninth century we read of abbots who were only deacons, and a Council of Poitiers in 1078 is still obliged to make a canon enjoining upon all abbots, on pain of deprivation, the reception of priests' orders. The original lay character here referred to must of course not be confounded with the status of those profane intruders described by Bede in his letter to Egbert, archbishop of York, who were rich laymen pretending to found monasteries for the sake of obtaining the exemption from civil burdens which monastic lands enjoyed, and could only be called pseudo-abbots.

The election of an abbot originally rested with the monks, according to the rule "Fratres eligant sibi abbatem." We meet, indeed, with many cases of episcopal intervention in elections, but the right of the monks is solemnly recognized in the body of the canon law. In the West, as the endowments of monasteries increased, temporal princes and lords usurped the right of appointing abbots in the larger monasteries, no less than of nominating bishops to the sees; our own history and that of Germany are full of stories of disputes thence arising. [See INVESTITURE.] At the Council of Worms in 1122 Pope Calixtus obtained from the emperor the renunciation of the claim to invest with ring and crosier the persons nominated to ecclesiastical dignities. The first article of Magna Charta (1215) provides that the English Church shall be *free*: by which, among other things, the right of monks to choose their own abbots was understood to be conceded. Practically, the patronage of the larger English abbeys for two centuries before the Reformation was divided by a kind of amicable arrangement between the Pope and the king.

St. Benedict (480–543), the patriarch of Western monachism, allows in his rule (which from its greater elasticity superseded other rules [see BENEDICTINES; RULE, RELIGIOUS]) a large discretion to the abbots of his convents, who were to modify many things in accordance with the exigencies of climate and national customs. Such modifications led of course in time to relaxation, the reaction against which led to reforms. A curious report of the discussion between the monks of Molesme and their abbot Robert (1075), who wished to restore among them the full observance of the rule of St. Benedict, may be read in the eighth book of Ordericus Vitalis. Not prevailing, St. Robert, with twelve companions, left Molesme and founded Cîteaux, under a reformed observance. [CISTERCIANS.]

The privileges of abbots grew to be very extensive. They obtained many episcopal rights, among others that of conferring minor orders on their monks. A practice which had arisen, by which abbots exempt from episcopal jurisdiction [EXEMPTION] claimed to confer minor orders even on seculars, was condemned by the Council of Trent.[1] The use of mitre, crosier, and ring was accorded to the abbots of great monasteries; these mitred abbots were named *abbates infulati*. In England mitred abbots had seats in Parliament: twenty-eight, with two Augustinian priors, are said to have sat in the Parliament immediately preceding the dissolution of monasteries. A remarkable privilege is noticed by Bede,[2] in virtue of which the abbots of Iona exercised a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction in the west of Scotland and the Hebrides. A similar exceptional arrangement appears to have been common in Ireland; but is doubtful in the case of Wales. It has been perpetuated to our own times in the territories technically styled *Nullius Dioeceseos* (Monte Cassino, Subiaco, &c., in Italy, Einsiedeln in Switzerland, New Norcia in Australia &c.) Some of these abbots, as they govern populous territories equivalent to true dioceses, receive episcopal consecration; but for the most part they are merely empowered to minister (though simple priests) the sacrament of Confirmation and invite some neighbouring bishop, as the need occurs, to ordain to the major orders and to consecrate the Holy Oils. Most abbots (even if they have no territorial jurisdiction) can consecrate altars, chalices, and the like, sometimes even churches. It is a matter of dispute, into which we do not enter, whether at any time abbots and others not of episcopal rank have been empowered to confer the subdiaconate and diaconate (a privilege laid claim to in particular by the Cistercians).

In the fifteenth and following centuries great efforts (encouraged by the Holy See in the interests of monastic discipline) were made to replace abbots for life by others enjoying the same privileges, but appointed only for a term of years. The trend of Canon Law now-a-days is on the contrary to return to the older practice.

The name of *abbé, abbate*, has come to be assumed by a class of unbeneficed secular clerks in France and Italy, apparently in the following manner. The practice by which laymen held abbeys *in commendam*—commenced in troubled times in order that powerful protectors might be found for the monks, and might have inducements to exercise that protection—grew by degrees into a scandalous abuse. Young men of noble families were nominated to abbeys, and could enjoy their revenues, long before they could take priests' orders; they were not bound to residence; and under Louis XIV. and Louis XV. many of these *abbés commendataires* never saw the abbeys of which they were the titular rulers. The possibility of winning such prizes drew many cadets of noble families, who had only just taken the tonsure, to Versailles; those who had succeeded in obtaining nominations still fluttered about the Court, not being bound to residence; and the name Abbé, which was really, though abusively, applicable to these, came to be applied in social parlance to the aspirants also, whom no external signs distinguished from the real abbés. By a further extension, the name came to be applied as a title of courtesy to unbeneficed clerks generally.

Benedictine abbeys have always been independent of each other in government; but an honorary superiority was accorded in the Middle Ages to the abbot of the mother house at Monte Cassino; he was styled *abbas abbatum*. Pope Leo XIII. appointed an Abbot Primate, whose position is one of honour rather than of jurisdiction, carrying with it the right of presiding at international assemblies of Benedictines and of being Superior of the Benedictine university founded by Leo XIII. on the Aventine at Rome. There are, however, many types of monastic government in which Benedictine abbots are subject, like the superiors of religious houses in other orders, to the control (more or less restricted) of a General Chapter or even of a chief prelate, styled Abbot-President or Abbot-General. In some instances (for example, among the celebrated Maurini in France) the title of *Abbot* was done away with altogether and the lesser dignity of *Prior* substituted. In our time the monasteries governed by abbots are chiefly those of the Benedictines and those of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. Certain dignitaries among the secular clergy also bear the title of Abbot, sharing the same privileges and receiving a like benediction with the corresponding Regular Prelates. In other orders various names have replaced that of "abbot"; the head of a Franciscan friary

[1] Sess. xxiii. De Reform. c. 10. [2] *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 4.

is a "guardian," that of a Dominican convent a "prior," that of a Jesuit house a "rector." There is a prior also in Benedictine convents [PRIOR], but his normal position is that of lieutenant to the abbot; sometimes, however, he was almost practically independent as the head of a *priory*, a cell founded by monks migrating from some abbey.

The duties of an abbot in early times may be learned from Rosweyde; somewhat later, and in the West, they were defined with great clearness and wisdom in the rule of St. Benedict. A deeply interesting sketch of the manner of life of an English abbot in the seventh century is preserved for us in Bede's "Lives of the Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow." Even more trying was his work in the twelfth century, as we know from the narration by Jocelyn de Brakelonde of the government of the abbot Samson at Bury St. Edmunds; with which may be read the striking, and on the whole appreciative, commentary of Carlyle.[1]

The name corresponding to Abbot in the Greek Church is Archimandrite, or Hegumenos. (Ferraris; Besse, in DACL; Montalembert, "Monks of the West," ed. Gasquet; Taunton, "English Black Monks of St. Benedict.")

ABBREVIATORS. The name given to a class of notaries or secretaries employed in the Papal Chancery. They are first met with about the beginning of the fourteenth century; were abolished in the fifteenth, but afterwards restored. They are generally prelates, and the office is considered one of great dignity and importance. It is not incompatible with Church preferment. The name arose from this, that the *abbreviator* made a short minute of the decision on a petition, or reply to a letter, given by the Pope, and afterwards expanded the minute into official form. The recent reorganization of the Roman Chancery by Pope Pius X. has definitely suppressed the "Abbreviators." (Ferraris.)

ABJURATION OF HERESY. This is required in the canon law as a preliminary to baptism, or, when there is no question of that (as in the case of converts from the Eastern Church), before the convert makes his confession of faith. There are decrees of several councils to this effect: thus the Council of Laodicea (about 364) ordains that Novatian and Photinian heretics, "whether they be baptized persons or catechumens, shall not be received before they have anathematized all heresies, especially that in which they were held." A celebrated instance of abjuration is that of Clovis (496), to whom St. Remy said before baptizing him, "Meekly bow down thy head, Sicambrian; adore what thou hast burnt, and burn what thou hast adored." An early German council requires the Saxon converts to renounce belief in "Thor and Woden and Saxon Odin" before being received into the Church.

Ferraris sums up the canonical requirements in the matter of abjuration as follows: —that it should be done without delay; that it should be voluntary; that it should be done with whatever degree of publicity the bishop of the place might think necessary; and that the abjuring person should make condign satisfaction in the form of penance.

The modern discipline insists mainly on the positive part, the profession of the true faith. Thus in the Ritual of Strasburg (1742) the abjuration required is merely general: "Is it your firm purpose to renounce in heart and mind all the errors which it [the Catholic religion] condemns?" In England at the present time the abjuration is, so to speak, taken for granted in ordinary cases, since converts are not admitted into the Church except after suitable instruction, and the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which everyone desiring to become a Catholic must accept, expressly denounces most of those errors which infect the religious atmosphere of this country. (See RECEPTION OF CONVERTS; Ferraris, *Abjuratio.*)

ABLEGATE. An envoy of the Holy See sent to convey the Red Biretta to a new Cardinal in his absence from Rome. [See LEGATE.]

ABLUTION. A name given, in the rubrics of the Mass, to the water and wine with which the priest who celebrates Mass washes his thumb and index-finger after Communion. When he has consumed the Precious Blood, the priest purifies the chalice; he then, saying in a low voice a short prayer prescribed by the Church, holds his thumb and index-finger, which have touched the Blessed Sacrament and may have some particle of it adhering to them, over the chalice, while the server pours wine and water upon them. He then drinks the ablution and dries his lips and the chalice with the mundatory. This ceremony witnesses to the reverence with which the Church regards the Body and Blood of Christ, and to her anxiety that none of that heavenly food should be lost. It is impossible to say when this rite was introduced, but we are told of the pious Emperor Henry II., who lived at the beginning of the eleventh century, that he used when hearing Mass to beg for the ablution and to receive it with great devotion. This ablution is mentioned by St. Thomas and Durandus. The former, however, gives no reason to suppose that it was consumed by the priest, and the latter expressly says that the ablution used formerly to be poured into a clean place. (Benedict XIV. "De Missa," III. xxi. C.)

ABRAHAMITE. [See PAULICIANS.]

ABRAXAS, Ἀβράξας or Ἀβρασάξ. A magical word used by the Basilidians, a Gnostic sect. They believed in the existence of 365 heavens, over which Abraxas pre-

[1] *Past and Present*, part ii.

sided, the numeral value of the Greek letters which composed the word being 365.[1] Many gems still exist with this word inscribed on them. An account of them, and of the immense literature to which they have given occasion, will be found in Kraus' "Real-Encyklopädie," under *Abraxas*. (Leclercq in DACL.)

ABROGATION. The repeal or cancelling of a law. As distinguished from Derogation, Abrogation is the total revocation, the former being only partial. [See CANON LAW.]

ABSOLUTION. Classical authors use the Latin word *absolutio* (literally, unbinding or unloosing) to signify acquittal from a criminal charge,[2] and ecclesiastical writers have adopted the term, employing it to denote a setting free from crime or penalty. But, as crime and its penalties are regarded even by the Church from very different points of view, "absolution" in its ecclesiastical use bears several senses, which it is important to distinguish from each other.

I. *Absolution from Sin* is a remission of sin which the priest, by authority received from Christ, makes in the Sacrament of Penance. It is not a mere announcement of the Gospel, or a bare declaration that God will pardon the sins of those who repent, but as the Council of Trent defines (sess. xiv. can. 9), it is a judicial act by which a priest as judge passes sentence on the penitent.

With regard to absolution thus understood, it is to be observed, first, that it can be given by none but priests, since to them alone has Christ committed the necessary power; and, secondly, that since absolution is a judicial sentence, the priest must have authority or jurisdiction over the person absolved. The need of jurisdiction, in order that the absolution may be valid, is an article of faith defined at Trent (sess. xiv. cap. 7), and it follows from the very nature of absolution as defined above, since the reason of things requires that a judge should not pass sentence except on one who is placed under him, as the subject of his court. This jurisdiction may be ordinary—*i.e.* it may flow from the office which the confessor holds; or delegated—*i.e.* it may be given to the confessor by one who has ordinary jurisdiction with power to confer it on others, as his delegates. Thus a bishop has ordinary jurisdiction over seculars, or religious who are not exempt, in his diocese, and within its limits he can delegate jurisdiction to priests secular or regular. Again, the prelates of religious orders exempt from the authority of the bishop have jurisdiction, more or less ample, within their own order, and they can absolve, or delegate power to absolve, the members of the order who are subject to them; nor until the pontificate of Pius X. was it possible for the bishop, or a priest who has his powers from the bishop only, to absolve such religious. Moreover, a bishop or a prelate of a religious order, in conferring power to absolve his subjects, may reserve the absolution of certain sins to himself. [See RESERVED CASES.] The Church, however, supplies all priests with power to absolve persons in danger of death, at least if they cannot obtain a priest with the usual "faculties" or powers to absolve.

Thirdly, absolution must be given in words which express the efficacy of absolution, viz. forgiveness of sin. The Roman Ritual prescribes the form "I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Beyond all doubt, the form "I absolve thee from thy sins" would suffice for the validity of the sacrament. But would a precatory form avail—such for example as, "May Jesus Christ absolve thee from thy sins"? The affirmative has been maintained by the celebrated critic Morinus, while Tourneley and many others have followed his opinion. They maintain their contention chiefly by two arguments: viz. (α) that the Sacramentaries, Pontificals, and Penitential Rituals used in the Western Church during the first thousand years after Christ contain only precatory forms of absolution; (β) that such forms have been employed from time immemorial by the Greeks. On the other hand, many even among modern theologians adhere to the opinion of St. Thomas, and insist on the strict necessity of an absolute form ("I absolve thee," &c.). It seems possible to reconcile the two opinions. A precatory form is enough, if it is used in an absolute sense—if, in other words, the circumstances in which the prayer is uttered make it more than a mere prayer. So that the priest, when he says "Absolve, O God, this man from his sins," means "Absolve this man through my ministry," and intends at the same time to utter a prayer which must needs be granted, provided that the requisite conditions have been fulfilled. Still it must be remembered that in any case it is unlawful to use such a form even in the East, since Clement VIII. in his instruction on the rites of the Greeks, issued 1595, required them to employ the form prescribed in the Council of Florence—viz. "I absolve thee," &c.

Lastly, the form of absolution must be uttered by the priest himself in the presence of the person absolved. This follows as a necessary consequence from the nature of the form of absolution sanctioned by the perpetual tradition of the Church; for the very words, "I absolve *thee*," imply the presence of the penitent; and the contrary opinion held by some Spanish theologians, who considered that absolution could be validly given by letter or by means of a messenger, was

[1] Iren. i. 24, *PG*, vii. 680. Many other Fathers mention the word.

[2] Cf. Cicero, *Pro Cluentio*, 27.

expressly condemned by Clement VIII. in the year 1603.

[N.B. For full information on the proofs from Scripture and antiquity for the Catholic doctrine of Confession and Absolution, see PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF.]

II. *Absolution from censures* is widely different from absolution from sins, because whereas the latter gives grace, removes guilt, and reconciles the sinner with God, the former merely removes penalties imposed by the Church, and reconciles the offender with her. [See CENSURE.] It may be given, either in the confessional, or apart altogether from the Sacrament of Penance, in the external forum—*i.e.* in the courts of the Church. It may proceed from any cleric, even from one who has received the tonsure only, without ordination, provided he is invested with the requisite jurisdiction. This jurisdiction resides, in the case of censures imposed by an individual authority through a special sentence, in the ecclesiastic who inflicted the censure, in his superior, in his successors, and in those to whom competent authority has delegated power of absolution. For example, if a bishop has placed a subject of his under censure, absolution may be obtained (1) from the bishop himself, (2) from a succeeding bishop, (3) from the metropolitan, in certain cases where an appeal can be made to him, or if he is visiting the diocese of his suffragan *ex officio*, (4) from any cleric deputed by one of the above. With regard to censures attached to certain crimes by the general law of the Church, unless they are specially reserved to the Pope or the bishop, any confessor can absolve from them; and this is generally considered to hold good also of censures inflicted by the general (as opposed to a particular) sentence of a superior. Again, it is not necessary that the person absolved from censure should be present, or contrite, or even that he should be living. As the effects of censures may continue, so they may be removed after death. Excommunication, for instance, deprives the excommunicated person of Christian burial. It may happen that he desired but was unable to obtain remission of the penalty during life, and in this case he may be absolved after his soul has left the body, and so receive Catholic burial and a share in the prayers of the Church.

III. *Absolution for the dead (pro defunctis).* A short form, imploring eternal rest and so indirectly remission of the penalties of sin, said after a funeral Mass over the body of the dead person, before it is removed from the church.

IV. *Absolutions in the Breviary.* Certain short prayers said before the lessons in matins. Some of these prayers express or imply petition for forgiveness of sin, and this circumstance probably explains the origin of the name Absolution which has been given to such prayers or blessings. (St. Thom., 3ª, q. 84, a. 3; Chardon, 639 *sqq.*; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 482; DThC, *Absolution des Péchés.*)

ABSTINENCE, in its restricted and special sense, denotes the depriving ourselves of certain kinds of food and drink in a rational way and for the good of the soul. On a fasting day, the Church requires us to limit the quantity, as well as the kind, of our food; on an abstinence-day, the limit imposed affects only the nature of the food we take. The definition given excludes three possible misconceptions of the Church's law on this point. First, the Church does not forbid certain kinds of food on the ground that they are impure, either in themselves or if taken on particular days. On the contrary, she holds with St. Paul[1] that "every creature of God is good," and has repeatedly condemned[2] the Gnostic and Manichaean error, which counted flesh and wine evil. Next, the abstinence required is a reasonable one, and is not, therefore, exacted from those whom it would injure in health or incapacitate for their ordinary duties. Thirdly, Catholic abstinence is a means, not an end. Abstinence, says St. Thomas, pertains to the kingdom of God only so far "as it proceeds from faith and love of God."[3]

But how does abstinence from flesh-meat promote the soul's health? The answer is, that it enables us to subdue our flesh and so to imitate St. Paul's example, who "chastised his body and brought it into subjection."[4] The perpetual tradition of the Church is clear beyond possibility of mistake on this matter, and from the earliest times, the Christians at certain seasons denied themselves flesh and wine, or even restricted themselves to bread and water.[5] Moreover, by abstaining from flesh, we give up what is, on the whole, the most pleasant as well as the most nourishing food, and so make satisfaction for the temporal punishment due to sin even when its guilt has been forgiven. [See also FAST and PENANCE (4).]

The abstinence (as distinct from fasting) days to be observed in England are, all Fridays, except those on which Christmas Day and certain other great feasts may fall, and the Sundays in Lent, though on these last the faithful now receive an annual dispensation from the abstinence. Saturday also was formerly an abstinence-day. It ceased to be so in England in virtue of a Rescript of Pius VIII., in 1830.

A further dispensation has been recently granted allowing meat on Maundy Thursday, Ember Saturdays (outside Lent) and on such vigils as immediately precede or follow a Friday or other day of abstinence.

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 4.
[2] *Canon. Apost.* 53. Concil. Ancyr. (314) can. 14. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 315.)
[3] 2a 2æ, q. 146, a. 1. See also the Collect for Monday in the second week of Lent.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 27. [5] Concil. Laod. can. 50.

It may be of some interest, in conclusion, to trace the history in the Church of abstinence as distinct from fasting. Abstinence-days were observed from ancient times by the monks. Thus Cassian tells us that in the monasteries of Egypt, great care was taken that no one should fast between Easter and Pentecost, but he adds that the "quality of food" was unchanged. In other words, the religious fasted all the year, except on Sundays and the days between Easter and Pentecost. These they observed as days of abstinence. Again, it is certain that the faithful generally did not, and, indeed, could not, fast on Sundays in Lent, for the early Church strongly discouraged fasting on that day; but it is also certain that they did abstain on the Sundays in Lent. For, during the whole of that season, says St. Basil, "no animal has to suffer death, no blood flows." We learn incidentally from Theophanes and Nicephorus, that no meat was exposed during Lent in the markets of Constantinople. The Sundays, then, in Lent were kept in the ancient Church as days of abstinence. With regard to the abstinence-days of weekly occurrence, Thomassin shows that Wednesday and Friday have been from ancient times observed in the East, not only as abstinence, but as fasting-days. Clement VIII., in 1595, in laying down rules for Catholic Greeks under Latin bishops, excuses them from some of the Latin fasts, on the ground that, unlike the Latins, they fasted every Wednesday and Friday. Thomassin illustrates the custom of the West, by quoting a number of statutes, &c., prescribing sometimes abstinence from flesh, sometimes fasting and abstinence, on Friday. His earliest authority is Nicolas I. (858–867), and he concludes, "even after the year 1400, the Saturday abstinence was rather voluntary than of obligation among the laity; but the Friday abstinence had long since passed into a law. I say abstinence, for, in spite of efforts made, the fast was never well established." (See Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," from which the foregoing historical sketch is taken.)

ABSTINENTS. A name given to the Encratites (*q.v.*), or Manichees (*q.v.*), because of their professed abstinence from wine, marriage, &c.

ABYSSINIAN or ETHIOPIAN CHURCH. Tradition relates that the officer of Candace, Queen of Ethiopia, whom Philip the Deacon met and converted near Gaza,[1] on his return home spread the Christian faith among the peoples dwelling on the Upper Nile. But if this were so, the seed then planted must have withered away, for in the middle of the fourth century—when the narrative of Rufinus, in his "Ecclesiastical History," casts a strong light for us on Abyssinian affairs—the zeal of Athanasius appears to have raised up a church in an absolutely heathen land. Frumentius of Tyre, the apostle of Abyssinia, first visited the country, when a mere youth, in 316; his uncle, with whom he travelled, was murdered by the natives: he was himself brought up as a slave in the court of Axum; but his virtue and intelligence led to his being enfranchised; and in his person Christianity, to which he had strictly adhered, appeared attractive. Repairing to St. Athanasius, then recently raised to the patriarchal chair of Alexandria, Frumentius was consecrated by him the first bishop of his adopted country. When he returned, the king and his people willingly received baptism. He chose Axum for his see; and this place remains to this day the official centre of Abyssinian Christianity. As the work of conversion proceeded, this see became the residence of a Metropolitan (*abuna*, father), having under him seven suffragans. The name and rank of "Abuna" are still retained, but the seven suffragans have disappeared.

The bright promise of this commencement was soon overclouded. An effort, indeed, of Constantius to introduce Arianism failed; but when, in the fifth century, Alexandria, along with the majority of the Eastern churches, rejected the decrees of Chalcedon, and the patriarchate became Monophysite, the Abyssinians followed in the wake of their mother church, and they have never unanimously, or for long together, shaken off the heresy down to this day. In the sixth century the country was the object of a religious rivalry between Justinian and the Empress Theodora, the former wishing to attach it to the Roman Church, the latter to preserve it for her Monophysite friends at Alexandria.[1] The empress, aided by the popular sympathies, prevailed; and the Abyssinian Church, cut off from true Catholic communion, and severed from the chair of Peter, became in the course of ages the strange, unprogressive, semi-pagan institution which modern travellers have described. Thus, although never persecuted for the faith like the Irish and the Poles, the Abyssinians allowed its lustre to be tarnished and its moral fruits to pine and wither, through casting off that vitalizing communion with the Holy See which has kept alive the Irish and Polish nationalities in the face of secular persecution.

In the seventeenth century, Abyssinia, having been almost an unknown land to Europe for a thousand years, was entered by Portuguese Jesuits, whose preaching was attended for a time by marked success. Two emperors in succession became Catholics; a Jesuit was nominated patriarch of Æthiopia, and an outward reconciliation with Rome was effected. But the masses of the people remained uninfluenced, and their hearts still yearned towards Egypt: the patriarch Mendez is said to have acted imprudently in attempting to abolish the rite of circum-

[1] Acts viii. 27.

[1] Renaudot, quoted in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, c. 47.

cision[1]; the second Catholic emperor died, and his son expelled the Jesuits, and restored the connection with Alexandria. After a long interval of exclusion, Catholic missionaries have again entered Abyssinia (in 1838), and flourishing congregations have been formed in the northern and north-eastern districts, near Massowah.[2] In 1894 a mission of the Latin rite was established in the Italian colony of Erythraea. The Vicar Apostolic resides at Keren, and has under him some eighty priests, who serve forty-three churches and chapels. There are also twenty-five elementary and two higher schools; and eight orphanages. ("Missiones Catholicae," 1901; Streit, "Atlas," 1914.)

In 1914 there were three Vicars Apostolic —Abyssinia, Galla, and Erithrea (Erythraea) —with about 25,000 Catholics, not including 15,000 Catholic Copts.

The Abuna, or head of the Abyssinian Church, is always an Egyptian monk, nominated by the Patriarch of Egypt. The cross is held in honour by the Abyssinians, but the use of the crucifix is unknown. They tolerate paintings in their churches, but no sculptured figures. Their priests can marry once only, as in the Greek Church. There is considerable devotion to the Blessed Virgin, but, along with this and other Christian characteristics, various superstitious beliefs and practices are rife among them, to the great detriment of their morals and intellectual advancement. (DHGE.)

ACACIANS. A sect of Arians who under the leadership of Acacius of Caesarea rejected the terms consubstantial, like in substance, and unlike in substance (*ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοιούσιος, ἀνόμοιος*), and contented themselves with declaring that the Son is like the Father (*ὅμοιος*). Hence they were also called Homoeans. (See ARIUS AND ARIANISM; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 903; Newman, "Arians," p. 304.)

ACCIDENT. [See EUCHARIST, I. (γ).]

ACCLAMATION. The elevation to an ecclesiastical dignity by the unanimous voice of the electors, without voting. This is one of the three modes in which a Pope may be elected, and the election is said to be *per inspirationem*, because "all the Cardinals, with a sudden and harmonious consent, as though breathed on by the Divine Spirit, proclaim some person Pontiff with one voice, without any previous canvassing or negotiation, whence fraud or insidious suggestion could be surmised." (Vecchiotti, "Inst. Can." ii. 10.)

ACCOMMODATED SENSE. If we quote Scripture to prove a point of doctrine, we must of course try to ascertain the precise meaning of the sacred writer, and then argue from the proper sense of his words. We may, however, take the words of Scripture and make an application of them which was not originally intended. In other words we may *accommodate* the sense to the needs of our own discourse or the subject we wish to illustrate. Thus when Baronius said of his unaided labour in compiling his ecclesiastical Annals, "I have trodden the wine-press alone," he used the words of Isaiah in an accommodated sense. This practice is innocent in itself, as is shown by the example of our Lord (Mt. iv. 4), and of St. Paul (Acts xxviii. 25–28), and is frequently adopted by the Church in the Missal and Breviary. (Gigot, "General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures," p. 390.)

ACEPHALI. In the year 482 the Greek emperor Zeno issued his "Henoticon" (*q. v.*), in order to reunite the Monophysites with the Church. The heretical leaders—*e.g.* Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria—were ready to accept the emperor's terms, but many of the heretics were more obstinate, and so were nicknamed "headless" (*ἀκέφαλοι*). (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 865, 866.)

ACOEMETI (*ἀκοίμητοι*, sleepless). A name given to Eastern monks who maintained perpetual prayer, day and night. Each monastery was divided into three or more choirs, which relieved each other. This institute is said to have been introduced by Abbot Alexander, in a monastery on the Euphrates, at the beginning of the fifth century; but their most famous house was that of Studium, in Constantinople. It was founded and endowed by the Roman Studius, from whom it took its name. In 533 the Acoemeti attacked a formula used by other monks—"One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh"—and tried to procure its condemnation by the Holy See. In this they failed; they themselves fell into Nestorianism, and the formula was approved by Pope John II., and under anathema by the Fifth General Council.[1] (Life of St. Alexander, "Acta Sanct." ii. Jan. 14; Hélyot.)

ACOLYTE, from *ἀκολουθέω*, to follow; and here, to follow as a server or ministrant: a name given to the highest of the four Minor Orders. It is the duty of the acolyte to supply wine and water and to carry the lights at the Mass; and the bishop ordains him for these functions by putting the cruets and a candle into his hand, accompanying the action with words indicating the nature of the office conferred. The Order of acolyte is mentioned along with the others by Pope Cornelius[2] in the middle of the third century. Their ordination is mentioned in an ancient collection of canons commonly, though wrongly, attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage.[3] The functions of acolytes are now freely performed by laymen, though the Order is still always received by those who aspire to the priest-

[1] Practised by the Abyssinians: or sanitary, not for religious reasons.
[2] *Annals of the Propagation of Faith*, 1876.

[1] In the tenth of the fourteen anathemas of this Synod. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 112; iii. 120.)
[2] Euseb. *Hist.* vi. 43. [3] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 70.

hood.[1] (Ferraris ; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," pp. 344, 352, 366 ; Chardon, 789 ; Leclercq in DACL.)

ACTION. A word used for the Canon of the Mass, but formerly for the whole Mass. Liturgists are not agreed as to its origin and meaning. The best explanation would seem to be that given by Walafrid Strabo : "Actio dicitur ipse canon, quia in eo sacramenta conficiuntur dominica" ("De Rebus Eccl." c. xxii., PL, cxiv. 950). The title "Infra Actionem" in the rubrics of the Missal means "within the Canon," or "during the Canon." It is indeed sometimes "intra canonem." A recent theory takes "infra actionem" to be the mere perpetuation of an ancient copyist's error in transcribing the words "in fractione" (in the breaking of bread) which would thus become the title of the heading of the whole Mass-Canon, and would suggest the theory that like the Memento for the Dead, that for the Living (with the "Te igitur" its introduction) in primitive times followed instead of preceding the Consecration. If the words are taken to mean "within the Canon," they may seem to be superfluous ; but we must remember that at certain seasons there are special "Communicantes" which are placed among the Prefaces although they are recited "within the Canon." Hence the title means that the "Communicantes," whether placed here in its normal place or elsewhere, should be said "within the Canon." (Cabrol in DACL; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 330.)

(2.) The treatment of a particular subject in the session of a council. (Kraus, "Real-Encyklop.")

ACTS OF THE MARTYRS. "Acta" is technically used in Latin (1) for the proceedings in a court of justice, and (2) for the official record of such proceedings, including the preliminaries of the trial, the actions and speeches of the contending parties, the sentence of the judge ; which last, when it had been committed to the Acta, was proclaimed aloud by the public crier. "Acta martyrum," then, in its strict and original sense, meant the official and registered account of a martyr's trial and sentence. Naturally enough, the early Christians were anxious to possess these accurate narratives of the witness which their brethren made to the truth of the Christian religion. In some cases, as appears from the Acta of St. Tarachus in Ruinart, they were able by means of a bribe to get a copy of the official document. This, however, could not always be done, and the want was supplied sometimes by accounts of his trial written by the martyr himself and supplemented with the history of his "passion" or suffering from the hands of those who had witnessed it ; sometimes by accounts which proceeded entirely from friends of the martyr ; sometimes, lastly (as in the Roman Church), notaries were appointed for the special purpose of setting down the incidents of the martyrdom in documents meant for public use in the Church. Thus the expression "Acta martyrum" came to be used in a more extended sense for any account of a martyr's confession and death.

A vast number of original Acts perished in the year 303, when Diocletian by an imperial edict required Christians to deliver up to the magistrates their sacred books and books in ecclesiastical use. After the persecution of Diocletian was over, Eusebius of Caesarea made two collections of the Acts of Martyrs. One of them, entitled τὸν ἀρχαίων μαρτυρίων συναγωγή, a general Collection of the Acts of Martyrs, has perished ; the other, "On the Martyrs of Palestine," still survives as an appendix to the eighth book of his Church History. In the ninth century the Church of Constantinople possessed a great collection of the Acts of Martyrs in twelve volumes, and this probably formed the basis of the legends of saints and martyrs compiled by Simeon Metaphrastes (about 900). In the West, the most famous collection of the Lives of saints and martyrs was the "Legenda Aurea" of Jacobus de Voragine (died 1298). [See GOLDEN LEGEND.]

It is scarcely necessary to say that the value of the extant Acts of the Martyrs varies very much. Some, like the Acts of the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and of St. Polycarp, rank among the purest sources of ecclesiastical history. In other cases the original Acts have been interpolated in such a manner that it is hard to distinguish the basis of historical fact from the structure of legend and fable which has been raised upon it. The Acts of St. Caecilia furnish a striking instance of Acts which exhibit this mixed character. Other Acta again, like many of those compiled by Metaphrastes, possess little or no historical value. After the Renaissance, criticism set itself to distinguish what was ancient from that which was comparatively modern in the current Acts of the Martyrs, and in 1689 the learned Ruinart, a Benedictine of the congregation of St. Maur, published in a folio volume the "Acta sincera martyrum" ("Pure Acts of the Martyrs"), a work which in its own day could scarcely be surpassed for honest and accurate scholarship. In 1748 Stephen Assemani, a Maronite, issued his "Acta SS. martyrum orientalium et occidentalium," in two volumes folio. It includes the history of the martyrdoms east and west of the Tigris. (See BOLLANDISTS ; Delehaye, "The Legends of the Saints.")

ADAM, the first man. The Hebrew word, אָדָם which probably means earth-born,[1] is used for man in general, and also, as a proper name, for the first man. It is in the latter of these two senses that the word is taken here.

[1] But see Council of Trent, xxiii. 17.

[1] See Gen. ii. 7.

Adam was formed from "the slime of the earth" by God, who "breathed into his face the breath of life and made him to His own image and likeness." From him all mankind are descended.[1] So far all is clear. But there are great differences, with regard to the state in which Adam was created, between the teaching of Catholic and Protestant theologians, and, unless the doctrine of the Church with reference to the state of Adam in Paradise is clearly apprehended, it is impossible to understand many other parts of the Church's dogmatic system. We must begin by distinguishing between the gifts bestowed on him in the order of nature and in that of grace.

In the order of nature, Adam received from God human nature, including its constituent principles and all which flows from them or is due to them. Thus, as a man, he possessed reason and free will; he could know God as the Author of the world, if he chose to make a right use of his reason, and love Him with his will as the giver of natural good. God might have left man thus, without conferring any higher gift, for it would not have been unjust to create man for a state of "pure nature." So created, he would have been subject to disease, suffering, and death, to ignorance and to the rebellion of the appetites. He would have been destitute of grace, and could never have hoped for the happiness of heaven. But, at the same time, he would have had the ordinary help of God's providence to assist him in avoiding sin and doing his duty; and if faithful to the natural law, he would have had his reward, in knowing God eternally, so far as He can be known by reason, and in union with Him by love.

Such a state was possible.[2] But as a matter of fact, God poured into the soul of Adam, while he was in Paradise,[3] a boon which transcends all nature—that of sanctifying grace. He was able to believe in God as He is known by the light of faith, to hope that he would see Him after this life face to face, and to love Him with supernatural charity. Further, this fullness of the gifts of grace affected his natural powers. As grace subjected his soul to God, so the body in its turn was subject to the soul. The body could neither suffer nor die; the lower appetite could not rebel against the reason.[4] He had, moreover, that full knowledge of things human and divine which beseemed him, as the head of the human race.

The Scriptural account of the Fall is in striking harmony with the Catholic doctrine on original justice. Our temptations come very often from within; in Adam and Eve, because their appetites were in perfect subjection, such temptation was impossible. The Serpent tempted Eve, and Eve Adam, to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, that they might "become as gods." By the rebellion, Adam lost that sanctifying grace which made him the friend of God. He also forfeited that "integrity of nature," as theologians call it, which flowed from original justice, and thus his body passed under the yoke of suffering and death; the flesh became a constant incentive to sin. He still preserved reason and free will, was still capable of natural virtue and even of corresponding to the grace of repentance; but just as the effects of the grace in which he had been constituted at first overflowed on his natural faculties, so now the fall from grace darkened his intellect and weakened his will.

Adam was the representative of the human race. If he had persevered in obedience, his descendants would have inherited from him, along with human nature, original justice and the virtues annexed to it. As it is, men come into the world destitute of grace, and so unable to attain the end for which they were created; while their very nature is wounded and impaired through the fall of their first parent. It is heresy, however, to hold, with Calvin and the other Reformers, that even fallen man is wholly evil. It is grace, not nature, which he has lost, and in his degradation he still keeps reason and free will; he is still capable of natural good. (See CONCUPISCENCE, GRACE and ORIGINAL SIN.; St. Thom. 1a, qq. 90–95; Pesch, "Praelect. Dogm." iii. *De Deo Creante*, s. iv. a. 1; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 334, 389, 505; ii. 20, 88, 475.)

ADAMITES. (1.) An obscure Gnostic sect, said to have been founded by Prodicus, son of Carpocrates, in the second century. They are alleged to have met together without clothes and abandoned themselves to horrible immorality.

(2.) A fanatical sect of the Middle Ages. Their leader, who called himself Adam, was a Frenchman whose real name was Picard (he may perhaps have come from Picardy). From France they spread through Holland and Germany, but had their chief settlement in Bohemia, where they flourished at the time of the Hussite troubles. They were annihilated with frightful severity by Ziska in 1421. They recommended their followers to go naked, and gave unrestrained licence to sensuality. (St. Augustine, "Haeres." xxxi., PL, xlii. 31; Bareille in DTaC; Hergenröther, in "Kirchenlex.")

ADJURATION. *Adjurare* in classical Latin means to swear or confirm by oath. In ecclesiastical usage it means to beg earnestly or to command in God's name, or in the name

[1] Gen. iii. 20.

[2] This is evidently the doctrine of the Church. See the propositions of Baius, especially 26, 55, condemned by the Popes.

[3] It is not certain, though generally held, that Adam was *created* in grace. The Council of Trent left the matter open.

[4] "By sin," St. Paul says, "[came] death" (Rom. v.). Adam and Eve before the Fall, although naked, "were not ashamed," which indicates the complete subjection of the lower nature (Gen. ii. 25).

of some holy person or thing. Thus when our Lord refused to answer, the High Priest said: "I adjure thee (ἐξορκίζω) by the living God that thou tell us if thou be the Christ" (Mt. xxvi. 63). Such a calling upon God is lawful if it fulfils the ordinary conditions: "in truth, in justice, and in judgment" (Jerem. iv. 2). That is to say, the person who brings in God's name must really intend to obtain what he asks; he must not ask for anything unjust; and he must not ask without due cause. Adjuration is of two kinds: solemn and private. The former is done by the Church's ministers and with a rite sanctioned by her; the latter has no particular rite and can be used by anyone. (See EXORCISM; St. Thom. 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 90; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 434.)

ADMINISTRATOR. When a bishop is lawfully absent from his diocese for a prolonged period, the Pope sometimes grants him an "apostolic administrator" to take charge of the see. So, too, when a prince was appointed to a bishopric before he was capable of governing it.

The name is commonly applied to a priest in charge of a parish, but who is not himself the rector of the parish. Thus, a bishop's parish is under the care of an administrator. (Taunton.)

ADOPTION. The Roman law held that by adoption a civil or legal kindred was established between the parties, which in many respects had the same effects as natural kindred. To this as a general principle the canon law adhered. But since, in proportion to the degree in which the adoptive was assimilated to the real relationship, impediments to marriage were multiplied, it became necessary in the interest of Christian society to restrict the effects of adoption within reasonable limits. So intricate a subject cannot be fully treated here, but the outlines of the compromise which the canonists ultimately acquiesced in may be briefly stated.

The Roman law made void a marriage between (1) the adoptive father and his adopted daughter; (2) the adopted children and the natural children of the same parent; (3) the adoptive father and the adopted son and the widows of these two respectively. In the first two cases the impediment to marriage was legal consanguinity: in the third, legal affinity. (Hunter, "Rom. Law," pp. 58-66.) The canon law has affirmed the impediment in the first and in the third case. A Catholic may not marry his adopted daughter, nor the widow of his adoptive father. In the second case the impediment only exists so long as the adopted child and the child by blood, or either of them, remain in the father's power; that power being withdrawn, by death or otherwise, the impediment ceases. (See the chapter in Vecchiotti, "Inst. Can." v. 13, *De cognatione civili seu legali.*)

Adoption has never been recognized as a legal institution in England or Scotland. In the United States it is admitted, with more or less of restriction according to the ideas of jurisprudence prevailing in different States. In Massachusetts, by the law of 1876, adoption is an impediment to marriage, between the adopter and the adopted, but to no other unions. The Code Napoléon allows adoption, but under rigorous conditions. (See Whitmore's "Law of Adoption in the U.S.")

ADOPTION, SUPERNATURAL. The supernatural status, the life, and the goods to which God has called man are designated in Scripture as an elevation from slavery to adoptive sonship of God. "God sent his Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons" (τὴν υἱοθεσίαν, Gal. iv. 5; cf. Rom. viii. 14-17, Eph. i. 3-6, Jn. xv. 14, 15, 1 Cor. vi. 16, 17.) This sonship is not merely a natural relation to God founded upon sinlessness, but a thoroughly intimate relation raising the creature from its natural humble estate and making it the object of a peculiar Divine benevolence and complaisance, admitting it to filial love and enabling it to become the heir of God and joint heir with His Divine Son. Thereby we obtain the "fellowship (κοινωνία) with the Father and the Son" (1 Jn. i. 3) and the "communication (κοινωνία) of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cor. xiii. 13); and are made "partakers of the Divine nature" (θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 2-5). The Fathers commonly call this supernatural union of the adopted creature with God the "Deification" of the creature. St. Athanasius insists on this again and again: Christ "became man that we might be made Gods" (θεοποιηθῶμεν, "De Incarn." n. 54, PG, xxv. 192; Newman, "St. Athan." II. p. 88). The contents of these pregnant expressions have been admirably drawn out by the Fathers and theologians especially since the Council of Trent. (See Petavius, "De Trin." I. viii.; Thomassin, "De Incarn." I. vi.; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." I. p. 443 *sqq*; see also GRACE, SUPERNATURAL ORDER.)

ADOPTIONISM. A heresy which arose in Spain and is closely allied to Nestorianism. Towards the end of the eighth century, Felix, bishop of Urgel, and Elipandus, bishop of Toledo, held the opinion that Christ as man is only the adopted son of God. They supported this error by passages quoted from the Fathers and by the expression "*homo adoptivus*" which occurs in the Mozarabic Missal. Pope Hadrian, in a letter to the Bishops of Spain, condemned this error as Nestorian, and a like sentence was passed against it in three synods convoked by Charlemagne, at Ratisbon in 792, at Frankfort in 794, and at Aix-la-Chapelle in 798. Alcuin, Paulinus of Aquileia, and Agobard wrote against the error. Both Felix and

Elipandus died in heresy, but, owing to the zeal of Leidrad of Lyons and Benedict of Aniane, who made repeated visits to Spain, the followers of the heresiarchs were converted and the error died out. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 1034, 1045, 1096.)

The Catholic Doctors in their controversy with the Adoptionists rightly urged that adoption implies that the person adopted was, previous to his adoption, alien to the person who adopts him. Now, even as man, Christ, far from being alien to God, was the natural Son of God. His sacred Humanity was united from the first moment of its existence to the Person of God the Word. When we say "this man," we indicate not only the possession of human nature: the words signify a person. Hence "the man Christ" or "Christ in His human nature" is equivalent to God the Son subsisting in human nature; and He cannot have been adopted, for the simple reason that He was son by nature. So St. Paul speaks of Him even in His humanity as the proper Son of God. God, he says, did not spare His own Son (*τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ*) "but gave him up for us all" [1]: where the reference clearly is to Christ as man.

The Adoptionist heresy "halts between two opinions"—viz. Catholic doctrine and Nestorianism. If in Christ there had been two persons, one human and one divine, then there might also have been two sons, one by adoption, one by nature. (See Petavius, "De Incarnat." i. 22, and vii. 1 *seq.*; and for the opinion of Scotus, who seems to have used the form "Christ as man is the adopted Son of God," but in an orthodox sense, see Billuart, "De Incarnat." Diss. xxi.; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 126.)

ADORATION, &c. [See CULTUS; LATRIA; PERPETUAL ADORATION.]

ADULTERY. The Catholic Church holds that the bond of marriage is not and ought not to be dissolved by the adultery of either party; see the decree of the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. can. 7). It remains to consider in what way the act affects, though it cannot break, the nuptial tie. The canon law allows of divorce from bed and board (*a toro et cohabitatione*), whether permanent or temporary, for various causes. Of these causes adultery is one of the chief. The right to this species of divorce, or, as it is called in England, judicial separation, accrues to either party in consequence of the adultery of the other, provided that the guilt be certain and notorious, whether in fact or in law. It was formerly held that this right, though it undoubtedly belonged to the husband after the misconduct of his wife, ought not to be similarly extended to a wife on account of the adultery of the husband. This opinion is not now held, and it is agreed that the adultery of either party is a sufficient cause entitling the innocent person to claim a judicial separation for life.

Several questions, however, arise. Is the husband whose wife has committed adultery bound to separate himself from her, or does he merely enter into a right which he may either exercise or not as he likes? Arguments of great weight have been adduced by canonists on either side of this question. But there is no doubt that the wife, in the parallel case, is not so bound, and that for reasons such as these: (1) that her husband's guilt implies no acquiescence on her part, which could hardly be the case were the wife the offender; (2) that the honour of the family and the legitimacy of the children are not stained or imperilled in the one case as they are in the other; (3) that her insisting on being separated from him is not likely to lead to the husband's reformation, but rather the contrary.

Another question arises, as to the legal effect of the commission of adultery by the innocent party after the sentence of divorce (judicial separation) has been pronounced. On this point, opinions are greatly divided, some holding that the divorce is a *res judicata*, which no subsequent misconduct on the part of the spouse innocent at the date of the sentence can affect; others maintaining that the sentence itself saddles the party relieved with an implied condition "*quamdiu bene se gesserit*," and that if that condition is violated, the spouse against whom the judgment was given may justly claim the restitution of conjugal rights.

Various impediments to divorce on account of adultery are allowed by the canon law, of which the chief are, the proof of adultery against the spouse seeking a divorce, and condonation.

The statutory law of England, as is well known, holds the adultery of the wife to be a good cause, not only of the limited species of divorce treated above, but of the absolute severance of the nuptial bond, provided always that, as the saying is, the husband comes into court with clean hands. But the proof of adultery alone does not entitle a wife to obtain a divorce *a vinculo* against the husband; it must, to have that effect, be coupled with cruelty or desertion. (See MARRIAGE, III.; Vecchiotti, v. 14, § 123.)

ADVENT, SEASON OF. The period, of between three and four weeks from Advent Sunday (which is always the Sunday nearest to the feast of St. Andrew) to Christmas Eve, is named by the Church the season of Advent. During it she desires that her children should practise fasting, works of penance, meditation, and prayer, in order to prepare themselves for celebrating worthily the coming (*adventus*) of the Son of God in the flesh, to promote His spiritual advent within their own souls, and to school themselves to look forward with hope and joy to

[1] Rom. viii. 3.

His second advent, when He shall come again to judge mankind.

It is impossible to fix the precise time when the season of Advent began to be observed. A canon of a Council at Saragossa, in 380, forbade the faithful to absent themselves from the Church services during the three weeks from December 17th to the Epiphany; this is perhaps the earliest trace on record of the observance of Advent. (Hefele-Leclercq. i. 987.) The singing of the "greater antiphons" at vespers is commenced, according to the Roman ritual, on the very day specified by the Council of Saragossa; this can hardly be a mere coincidence. In the fifth century Advent seems to have been assimilated to Lent, and kept as a time of fasting and abstinence for forty days, or even longer—*i.e.* from Martinmas (Nov. 11) to Christmas Eve. In the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great there are Masses for five Sundays in Advent; but about the ninth century these were reduced to four, and so they have ever since remained. "We may therefore consider the present discipline of the observance of Advent as having lasted a thousand years, at least as far as the church of Rome is concerned." [1] Even now the Mass for the last Sunday after Pentecost cannot be separated from Advent.

With regard to fasting and abstinence during Advent, the practice has always greatly varied, and still varies, in different parts of the Church. Strictness has been observed, after which came a period of relaxation, followed by a return to strictness. At the present time, the Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent are observed as fast-days by English and Irish Catholics; but in France and other Continental countries the ancient discipline has long ago died out, except among religious communities.

There is a marvellous beauty in the offices and rites of the Church during this season. The lessons, generally taken from the prophecies of Isaiah, remind us how the desire and expectation, not of Israel only, but of all nations, carried forward the thoughts of mankind, before the time of Jesus Christ, to a Redeemer one day to be revealed; they also strike the note of preparation, watchfulness, compunction, hope. In the Gospels we hear of the terrors of the last judgment, that second advent which those who despise the first will not escape; of the witness borne by John the Precursor, and of the "mighty works" by which the Saviour's life supplied a solid foundation and justification for that witness. At vespers, the seven greater antiphons, or anthems—beginning on December 17th, the first of the seven greater Ferias preceding Christmas Eve—are a noteworthy feature of the liturgical year. They are called the O's of Advent, on account of the manner in which they commence; they are all addressed to Christ; and they are *double*—that is, they are sung entire both before and after the Magnificat. Of the first, *O Sapientia, quae ex ore Altissimi prodiisti*, &c., a trace still remains in the words *O Sapientia* printed in the calendar of the Anglican Prayer Book opposite December 16—words which probably not one person in ten thousand using the Prayer Book understands. The purple hue of penance is the only colour used in the services of Advent, except on the feasts of saints. In many other points Advent resembles Lent: during its continuance, in Masses de Tempore, the *Gloria in excelsis* is suppressed, the organ is silent, the deacon sings *Benedicamus Domino* at the end of Mass instead of *Ite, Missa est*, and marriages are not solemnized. On the other hand, the *Alleluia*, the word of gladness, is only once or twice interrupted during Advent, and the organ finds its voice on the third Sunday (*Gaudete* Sunday); the Church, by these vestiges of joy, signifying that the assured expectation of a Redeemer whose birth she will soon celebrate fills her heart, and chequers the gloom of her mourning with these gleams of brightness. (Fleury, "Hist. Eccles." xvii. 57; Guéranger's "Liturgical Year"; Cabrol in DACL; Thurston, "The Great Antiphons" in *Month*, Dec. 1905.)

ADVENT OF CHRIST. [See MILLENNIUM.]

ADVOCATUS DEI. ADVOCATUS DIABOLI. [See CANONIZATION, p. 115.]

ADVOCATUS ECCLESIAE. Ferraris distinguishes four classes of *advocati ecclesiarum*, but the most important class, and that with which alone we shall concern ourselves here, was that of advocate-protectors, princes or barons, or other powerful laymen, who, for a consideration, undertook to protect the property of a church or monastery, as well as the lives of the inmates. In the turbulent period between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries this practice was largely resorted to. The *advocatus* sometimes received a kind of rent, either in money or in kind, but more generally he was put in possession of Church lands, which he might use for his own benefit on condition of protecting the rest. "But these advocates became too often themselves the spoilers, and oppressed the helpless ecclesiastics for whose defence they had been engaged." [1] The Lateran Council, in 1215, had to decree (chap. 45) "that patrons or advocates, or vidames, should not in future encroach on the property entrusted to them; if they presume to do otherwise, let them be restrained by all the severity of the canon law." As law and order became stronger in Europe, the practice of employing *advocati* naturally fell into disuse. (See PATRON; Ferraris.)

ADVOWSON (*Advocatio*) is the right of

[1] Guéranger's *Liturgical Year*, translated by Dom Shepherd, 1867.

[1] Hallam's *Middle Ages*, c. vii. part 1.

presentation to a vacant benefice. This right originally belonged to the founder of the benefice, but subsequently (in the case of a church) passed to the lord of the manor or to others. When the presenter was a lay person he merely nominated to the bishop, who then instituted the presentee, but if the bishop has the advowson he is said to "collate," for the two acts of nomination and institution are consolidated. (See PATRON; Taunton.)

AEON. [See GNOSTICISM, p. 384.]

AËTIUS and AËTIANS. Aëtius was a native of Antioch, born in the first half of the fourth century. He was a good example of the "Graeculus esuriens" satirised by Juvenal; after having been successively a slave, a charcoal-burner, a tinker, and a quack doctor, he applied himself to the profession of philosophy, and finally to that of theology. He became a pupil of Leontius, who, on being made Patriarch of Antioch in 350, ordained Aëtius deacon. The Arian sentiments to which he could not help giving expression led to his expulsion from Antioch; he sought refuge at Alexandria, where he learnt from a sophist the Aristotelian logic, and contrived to ingratiate himself with George the Arian patriarch. Aided by a zealous disciple, Eunomius, who joined him at this time, he denied not only the doctrine of Nicaea, which the great Athanasius was engaged in defending, but also that of the Homoiousians that the Son was *like* to the Father. The laxity and recklessness of his language were such that the people called him "the atheist." In 358, hearing that Eudoxus, an inveterate and audacious Arian, was installed at Antioch, Aëtius went thither, and soon became a person of some importance. But Eudoxus could not prevail upon the bishops of the neighbouring sees to consent to his reinstating Aëtius in the diaconate. Basil of Ancyra complained to the Emperor Constantius of the licence which was allowed to heresy at Antioch; and the Emperor in alarm ordered Eudoxus and Aëtius to come to Constantinople. The authorship of an exposition of faith in which the unlikeness of the Son to the Father was maintained was brought home to Aëtius, and the Emperor banished him to Phrygia (360). His place of exile was changed to Mopsuestia, and afterwards to an unhealthy town in Pisidia. Here he is said to have maintained his heresy yet more openly, and published in support of it a syllabus of forty-seven articles, which St. Epiphanius has preserved and refuted. The date of his death is not recorded (366–370 ?). (Fleury, "Hist. Eccles." xii.–xiv.; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 887.)

AFFINITY, in the proper sense of the word, is the connection which arises from cohabitation between each one of the two parties cohabiting, and the blood-relations of the other. It is regarded as an impediment to marriage in the Jewish, Roman, and canon law.

In the Jewish law a man is forbidden, by reason of affinity, to marry his step-mother, step-daughter, and step-granddaughter, his mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, the widow of his father's brother (the Vulgate adds the widow of his mother's brother), the widow of his brother, if he has left children.[1]

In the Roman law marriage was forbidden between a man and his mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, step-mother, step-daughter, the wife of his deceased brother, the sister of his deceased wife. It also forbade a step-father to marry the widow of his step-son, and a step-mother to marry the surviving husband of her step-daughter.

The canon law, starting from the principle that man and woman who have intercourse with each other become one flesh, considered the marriage of one party with the relations of the other as equivalent to a marriage with his or her own relation. Affinity was computed by degrees just as consanguinity was, according to the legal maxim, "The degree of a person's consanguinity with one of a married pair is the degree of his affinity to the other." Thus gradually marriage was forbidden to the seventh degree of affinity.[2] Further, although the relations of one married person could espouse the relations of the other, on the principle that "affinity does not produce affinity," still the impediment of affinity was extended to the children a woman had by her second marriage and the relations of her first husband. Moreover, two other kinds of affinity were introduced, viz. of the second and third class (*secundi et tertii generis*), so that marriage was unlawful between a man married to a widow and those who had affinity to his wife's former partner, or, again, who had affinity to those who were in affinity to the former partner. Finally, all these degrees of affinity were contracted by unlawful intercourse as well as by marriage.

In 1215 the fiftieth canon of the Fourth Lateran Council abolished the impediment from affinity of the second and third class, as well as that from affinity between the children a woman had in second marriage and the relations of her first husband, and limited the impediment of affinity in the strict sense to the first four degrees. Lastly, the Council of Trent[3] confined the impediment of affinity from unlawful intercourse to the first two degrees, and so the law of the Church continues to the present day. Thus, affinity arising from previous marriage, to the fourth degree, and from unlawful intercourse, to the second degree (both inclusive), makes marriage null and void, and, if it supervenes after marriage, deprives the guilty party of his or her marriage rights. However, with one

[1] Levit. xviii. 8, 14–17; xx. 11, 12, 14, 20, 21; Deut. xxii. 30; xxvii. 20, 23.
[2] Concil. Rom. anno 721. [3] Sess. xxiv. c. 4.

possible exception, viz. that between a man and the woman whose mother or daughter he has married, or, *vice versa*, between a woman and a man to whose father or son she has been married, affinity impedes marriage only by ecclesiastical, not by natural law, so that the Pope can grant a dispensation.[1]

Besides the various classes of affinity properly so called, there are further two species of *quasi-affinity*, known as *legal* and *spiritual affinity*. With regard to the former, the Church has adopted the determination of the Roman law, according to which marriage cannot be contracted between an adopted son and the widow of his adoptive father, or between the adoptive father and the widow of the adopted son. [See ADOPTION.] According to the canon law, spiritual affinity nullified marriage between the widow or widower of the God-parent in baptism and the person baptized or confirmed, and between the widow or widower of the God-parent and either parent of the person confirmed or baptized. Since, however, the Council of Trent, in reforming the older law on spiritual relationship (*cognatio spiritualis*), makes no mention of spiritual affinity, it is generally supposed that the latter is no longer to be recognized as an impediment to marriage. (Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vi. 595; Slater, "Mor. Theol." ii. 301.)

AFRICAN CHURCH AND COUNCILS. Among the witnesses of the Pentecostal miracle[2] were Jews, not from Egypt only, but also from "the parts of Libya about Cyrene," and by some of these Christianity must have been extended in North Africa at a very early period. Eusebius tells us that St. Mark went into Egypt, and founded the Church of Alexandria, of which he was the first patriarch. The first see founded further west is believed to have been Carthage, which, at the time when we first hear of it, through Tertullian, one of its presbyters, writing about 200, was already the centre of a flourishing Afro-Roman Christian province, in which the majority of the inhabitants were Christians. Monachism sprang up in Egypt [ABBOT] in the third century, and the heresy of Arius appeared at Alexandria near the beginning of the fourth. A flood of light is thrown upon the condition of the African Church at the beginning of the fifth century by the writings of its greatest son, St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, whose vast and disciplined genius has never ceased to instruct and delight the Catholics of every later age. When St. Augustine died (430), his episcopal city was being besieged by the Vandals from Spain, who soon after made themselves masters of the whole of Roman Africa. They were Arians, and cruelly persecuted the orthodox Church, which in the time of St. Augustine could count its four hundred sees. The Donatist schism, which seduced great numbers into a state of alienation from Catholic communion, had already arisen about the beginning of the fourth century. [ARIANISM; DONATISTS.] Belisarius in the sixth century defeated the Vandals and recovered Africa for the Emperor Justinian; but Christianity had not had time to recover from the blows which war and heresy had inflicted, before the swords of the Arabs, fanatical propagators of the religion of Mahomet, hewed down, from the Nile to the Pillars of Hercules, all authority but their own. Under their baneful sway, which in the early ages of Islam was wielded with great political skill, Christianity became all but extinct in North Africa. Only in our own day, through the conquest of Algeria by the French, the Cross has driven back the Crescent on the Barbary coast; and the work of Cardinal Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers (d. 1892), seems likely to reillume a ray of the ancient glory of the African Church.

Africa is at present ringed round with Catholic missions. On the other hand, the Moravians, the Presbyterians, the Independents, the Anglicans, and other sects, have shown much activity in indoctrinating the native tribes (especially of South Africa) in their respective systems, and have met with considerable success. (See "Missiones Catholicae," the official year-book of Propaganda; Streit, "Atlas Hierarchicus"; and the art. MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN.)

AFRICAN COUNCILS. These were for the most part held at Carthage. In the first four centuries the African Church, full of activity and fervour, and represented by men of the highest intellectual eminence, among whom we need but name St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, bore its part to the full in those memorable conciliar discussions which settled the form of doctrine and discipline that Christianity was to bear in the world. The chief subjects discussed at the African councils which preceded the Vandal invasion were, the re-baptism of heretics returning to the Church, the Donatist controversy, the heresy of Pelagius, and the adjustment of questions of discipline either internal or between Africa and Rome. Fleury enumerates seventeen Councils of Carthage, the last of which, held in 535, busied itself with repairing the havoc which the ravages of the Arian heretics had made. We read of an African Council, the last of the entire series, held in 646, which condemned the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius. In the following year the Caliph Othman despatched the expedition which, with others that followed it, brought utter ruin on the Roman and Christian civilization of Africa. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii.: Leclercq, "L'Afrique Chrétienne"; Froidevaux in DHGE; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise," i. 388.)

[1] Gury, *Moral. Theol.* "De Matrimon." § 813, with Ballerini's note.

[2] Acts ii. 10.

AGAPE (from *ἀγάπη*, love). A name given in Jude 12 to the brotherly feasts of the early Christians, which are described at length in 1 Cor. xi. They were instituted in part on the analogy of the common meals usual among the Greeks (*συσσίτια*) to which each contributed his share; but this common meal was elevated by the spirit of Christian charity and designed to commemorate the Last Supper which Christ held with His disciples, as well as to serve for the relief of the poor. Thus it received a liturgical character, so that the Apostle calls it "the supper of the Lord."[1] It was also closely connected with the sacred mysteries, and, more probably, preceded them. However, this custom of taking other food before the Communion soon died out, although in St. Augustine's time the custom still survived of permitting Communion once a year—viz. on Holy Thursday—to those who had just partaken of the Agape.[2]

The Agape thus separated from the Eucharist survived for many centuries in the Church, although it was evident even in St. Paul's day how liable it was to abuse, and the complaints of St. Augustine prove that he was familiar with similar scandals. The Synod of Gangra, about the middle of the fourth century, anathematizes those who despise the Agape, although Van Espen is of opinion that in this place the Agape means no more than a common meal charitably supplied to the poor.[3] Be that as it may, the Agapai still continued to be celebrated in the Church. The Council of Laodicea, in the latter part of the fourth century, forbade "eating in the house of God," but the Synod in Trullo, centuries after, had to repeat the prohibition, which was placed by Gratian in the *corpus juris*.[4] (Leclercq in DACL; Batiffol in DThC; J. F. Keating, "The Agape and the Eucharist in the Early Church.")

AGAPETÆ ('Αγαπηταί, beloved), a term popularly applied to virgins consecrated to God who had laymen associated with them to manage their affairs. This practice, perfectly innocent in its origin (1 Cor. ix. 5), easily led to scandals which were denounced by St. Cyprian (Ep. iv. ed. Hartel, 472), St. John Chrysostom (PG, xlvii. 495), and St. Jerome (Ep. xxii., PL, xxii. 402). They are not to be confounded with the *subintroductae*, women who lived in the houses of clerics concerning whom the Council of Nicaea legislated (Hemmer in DThC; Hefele-Leclercq, i. p. 201, 236, 536).

AGE, CANONICAL. The Church, like the State, fixes certain ages at which her subjects become capable of incurring special obligations, enjoying special privileges, of entering on special states of life, or of holding office and dignity. The following is a summary of the principal determinations regarding age, so far as they affect (1) the ordinary life of a Christian, (2) the ecclesiastical and religious state. It must be observed that the canonical age is reckoned from the day of birth, not from that of baptism.

1. *With regard to ordinary Christians.* The age of reason is generally supposed to begin about the seventh year, though of course it may come earlier in some cases, later in others. At that time a child becomes capable of mortal sin, and so of receiving the sacraments of penance and extreme unction, which are the remedies for post-baptismal sin. The Holy Eucharist and Confirmation, according to the discipline of the West, are given soon after the use of reason has been attained, when the child has received some instruction in Christian doctrine, and is able to understand the nature of these sacraments. [See CHILDREN'S COMMUNION.] Further, at seven years of age, a child becomes subject to the law of the Church (*e.g.* with regard to abstinence, Sunday Mass, &c.), and can contract an engagement of marriage. [See ESPOUSAL.]

The age of puberty begins in the case of males at fourteen, in that of females at twelve. Marriage contracted by persons under these ages is null and void (*nisi malitia suppleat aetatem*). Till the age of puberty is reached, no one can be required to take an oath.

At twenty-one, the obligation of fasting begins; it ceases, according to the common opinion, at sixty for men, and at fifty for women.

2. *With regard to religious and ecclesiastics.* —At seven, a person may be tonsured. No special age is named in the canon law for the reception of minor orders. A subdeacon must have completed his twenty-first, a deacon his twenty-second, a priest his twenty-fourth, and a bishop his thirtieth year. A cleric cannot hold a simple benefice before entering on his fourteenth year; an ecclesiastical dignity—*e.g.* a canonry in a cathedral church—till he has completed his twenty-second year; a benefice with cure of souls attached to it, before he has begun his twenty-fifth year; a diocese, till he has completed his thirtieth year.

A religious cannot make his profession till he is at least sixteen years old, and has passed a year in the noviciate. He must be thirty years of age before he can hold a prelacy which involves quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. A girl must be over twelve years of age before she assumes the religious habit. A woman under forty cannot be chosen religious superior of a convent, unless it is impossible to find in the order a religious of the age required, and otherwise suitable. In this case, a religious thirty years old may be chosen with the consent of the bishop or other

[1] In Estius *ad loc.* convincing reasons are given for distinguishing the "Supper of the Lord" from the Eucharist.
[2] See Estius, and the Council of Hippo, Hefele-Leclercq, 88.
[3] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 1037.
[4] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 1015.

superior. This legislation has, however, frequently been modified in the Constitutions given by the Holy See to Orders or Congregations of Women. Mostly, the condition that a superior be at least forty years of age is not now insisted upon; and on the other hand a maximum age limit is often fixed, for admission to the Institute, usually thirty. (See Council of Trent, sess. xxiii., xxiv., xxv.; Ferraris.)

AGNOETAE. A sect of Monophysites founded by the Alexandrian deacon Themistius, and hence also called Themistians. Themistius, although, being a Monophysite, he held only one nature of the Incarnate Word, maintained that this nature was subject to ignorance. Timothy, Patriarch of Alexandria, and his successor Theodosius (537–539) opposed this assertion, which led logically to the confession of two natures, or to the open denial of Christ's divinity. Thereupon, the Agnoetae formed themselves into a special sect which lasted till the eighth century. (See Petavius, "De Incarnat." I. xvi. 11; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 876; Vacant, in DThC.)

AGNUS DEI. (1) A prayer in the Mass, which occurs shortly before the Communion—"Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, &c., give us peace." It has been used since the time of Pope Sergius, in the seventh century. Originally (according to some, till the time of John XXII.), each petition ended with "have mercy on us"; and this custom still continues in the Lateran basilica (Gavantus; Cabrol, in DACL).

(2) The figure of a lamb stamped on the wax which remains from the Paschal candles, and solemnly blessed by the Pope on the Thursday after Easter, in the first and seventh years of his Pontificate. Amalarius, writing early in the ninth century,[1] mentions the fact that in his time the Agnus Dei's were made of wax and oil by the Archdeacon of Rome, blessed by the Pope, and distributed to the people on the octave of Easter. A bull of Gregory XIII. forbids persons to paint or gild any Agnus Dei blessed by the Pope, under pain of excommunication.[2] (Henry, in DACL; Thurston, "Holy Year of Jubilee," 247–256.)

AGRAPHA ("Ἄγραφα, unwritten). Sayings of our Lord which do not occur in the canonical Gospels. The term is not exact, for some of these sayings are recorded in the inspired Scriptures, *e.g.* "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts xx. 35). Resch ("Agrapha," 1889) has collected more than seventy of them, but most are only interpolations, interpretations, or quotations from memory. They have no authority except as proofs of opinions current at the time they are cited. Recent researches in Egyptian papyri have added considerably and continue to add to the Agrapha known, many of which, however, internal evidence shows to be spurious. (Mangenot, in DThC; Batiffol, "La Littérature Grecque," 27.)

ALB. A vestment of white linen, reaching from head to foot and with sleeves, which the priest puts on before saying Mass, with the prayer—"Make me white, O Lord, and cleanse me," &c. It sprang from the undergarment (the *tunica*, or ποδήρης (Apoc. i. 13)) of the Romans and Greeks, which was usually white, although *alba* does not occur as a technical term for the white tunic till nearly the end of the third century. The Greek under-garment had sleeves, and it was this which the Christians adopted for ecclesiastical use. The alb was adopted for Church use from early times. Eusebius speaks of bishops clothed in the holy ποδήρης. A canon attributed to the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage, 398, and which certainly belongs to that period, orders deacons to use the alb "only at the time of the oblation or of reading." In 589, the Council of Narbonne forbade deacons, subdeacons, or lectores to put off the alb before the end of Mass. At the same time, long after this date the alb continued to be worn, at least by clerics, in daily life. Thus, in 889, a Bishop of Soissons forbids an ecclesiastic to use at Mass the *same* alb which he is accustomed to wear at home.

The shape of the alb has remained much as it was, for it is a mistake to suppose that it ever was a tight-fitting garment. As a rule, too, it was made of linen, whence it is often called *linea*, but it was sometimes made of silk, and adorned with gold and with figures. It was also in ancient times ornamented with stripes of purple or gold. Another ancient ornament of the alb consisted in the *paratura* (or apparel), which was in use from the eleventh to the sixteenth century. This *paratura* (from *parare*, to adorn: French, *parure*, apparel) was a square piece of coloured embroidery from half a foot to one foot in length, sewed on at four places in the alb. [See APPAREL.]

The mystical meaning of this vestment is plainly indicated by the prayer given above. (Hefele, "Beiträge," &c.)

The tight-sleeved *rochet* worn by prelates and the loose-sleeved Roman *cotta* (*curta*, short) are nothing more than reduced albs. In France, and some other countries, acolytes and others serving at Mass to this day appear vested in long albs identical with those of the sacred ministers. The true surplice (*superpelliceum*) is in like manner the alb shortened and so fashioned as to be able to be worn over a thick outer garment. Albs were formerly worn unconfined by girdles, but the need of freedom of movement led easily to the introduction of a cincture of some sort,

[1] Fleury, xlvii. 36.
[2] St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.* vii. n. 209.

(the priest's girdle, the French altar boy's sash, &c.).

In another direction subdeacons, by having their albs or tunics made of silk materials, coloured and richly embroidered, shortening them and wearing them over a second linen alb, produced the garment they now wear (tunicle), practically undistinguishable from the robe of honour called a dalmatic, which is proper to bishops and deacons, and, is denied even to priests as such. (Braun, "Die Priesterlichen Gewänder des Abendlandes," 16–43, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 57–101; Rock, i. 347–373; De Montault, "Costume Ecclésiastique"; Marriott, "Vestiarium Christianum"; Thurston, in "Cath. Enc.")

The word is often used, commonly in the plural ("Dominica in albis"), for the white robes received in baptism. [See CHRISOM.]

ALBIGENSES. These heretics were so named from the town of Albi in Languedoc, where a Council was held in 1176 which condemned their doctrines. They owed their Manichaean tenets to the Paulician sect, which, originally formed in Armenia in the eighth century, was exiled to Bulgaria, and, becoming very powerful there, gradually extended its numbers and influence up the valley of the Danube, and passed out of Swabia into the south-east of France. Their teachers assumed a great simplicity of manners, dress, and mode of life; they inveighed against the vices and worldliness of the clergy; and there was sufficient truth in these censures to dispose their hearers to believe what they advanced and reject what they decried. They taught the well-known doctrine of the Manichaeans, that there are two opposing creative principles, one good, the other evil: the invisible world proceeding from the former, the body and all material things from the latter.[1] They also rejected the Old Testament, said that infant baptism was useless, and denied marriage to the "perfect," as they called their more austere members. The condemnation of their tenets by the Council of Albi produced little or no effect; they still multiplied and spread; and Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, protected them. Innocent III. sent Peter of Castelnau to Languedoc, as his legate, to oppose the spread of the mischief. In 1206 Diego, the holy Bishop of Osma in Spain, attended by Dominic his sub-prior, engaged in a mission in the south of France, the result of which was to bring back great numbers to the Catholic faith. The legate having been murdered in 1208 by a servant of the Count of Toulouse, Innocent proclaimed a crusade or holy war, with indulgences, against the Albigensian heretics, and requested Philip II., the King of France, to put himself at its head. The king refused, but permitted any of his vassals to join it who chose. An army was collected, composed largely of desperadoes, mercenary soldiers, and adventurers of every description, whose sole object was plunder. Raymond, in great fear, not only promised all that was demanded of him, but assumed the Cross himself against his *protégés*. The war opened in 1209 with the siege of Béziers and the massacre of its inhabitants. Simon de Montfort, the father of the famous Earl of Leicester, was made Count of the territories conquered. The war lasted many years and became political; in its progress great atrocities were committed, Languedoc was laid desolate, and the Provençal civilization destroyed. Peace was made in 1227, and the tribunal of the Inquisition established soon after. St. Dominic, who preached zealously in Languedoc while the war was proceeding, and founded his celebrated Order in 1215, is thought by some to have been the first Inquisitor; but this seems to be a mistake. (Gibbon, liv.; Fleury, lxxii.; Guilleux in DAp; Guiraud in DHGE, and "Chartulaire St. de la Rouille"; Douais, "Les Albigeois;" Hefele-Leclercq, v. 1260 *sqq.*)

[1] Protestant writers have denied this, but it has been conclusively established by, among others, Hallam, in his *History of the Middle Ages*, ch. ix. part 2.

ALEXANDRIA (Church of). The foundation of this Church by St. Mark the Evangelist, the ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, as he is called by Papias, has been already noticed [AFRICAN CHURCH]. The names of eighteen bishops of Alexandria between St. Mark and St. Athanasius are on record, but little is known about most of them. Demetrius, who died in 234, is known as having been the great Origen's bishop, who first favoured and afterwards persecuted that extraordinary man. The eighteenth in succession to St. Mark was Alexander, one of the fathers who sat at Nicaea. Under him arose the Arian controversy [ARIANS, ARIUS]. Athanasius succeeded Alexander in 326, and after battling with Arianism for more than forty years, passed the close of his stormy life in peace, dying in 373. Even in the fourth century, a large proportion of the people of Alexandria were idolaters, as is shown by the story of George the intrusive Arian bishop, murdered in a popular rising because he was believed to have insulted some of the heathen rites. In the fifth and sixth centuries Monophysite bishops had possession from time to time of the see of Alexandria, which now began to be called a patriarchate [PATRIARCHATE]. The people of Egypt became generally attached, with the greater part of their clergy, to the doctrine of one nature in Christ, and rejected the decrees of Chalcedon. But these decrees, after a long period of more or less direct opposition, were espoused by the Byzantine emperors, and imposed by force on all the countries under their rule. Hence it happened that the Coptic Monophysites, when Amrou, the lieutenant of Omar, invaded Egypt in 638, were in the

position of an oppressed sect, and they eagerly joined their forces to those of the Arabs in order to drive out the Greek officials and the orthodox creed. From that time the patriarchate of Alexandria has been Monophysite, and severed from Catholic communion. Alexandria having again become a place of considerable trade, there is now a fair sprinkling of Catholics in the population, for whom Gregory XVI. created a Vicariate. On the present Patriarch of Alexandria of the Latin rite, see PATRIARCH. (Renaudot, "Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrianorum"; Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus"; Neale, "A History of the Holy Eastern Church," "The Patriarchate of Alexandria"; Pargoire in DThC; Faivre in DHGE, with good bibliography.)

ALEXANDRIA (School of). Founded by Alexander the Great about B.C. 330, Alexandria rapidly grew in population and wealth, and numbered, towards the Christian era, more than six hundred thousand inhabitants.[1] Under the Ptolemies Greek literature flourished there with extraordinary brilliancy in every department of thought. The Jews, who settled there in great numbers, struck by the fecundity of the Greek mind, strove to turn it from its errors, and convert it to the belief in the unity of the Godhead. The Hebrew Scriptures were under this impulse translated into Greek [SEPTUAGINT], and a school of eminent writers arose, among whom the most distinguished were Philo and Josephus. In a place so full of learning and intellectual strife, Christianity could only hold its ground, after being once planted, by entering seriously into the philosophical debate, and justifying, by arguments which the learned would appreciate, the wisdom of God in the revelation through Christ. Plato, rather than Aristotle, was looked up to as the great authority, and the allegorical interpretation of Scripture was especially cultivated. Hence arose the Christian school of Alexandria, the great lights of which—Pantaenus, Origen, and Clement—lived in the third century. Among the numerous works of Origen the most celebrated are his commentaries on Scripture (he was the founder of Biblical criticism), the "Principia" and the book "Contra Celsum." Clement is known chiefly as the author of the "Pedagogus" and the "Stromata." The latter (the name means "hangings," "tapestries") is a multifarious treatise, in which he professes to fashion a web of Christian philosophy, discussing the conduct and the sentiments which should belong to a Christian in all the more important relations and emergencies of life. The rise of Arianism, and the conflicts to which it led, checked the prosperity of the School of Alexandria. St. Athanasius writes rather as a worker than as a thinker, and after him no great name occurs till that of Cyril of Alexandria, who, though not inactive as a writer, employed his stern will and vigorous intellect chiefly in repressing all dissent from the creed of Ephesus (431). (Petavius, "Theol. Dogm." I. c. v.; II. c. vi.; III. c. ix.; De la Barbe in DThC; Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.")

[1] Gibbon, ch. x.

ALEXIAN BROTHERS. An institute of men for the nursing of the sick and burial of the dead, founded at Mechlin in the fifteenth cent. Its patron is St. Alexius, who served many years in a hospital during his voluntary exile in Syria. At first the members took no vows, but afterwards became a regular order under the rule of St. Augustine. A revised constitution was confirmed by Pius IX. in 1870. They have houses in England and in the United States, besides many abroad. The members are sometimes called "Cellites" from *cella*, a cell, a grave; also "Lollharden" (from Old Dutch *lollaerd*, God-praiser or singer: Skeat) from their chants over the dead. (A'Becket in "Cath. Enc.")

ALLEGORICAL SENSE. [See MYSTICAL SENSE.]

ALLELUIA, or HALLELUJA, הַלְלוּיָהּ *ἀλληλούϊα*, meaning "praise Jah," or "praise the Lord." It occurs frequently in the last fifty psalms, but nowhere else in the Old Testament, except Tobias, c. 13. In the Apocalypse (xix. 1) St. John mentions that he heard the angels singing it in heaven. The early Christians kept the word in its original Hebrew form, and we know from St. Jerome that children were taught to pronounce it as soon as they could speak, while it was sung during his time by the Christian country-people in Palestine, as they drove the plough.

According to Sozomen, the Roman Church did not use it in her public services, except on Easter Sunday. At present, it constantly occurs in the Roman Mass and office; indeed, it is always used in the Mass between the Epistle and Gospel except at certain times when the Church omits it altogether, as a sign of mourning. It is thus omitted from Septuagesima to Holy Saturday; in ferial Masses during Advent; on the feast of the Holy Innocents, unless it falls on a Sunday; on all vigils which are fasting-days, if the Mass of the vigil be said, and in all Requiem Masses. It is, however, used in the Mass on the vigil of Easter (Holy Saturday) and of Pentecost, because the Masses were anciently said at night, and belonged to the solemnity of the respective feasts. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." ii. 5; Fortescue, "The Mass," 268.)

ALL SAINTS. As early as the fourth century, the Greeks kept on the first Sunday after Pentecost the feast of all martyrs and saints, and we possess a sermon of St. Chrysostom delivered on that day. (See, however, Cabrol, "Revue du Clergé Français," 1909.) In the West, the feast was introduced by Pope Boniface IV. after he

had dedicated, as the Church of the Blessed Virgin and the Martyrs, the Pantheon, which had been made over to him by the Emperor Phocas. The feast of the dedication was kept on the thirteenth of May. About 731 Gregory III. consecrated a chapel in St. Peter's Church in honour of all the saints, from which time All Saints' Day has been kept in Rome, as now, on the first of November. From about the middle of the ninth century, the feast came into general observance throughout the West. It ranks as a double of the first class with an octave. (Butler, "Lives of the Saints," November 1; Kellner, "Heortology.")

ALL SOULS' DAY. A solemn commemoration of, and prayer for, all the souls in Purgatory, which the Church makes on the second of November. The Mass said on that day is always the Mass of the dead. By an Apostolic Constitution dated August 10, 1915, Benedict XV. grants to all priests permission to say three Masses, just as on Christmas Day. Priests and others who are under obligation of reciting the breviary are required to say the office of the dead in place of the office which would be said on that day according to the ordinary course, and the vespers of the dead are said on the first of November, immediately after the vespers of All Saints. This solemnity owes its origin to the Abbot Odilo of Clugny, who instituted it for all the monasteries of his congregation in the year 998. Some authors think there are traces at least of a local celebration of this day before Odilo's time. With the Greeks Saturday was a day of special prayer for the dead, particularly the Saturday before Lent and that which preceded Pentecost. (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes," liv. ii. ch. 21; Thurston, "Month," Oct. 1915; Cabrol in "Revue du Clergé Français," Nov. 1909.)

ALMA REDEMPTORIS. (See ANTIPHON.)

ALMONER (*eleemosynarius*). An ecclesiastic at the court of a king or prince, or in a noble mansion, having the charge of the distribution of alms. From the fourteenth century the office of Grand Almoner in France rose into even greater importance, because this officer had the charge of the king's ecclesiastical patronage. The Revolution swept it away; under the Second Empire it reappeared; but it has not survived Sedan. One of the Anglican bishops has the title of Lord High Almoner, and dispenses the sovereign's alms. Chaplains of any kind, *e.g.* to convents, are commonly called almoners in France.

ALMS (from ἐλεημοσύνη, originally a work of mercy, spiritual or temporal, and then used to denote material gifts bestowed on the poor). Almsgiving is frequently and urgently enjoined in the Old Testament.[1] So highly did the Jews think of this duty, that in Chaldee almsgiving is expressed by a word which signifies justice or righteousness, and in the LXX the word ἐλεημοσύνη or "almsgiving" is often used to translate the Hebrew for justice or righteousness. In the New Testament Christ makes almsdeeds in those who are able to perform them an absolute condition of salvation.[1] St. Paul exhorts the faithful to lay by every week something for the needs of the poor (1 Cor. xvi. 2); and the numerous religious orders which devote themselves chiefly or in part to the care of the poor prove that the spirit of Christ and His Apostles still animates the Church.

All are of course strictly bound to relieve the poor, when they are in extreme necessity —*i.e.* when they are in proximate danger of death, or grievous sickness through want. Besides this, St. Alphonsus teaches that persons are bound, out of that part of their income which remains over when they have made suitable provision for themselves and their families, to relieve the ordinary necessities of the poor. The sum which a rich man is strictly bound to give in charity must vary in varying circumstances, and can never be fixed exactly; but, apart from strict obligation, the blessings promised to generous almsgiving for the love of God will always prove a strong incentive with the Christian soul. Ecclesiastics are bound to spend all the revenues of their benefices, except what is required for their own maintenance, in pious uses. The poor of the place, if they are in serious need, must be considered first,[2] and if the cure of souls is attached to the benefice, the cleric who holds it is bound to seek out the poor in his district. (St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 32; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. iii. 31 *seq.*, lib. iv. 497.) [See CHARITY (WORKS OF).]

ALMUCE (*almucia, aumusse*). An ecclesiastical garment covering the head and shoulders, worn by canons while chanting the office in choir. It is often confounded with the amice (*q.v.*). It was commonly of black cloth lined with fur. When the fashion of wearing the cap or biretta came in, the almuce assumed the shape more of a tippet or hood, the upper part being thrown back from the head and allowed to hang down. In England before the Reformation the almuce was worn by parish priests (parsons) as well as by canons. This practice was ratified to them by Sixtus IV. in 1483. (See MOZETTA: Rock, ii. pp. 43, 70.)

ALOGI. A name given by St. Epiphanius to heretics who denied the doctrine of the Word (Λόγος) and rejected St. John's writings (*i.e.* the Apocalypse as well as the Gospel) on the ground that they did not agree with the rest of Scripture. Epiphanius speaks of Theodotus of Byzantium as an offshoot of this sect. This man, known as Theodotus the

[1] *E.g.* Levit. xix. 9, 10; xxiii. 22; Deut. xv. 11; Tob. xii. 9.

[1] Mt. xxv. 34 *sqq.* [2] So at least some grave authors say.

tanner, held that Jesus was a mere man, born, however, miraculously of a virgin; that Christ was united to him at his baptism, descending on him as a dove and conferring supernatural powers. Artemon taught the same doctrine. The heretics claimed to have the early Roman Church on their side, alleging that it had been corrupted by Zephyrinus—an assertion, as a contemporary writer quoted by Eusebius observes, abundantly confuted by the writings of the first Christians, and the hymns in which "from the beginning" Christ had been called God. Theodotus was excommunicated by Pope Victor at the end of the second century. Theodotus, the money-changer, taught similar doctrine, with the addition of certain Gnostic extravagances. He made Christ an aeon who had descended on Jesus, Melchizedek an aeon superior to Christ.[1]

Eusebius, with other ancient authorities, speaks of Paul of Samosata as renewing the error of Artemon. Paul, bishop of Antioch, was notorious for his avarice, love of worldly pomp, and irregular life. He considered the Word and Holy Ghost as mere attributes of God, not divine Persons. Jesus was a mere man, born of a virgin and enlightened in an extraordinary degree by the Word or Wisdom of God. After twice deceiving the bishops assembled in council at Antioch by false statements and false promises, he was deposed at a third Antiochene council in 267–8.[2] [See ANTIOCH, par. 7.]

Similarly Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, denied the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ. The bishops who met in council against him called in Origen to their help, and the latter succeeded in bringing back Beryllus to the truth.[3] (Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise," I. 465.)

ALTAR. The Hebrew word מִזְבֵּחַ which is usually translated "altar," means literally "a place for sacrifice"; and in the New Testament its equivalent is *θυσιαστήριον*. The sacred writers avoid the common Greek word for altar, *βωμός*,[4] "a raised place," adopting the unclassical word *θυσιαστήριον*, because by doing so they avoided the heathen associations connected with the common Greek term, besides expressing much more distinctly the purpose of sacrifice for which an altar is built. Whether the Christian altar is mentioned by name in the Bible is doubtful. There is some ground for supposing that it is referred to in Mt. v. 23, and in Hebrews xiii. 10. It has been argued that when our Lord imposes a precept of forgiveness before the gift is presented at the altar, he did not mean to give the Jews a new law with regard to their sacrifices, which were soon to pass away, but to establish the indissoluble connection between the Eucharistic Sacrifice of His Church and brotherly love. Similarly, it is urged that when the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews asserts "we have an altar, of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle," he is setting altar against altar, and declaring the impossibility of partaking in the Jewish sacrificial feastings and joining at the same time in the sacrificial banquet of the new law. It is certainly difficult to understand the "altar" as the altar of the cross, which is never once called an altar in the New Testament, and though, of course, an altar it indisputably is, still nobody ate of the sacrifice offered on it. At the same time, these interpretations are by no means held by all Catholic commentators.[1]

However it may stand with the name, the existence of the thing is implied in the New Testament doctrine of sacrifice [see EUCHARIST, III.], and the name occurs in early Christian writers. "There is one flesh," says St. Ignatius the disciple of St. John, "one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice for union with His blood, *one altar* (*θυσιαστήριον*), as one bishop."[2] So Tertullian describes Christians as standing at the "altar of God"[3]; and the same word "altar" is used in the Apostolic Constitutions and in the ancient liturgies. These testimonies are in no way weakened by passages in Minucius Felix and Arnobius, who in their controversies with Pagans deny the existence of Christian altars. Obviously, they deny that altars such as the Pagan ones were in use among Christians; just as one of these authors allows that there were no temples among Christians, though churches are distinctly recognized in the edicts of the Diocletian era, and are known to have existed at a still earlier date.[4]

In early times the altar was more usually of wood; and an altar of this kind is still preserved in the church of St. John Lateran at Rome, on which St. Peter is said to have celebrated Mass.[5] But the tombs of martyrs in the Catacombs and elsewhere were also used for the Holy Sacrifice, the slab of marble which covered the sepulchre serving as an altar-table; and, for almost fourteen centuries, that part of the altar on which the Eucharist is consecrated has always been of stone or marble. After the time of Constantine, when sumptuous churches were erected, careful arrangements were made for the position of the altar. It did not lean, as it often does now, against the sanctuary wall, but stood out with a space round it, so that the bishop when celebrating Mass looked towards the people. Thus the altar looked in the same direction as the portals of the church,

[1] Euseb. v. 28; *Philosophum.* vii. 35, 36.
[2] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 199. [3] Euseb. *Hist.* vi. 33.
[4] *βωμός* occurs only once in the N.T., and then of a heathen altar: Acts xvii. 23,

[1] Maldonatus ignores that given above, of Mt. v. 23. Estius, following St. Thomas, distinctly rejects that of Heb. xiii. 10. [2] *Philad.* 4, PG, i. 700.
[3] *De Orat.* 19, PL, i. 1182.
[4] Cardinal Newman's *Development*, 27.
[5] It is enclosed in the Papal altar of this church, except a portion of it, which is preserved in the church of St. Pudentiana: so, at least, says the writer of the article "Altar" in Kraus' *Real-Encyklopädie*,

and often both were turned towards the east. This ancient arrangement is still exemplified by the "Papal" altars in the Roman basilicas, but particularly in St. Peter's, where the Pope still says Mass on the great Festivals, looking at one and the same time to the people, to the portals of the church, and to the east.[1] The altars in the Catacombs were still employed, but even new altars were sanctified by relics, a custom to which so much importance was attributed that St. Ambrose would not consecrate an altar till he found relics to place in it. Then, as now, the altar was covered with linen cloths, which, as appears from a rubric in the Sacramentary of St. Gelasius, were first blessed and consecrated. It was surmounted by a canopy, supported by columns between which veils or curtains were often hung, and on great festivals it was adorned with the sacred vessels placed upon it in rows, and with flowers. The cross was placed over the canopy, or else rested immediately on the altar itself. The language and the actions of the early Christians alike bespeak the reverence in which the altar was held. It was called "the holy," "the divine table," "the altar of Christ," "the table of the Lord." The faithful bowed towards it as they entered the church; it was known as the ἄσυλος τράπεζα, or "table of asylum," from which not even criminals could be forced away.[2] Finally, before the altar was used, it was solemnly consecrated by the bishop with the chrism. The date at which this custom was introduced cannot be accurately determined; but the Council of Agde, or Agatha, in Southern Gaul, held in the year 506, speaks of this custom as familiar to everybody.[3]

The rubrics prefixed to the Roman Missal contain the present law of the Church with regard to the altar. It must consist of stone, or at least must contain an altar-stone large enough to hold the Host and the greater part of the chalice; and this altar, or the altar-stone, must have been consecrated by a bishop, or by an abbot who has received the requisite faculties from the Holy See. [See CONSECRATION OF ALTARS.] The altar is to be covered with three cloths, also blessed by the bishop, or by a priest with special faculties. One of these cloths should reach to the ground, the other two are to be shorter, or else one cloth doubled may replace the two shorter ones. If possible, there is to be a "pallium," or frontal, on the altar, varying in colour according to the feast or season. A crucifix [4] is to be set on the altar, between two candlesticks: the Missal placed on a cushion, at the right-hand side looking towards the altar: under the crucifix there ought to be an altar-card,[1] with certain prayers which the priest cannot read from the Missal without inconvenience.

With regard to the number of altars in a church, Gavantus says that originally, even in the West, one church contained only one altar. On this altar, however, the same author continues, several Masses were said on the same day, in proof of which he appeals to the Sacramentary of Leo. He adds that even in the fourth century the church of Milan contained several altars, as appears from a letter of St. Ambrose, and he quotes other examples from the French Church in the sixth century. (Rock, "Hierurgia," chap. xvi.; Probst in "Kirchenlex."; Leclercq in DACL.)

ALTAR-BREADS are round wafers made of fine wheaten flour, specially prepared for consecration in the Mass. The altar-breads according to the Latin use (followed also by the Maronites and Armenians) must be unleavened. They are usually stamped with a figure of Christ crucified, or with the I H S. They are of two sizes: one larger, which the priest himself consecrates and receives, or else reserves for the Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament; the other smaller, consecrated for the communion of the faithful.

The practice of stamping altar-breads with the cross or I H S seems to be ancient, and is widely diffused. Meratus mentions the fact that the cross is stamped on the altar-breads used by Greek, Syrian, and Alexandrian (Coptic ?) Christians.

ALTAR-CARDS. As mentioned under ALTAR, the rubric requires that an altar-card be placed in the centre under the crucifix; custom has introduced two others, one on each side, the object of all three being to aid the priest's memory, should it fail at any time during the celebration of Mass, though he is expected to have the prayers committed to memory. The centre card contains the "Gloria in excelsis," the "Credo," the Offertory prayers, the "Qui pridie," or beginning of the Canon, the form of consecration, the prayers before Communion, and the "Placeat," or last prayer. That at the Epistle side contains the prayer said while putting the water into the chalice, and the "Lavabo," said at the washing of the fingers. That at the Gospel side contains the prologue of St. John's Gospel (i. 1–14).

ALTAR-CLOTHS. The rubrics of the Missal require three fair cloths to be placed on the altar, or two cloths of which one is doubled. They must be blessed by the bishop, or by a priest with special faculties. In the fourth century St. Optatus speaks of the linen cloth placed on the altar as usual in his time, and Pope Silvester is said to have made it a law that the altar-cloth should be of

[1] Rock, *Hierurgia*, ii. 305.
[2] Synod of Orange, anno 441, Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 438.
[3] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. p. 987.
[4] The rubric says only a cross, but a crucifix is prescribed by subsequent decrees of a Congregation of Rites. St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Mor.* vi, *n.* 393.

[1] *Tabella secretarum*, in use since the sixteenth century. The rubric mentions one under the cross, but now two others are placed, one at each end of the altar.

linen. Mention, however, is made by Paulus Silentiarius of purple altar-cloths, and, in fact, both the material and the number of these cloths seem to have varied in early times. (See Rock, "Hierurgia," ii. p. 314; Kraus, "Real Encyklop.," *Altartücher*.)

ALTAR STONE. [See ALTAR.]

ALTAR, STRIPPING OF. [See HOLY WEEK.]

AMA or AMMA. A Semitic word applied to religious women, or ladies of distinction. It has not been adopted in the West, where the fem. of *abbas* has been corrupted into *abbatissa*. (Leclercq in DACL.)

AMA (2) *Amula*. [See CRUETS.]

AMBO (Gr. *ἀναβαίνειν*, to ascend). A raised platform in the nave of early Christian churches, surrounded by a low wall; steps led up to it from the east and west sides. The place on it where the Gospel was read was higher than that used for reading the Epistle. All church notices were read from it; here edicts and excommunications were given out; hither came heretics to make their recantation; here the Scriptures were read, and sermons preached. It was gradually superseded by the modern pulpit. A good example of the "ambo" may be seen in the church of San Clemente at Rome. (Ferraris; Leclercq in DACL.)

AMBROSIAN CHANT. [See CHANT.]

AMBROSIAN LITURGY. An ancient Liturgy still used in the church of Milan instead of the Roman Mass, from which it differs in many striking points. [See LITURGY.] We read in Walafrid Strabo, an author of the ninth century, that St. Ambrose regulated the Mass and Office of his church at Milan, but some parts of this rite are older than St. Ambrose, while, on the other hand, the Ambrosian Missal contains great additions which date from St. Gregory the Great. According to the Ambrosian rite, there is no Mass for the Fridays in Lent; and the offering of bread and wine by the people for the sacrifice is still retained in solemn Masses. The Ambrosian rite was confirmed by Pope Alexander VI. in 1497, and is still retained. (Ceillier, "Auteurs Sacrés," tom. xiii. c. 1; Lejay in DACL; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. ii.)

AMBRY (Lat. *armarium*, whence *almarium*; Fr. *armoire*). A closet or cupboard, place for tools, chest. "In the form *almery* corruptly confused with *almonry*, as if a place for *alms*" (Oxford Dictionary). The same authority explains an ambry in a church as "a cupboard, locker, or closed recess for books, sacramental vessels, vestments, &c." In its corrupt use the word was applied, Stow tells us, to the old almonry of Westminster Abbey, "for that the alms of the abbey were there distributed to the poor."

AMEN. A Hebrew word signifying "truly," "certainly." (אָמֵן, Ἀμήν.) It is preserved in its original form by the New Testament writers, and by the Church in her Liturgy. According to Benedict XIV., it indicates assent to a truth, or it is the expression of a desire, and equivalent to *γένοιτο*, "so be it."[1]

"Amen" signifies assent when used at the end of the Creeds. In the ancient Church the communicants used it as an expression of their faith in the Blessed Sacrament. Thus we read in the Apostolic Constitutions[2]—"Let the bishop give the oblation, saying, 'The Body of Christ,' and let the recipient say, 'Amen.'" St. Ambrose explains the "Amen" used thus in communicating at meaning "it is true."

At the end of prayers "Amen" signifies our desire of obtaining what we ask. Thus it is said by the server, after the collects in the Mass, as a sign that the faithful unite their petitions to those of the priest. In Justin's time, the people themselves answered "Amen" as the priest finished the prayers and thanksgivings in the Mass, and was about to distribute the Holy Communion.[3]

AMICE (*amictus*. Called also "humerale," "superhumerale," "anaboladium," from *ἀναβάλλειν*, and, in a corrupt form, "anabolagium"). A piece of fine linen, oblong in shape, which the priest who is to say Mass rests for a moment on his head and then spreads on his shoulders, reciting the prayer—"Place on my head, O Lord, the helmet of salvation," &c.

For many centuries priests celebrated with bare neck, as may be seen from many figures in the Roman Catacombs, and from the mosaic at San Vitale in Ravenna. The amice, however, is frequently mentioned after the opening of the ninth century.[4] As appears from the Roman "Ordines" in the eighth and ninth centuries the amice (*anaboladium, anabolagium*) was reserved for festival use. Originally, as Innocent III. expressly testifies, it covered the head as well as the neck; and to this day Franciscan and Dominican friars wear the amice over their heads till they reach the altar. It also was not at first concealed by the alb, as is now the case, and it was often made of silk and ornamented with figures. At present it is made of linen, and only adorned with a cross, which the priest kisses before putting on the amice.

Mediaeval writers have given very many and very different symbolical meanings to this vestment. The prayer already quoted from the Roman Missal speaks of it as figuring the "helmet of salvation," and a similar prayer occurs in most of the ancient Latin Missals. (Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 21.)

[1] *De Miss.* ii. 5. He adds a third sense—viz. consent to a request—but gives no clear instance of this use.
[2] viii. 12. [3] *Apol.* i. 67, PG, vi. 438.
[4] "It was introduced in the eighth," says Dr. Rock; but see Hefele, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte*, &c., 11.

AMULET. The wearing of some material object as a charm against evil was common in pagan times. (See Pliny, xxix. 4, 9.) It has recently been revived, in the wearing of mascots. Such a practice, involving belief in the efficacy of the object itself, or in the evil spirit to which it was dedicated, could not be tolerated among Christians; nevertheless the Church permitted the wearing of Christian emblems (the monogram of Christ, the cross, &c.). The limits between the pagan amulet and the Christian emblem were not easy to fix, and superstitious uses became prevalent. The Council of Trent declares that due honour and veneration is to be paid to sacred images "not because any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or because anything is asked of them; or because trust is to be reposed in images, as was done of old by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown to them is referred to the prototypes which these images represent." (Sess. xxv.) (See Leclercq in DACL; IMAGES; MEDALS; RELICS.)

ANAGNOSTES. [See LECTOR.]

ANAGOGICAL (literally, "leading up"). A name given to things typical of Christ in the Old, or to the actions of Christ in the New, Testament, so far as they signify the eternal glory which awaits the elect. The anagogical is a subdivision of the spiritual or mystical senses. (See St. Thomas, 1ª. q. 1, a. 10.)

ANAMNESIS. When our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist He said to His Apostles: "Do this in memory of me," εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Lk. xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23). Hence in the various liturgies the priest, after having recited the words of consecration, goes on to state that we do indeed always fulfil His divine command. In our Roman rite the words of this prayer are: "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants as also Thy holy people, *mindful* alike of the blessed Passion . . . . offer unto Thy most excellent majesty . . . a pure sacrifice, a holy sacrifice, a spotless sacrifice; the sacred bread of everlasting life, and the chalice of perpetual salvation." This portion of the Canon is sometimes called the *Post pridie* to indicate that it follows the words of institution which begin with "Who the day before (*pridie*) He suffered." The different forms of the prayer will be found in Cabrol, DACL. (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 345.)

ANAPHORA. The meaning of the word is "offering," *oblatio*. It does not, however, refer to our Offertory in the Mass, but to the Canon, including the Preface. (See CANON OF THE MASS; Cabrol, in DACL; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 323.)

ANATHEMA. A thing devoted or given over to evil, so that "anathema sit" means "let him be accursed." St. Paul at the end of 1 Corinthians pronounces this anathema on all who do not love our blessed Saviour. The Church has used the phrase "anathema sit" from the earliest times with reference to those whom she excludes from her communion either because of moral offences or because they persist in heresy. Thus one of the earliest councils—that of Elvira, held in 306—decrees in its fifty-second canon that those who placed libellous writings in the church should be anathematized; and the First General Council anathematized those who held the Arian heresy. General councils since then have usually given solemnity to their decrees on articles of faith by appending an anathema.

Neither St. Paul nor the Church of God ever wished a soul to be damned. In pronouncing anathema against wilful heretics, the Church does but declare that they are excluded from her communion, and that they must, if they continue obstinate, perish eternally.

ANCHOR. The symbol of hope was used by the early Christians on their sepulchral monuments to indicate their belief in a future life with Christ, whom St. Paul calls "our hope" (1 Tim. i. 1). The actual figure easily lent itself to combination with a cross, the foundation of Christian hope. Hence in the days of the *disciplina arcani* the anchor became a veiled image of the cross. The subject is treated at length by J. P. Kirsch in DACL; Northcote and Brownlow, "Roma Sotteranea," ii. p. 52.

ANCHORITE. [See HERMIT.]

ANGEL. The word "(ἄγγελος," a translation of (מַלְאָךְ) means messenger, and is applied in a wide sense to priests,[1] prophets,[2] or to the Messiah[3] as sent by God. Specially, however, it is used as the name of spiritual beings, created by God but superior in nature to man. The existence of such superhuman intelligences was conjectured even by heathens such as Plato; and although the Sadducees[4] believed "neither in angel nor spirit," angels are mentioned so frequently in the Old and New Testament that it would be idle to allege Scriptural proofs on the matter. When they were created, Scripture does not distinctly tell us. "The most ancient Fathers," says Petavius, "especially the Greeks and such Latins as are used to follow the Greeks," held that the angels were created "before the heavens and all material things." The contrary opinion, that the heavens were first created and the angels in the heavens, is that of St. Thomas, and has been commonly held since his time among the Latins. The Fourth Lateran Council declares that God created angels and material beings "at the same time from the beginning" (*simul ab initio temporis*). But

[1] Mal. ii. 7. [3] Agg. i. 13.
[2] Is. xlii. 19. There are different views held on this passage, but this is not the place to discuss them.
[4] Acts xxiii. 8.

the council had no intention of deciding this question, which still remains open, as has been pointed out by St. Thomas himself, by Vasquez, Petavius, and others.

With regard to the nature of angels, many early Fathers believed that they were corporeal. This opinion is not difficult to account for when we consider such a history as that of the marriages between the "sons of God" and "the daughters of men," given in the sixth chapter of Genesis.[1] At the Seventh General Council, the Patriarch Tarasius argued that angels might be painted, because they were "circumscribed (ἐπειδὴ περίγραπτοί εἰσιν) and had appeared to many in the form of men"; nor did the council censure his words, limiting itself to a simple decision that it was lawful to represent angels in pictures. However, our Lord's words [2] imply, that angels are incapable of marriage, and so exclude the interpretation which regards the "sons of God" in Genesis vi. as a synonym for angels. Many of the Fathers deny that angels have bodies; so do all modern theologians. The Fourth Lateran Council separates angelic from corporeal natures, and Petavius rightly characterizes the contrary opinion as "proximate to heresy." At the same time, angels are capable of assuming bodies; to which they are for the time intimately united; which they move and which they use to represent either their own invisible nature or the attributes of God. Passages of Scripture, which imply this, will readily occur to the reader.

The angels, then, are purely spiritual intelligences and, for that very reason, superior to man, who is composed of body and soul. They are immortal, since death consists in the separation of soul and body, nor could they be destroyed, except by the omnipotence of God. Their knowledge, unlike that of man, which is slowly acquired by means of the senses, depends upon images received from God along with the nature He has given them. They do not reason, as we do, for the keenness of their intellect enables them to see by intuition the conclusions which are involved in principles. Their intelligence is in perpetual exercise, and although the future, the thoughts of the human soul, and above all the mysteries of grace, are hidden from them, except so far as God is pleased to reveal them, still they can know and understand many things which are hidden from us. They can move from place to place with a swiftness impossible to man. Finally, they are endowed with free-will and are able to communicate with each other.[3]

To a nature so noble God added sanctifying grace. They received power to know God as revealed by faith, to hope in Him, to love Him, and afterwards, if they were worthy, see Him face to face. But, during the time of their probation, Lucifer and many other angels fell. It is hard to determine the precise nature of their sin, but we may quote Petavius, who places it in "a desire of absolute dominion over created things, and in hatred of subjection." The rebel angels were at once deprived of all supernatural gifts and thrust into hell without hope of pardon; the angels who had persevered were at once rewarded with everlasting bliss. The very greatness and perfection of angelic nature, says St. Gregory the Great, made their sin unpardonable.

Holy writ represents the number of the good angels as exceedingly great.[1] They are, according to the common teaching of theologians, divided into three hierarchies, each of which includes three orders. The first triplet consists of Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones; the second of Dominations, Principalities, Powers; the third of Virtues, Archangels, Angels. This enumeration occurs for the first time in Pseudo-Dionysius, from whom it was adopted by St. Gregory the Great, and so became current in the Church. But it is founded on the mention of seraphim and cherubim in Isaias and Ezechiel; of angels and of archangels throughout Scripture; and of the other orders in St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. The meaning of St. Paul is much disputed. But we may remark that very early writers divide the angels into orders, and count thrones, dominations, &c., among them,[2] though it is well to remember that the existence of these particular classes of angels is no article of faith.

As to the employment of the angels, we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews that they are "all ministering spirits." They serve God continually in heaven, and they also defend countries, cities, churches, &c., besides offering to God the prayers of the faithful, particularly, according to the Fathers and ancient liturgies, those which ascend to heaven during the Mass. Further, each man has an angel who watches over him, defends him from evil, helps him in prayer, suggests good thoughts, and at last, if he is saved, presents his soul to God.[3]

The Church, on her part, shows to the angels that veneration or inferior honour which is their due, and, knowing from Christ's words [4] that they are acquainted with things which pass on earth, she begs their prayers and their kind offices. It is true that St. Paul condemns the θρησκεία, or religion of angels, in writing to the Colossians (i. 16), but every

[1] But that the "sons of God" *may* mean pious men is proved by Ps. lxxiii. 15 (lxxii. in Vulg.), Osee ii. 1, &c.

[2] The γαμεῖν of Mt. xxii. 30 exactly corresponds to the "took to themselves wives" in the Hebrew of Genesis vi. 2.

[3] The text contains a summary of the teaching of theologians. It is contained in Scripture or deduced from it, as may be seen by consulting St. Thomas, 1a qq. [illegible].

[1] Dan. vii. 10.

[2] See Lightfoot's note on Coloss. i. 16.

[3] Gen. xlviii. 16; Mt. xviii. 10.

[4] Lk. xv. 10.

scholar is aware that he is warning them against the Gnostic error which regarded angels as the creators of the world, and with equal reason, the same passage might be alleged as in condemnation of humility. It is true also that, when St. John in the Apocalypse bowed down before an angel, the latter said, "See thou do it not, for I also am thy fellow-servant. . . . Adore God."[1] But if Protestants think the veneration of angels idolatrous, or at least unlawful, they ought not to suppose the holy Apostle so ignorant as to offer it—not to speak of his shortly after repeating the crime. Rather, surely, the angel refused the homage out of respect to the honour which human nature has received from the Incarnation and to the apostolic dignity; just as a bishop might out of humility decline the homage of one whom, although inferior to himself in ecclesiastical rank, he venerated for his great virtue. The Catholic may answer those who accuse the Church of idolatry for her cultus of angels, as St. Augustine and St. Cyril answered long ago, that we adore God alone with latria or supreme adoration, and that to Him alone we offer the sacrifice of the Mass. (St. Thomas, 1ª, qq. 50–64; Suarez, "De Angelis"; Bareille and Vacant in DThC; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 376.)

ANGELS, EVIL. [See DEVIL.]

ANGELS, FEAST OF. Since the fifth century churches were dedicated, both in the East and West, to the holy angels. In the West, there was a famous apparition of St. Michael on Mount Garganus, an event which Baronius places in the year 493; and this apparition gave occasion to the feast of St. Michael which the Roman Church keeps on September 29, and which is mentioned in the so-called martyrology of St. Jerome, as the Dedication of St. Michael. There was another apparition of the same archangel in France during 706. "It is this apparition," says Thomassin, "on Mount Michael, or *In Periculo Maris*, which was once so celebrated in France, and of which the commemoration is still observed in some dioceses."

In the East, the constitution of Manuel Comnenus mentions a feast of the apparition of St. Michael on September 6, and a feast of the angels in general on November 8.

The feast of Angel Guardians was instituted under Paul V., at the request of Ferdinand of Austria, afterwards emperor. (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes"; Kellner, "Heortology.")

ANGEL GUARDIANS. [See ANGEL.]

ANGELICALS. An order of nuns, following the rule of St. Augustine, founded by Luigia di Torelli, Countess of Guastalla, about 1530. She had been married twice, but being left a second time a widow when only twenty-five years of age, she resolved to devote the rest of her life and her large fortune to the divine service.

She founded her first convent at Milan. Her religious took the name of Angelicals in order to remind themselves whenever they uttered it of the purity of the angels. Every nun adopts the name of "Angelica," prefixing it to that of a patron saint and her family name—*e.g.* "Angelica Maria Anna di Gonzaga." Their constitutions were drawn up by St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan.

ANGELUS. By this name is denoted the Catholic practice of honouring God at morning, noon, and evening, by reciting three Hail Mary's, together with sentences and a collect, to express the Christian's rejoicing trust in the mystery of the Incarnation. The first sentence begins "Angelus Domini nuntiavit Mariae"; whence the name of the devotion. A bell, called the Angelus bell, rings at the several hours. The evening Angelus was recommended and indulgenced by Pope John XXII. in 1318 and 1327; that at noon, according to Mabillon, arose in France, and received Papal sanction at the beginning of the sixteenth century. In Paschal time the "Regina Coeli" [*q.v.*] is recited instead of the Angelus. (Rock, iii. 245–250; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

ANGLICAN ORDERS. The validity of Anglican orders is a subject of controversy or not, according to the view taken of the nature and effects of ordination. Whately (see his treatise on the "Kingdom of Christ," *passim*) held (1) that the Church of Christ consisted of many separate communions having nothing necessarily in common but the profession of belief in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of mankind; (2) that Christ's kingdom was "not of this world," *i.e.* not intended to be sustained by temporal coercion, as earthly kingdoms are; (3) that every Christian Church or sect, while repudiating all coercive means either for or against itself, had the right to organize itself and manage its internal affairs; (4) that a necessary part of such organization was the appointment of office-bearers and ministers. Considered thus, Anglican orders are undoubtedly "valid"; for no one doubts that the Anglican Church has a separate corporate existence, and laws and a government of its own, nor that its clergy are regularly appointed in conformity to those laws. Nor would any one holding this view justly object to the ordination of Anglican clergymen who have submitted to the Roman Church and desire to become priests; for he would [illegible] that his view of ordination and that of the Catholic Church were totally distinct things, so that to treat an Anglican clergyman as if he had not been previously ordained would merely imply a radical difference of conception as to the nature of ordination, and

[1] Apoc. xix. 10; xxii. 8. Another interpretation is also given by Petavius.

convey no slur on the rites or formalities by which his admission as an office-bearer in the Anglican Church had been prefaced.

But it is well known that there is a large and increasing section of Anglicans, who hold much the same theory as to the nature and effects of ordination that Catholics do—viz. that in virtue of authority derived in an unbroken chain from the Apostles [ORDER, HOLY] the bishop who ordains a priest confers on him the right and the duty of offering the sacrifice of the New Law by celebrating the Eucharist, and of absolving penitents from their sins. If Anglican ordination really conferred these powers, the consideration of the manner in which they have been used for the last three hundred years, and of the manner in which they are used now, would be one of the most painful and perplexing subjects of thought on which a Catholic could enter. At the same time, the Anglican party referred to have no choice but to claim for their ordinations nothing less than the potency above described, for they hold, as we do, that a priest in the Catholic Church is either all this, or he is—nothing.

For us Catholics the question was decided by the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (Sept. 13, 1896), which declared Anglican orders to be "absolutely null and utterly void," on the ground of defect of form in the rite, and defect of intention in the minister. The decision was not based upon a denial of Barlow's consecration or upon the "Nag's Head" fable. [See ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 305.]

1. The Catholic Church, though it had not pronounced a formal decision on the validity of Anglican orders, had in practice treated them as invalid, since Anglican clergymen had to go through all the usual stages before being admitted to the priesthood, as though they were simple laymen.

2. The ordinal used at Parker's consecration—that of Edward VI.—shows a manifest intention of *not* making a Catholic bishop, as then and now understood, but of appointing a sort of overseer, who, deriving his power from the sovereign, should administer discipline, teach, and preach.

3. Similarly the Anglican ordinal for making priests, at any rate down to the time of Charles II., bore on its face the intention, not to make sacrificing priests, but "a Gospel ministry."

4. Even if their orders were valid, Anglicans would not any the more belong to the true Church. "Catholics believe their orders are valid, because they are members of the true Church, and Anglicans believe they belong to the true Church, because their orders are valid." [1] (Estcourt, "Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed," 1873; A. Hutton, "The Anglican Ministry," 1879; "A Vindication of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*," by the Bishops of England, 1898; Brandi, "Roma e Canterbury," 1897; Gasquet, "Leaves from my Diary, 1894–1896." On the Anglican side, Lacey, "A Roman Diary," &c.; Denny and Lacey, "De Hierarchia Anglicana; Halifax, "Leo XIII. and Anglican Orders.")

[1] Cardinal Newman's *Essays Crit. and Hist.* (1887), vol. ii, p. 87.

ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH, HISTORY OF. [See ENGLISH CHURCH: *Anglo-Saxon Period.*]

ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH (FAITH AND DISCIPLINE OF). We have thought it well to devote a separate article to show how truly Roman, and how identical with the Catholic creed and worship of to-day, were the Anglo-Saxon creed and worship. When Aetheleard, archbishop of Canterbury, demanded of the bishops assembled in council at Cloveshoe (803) an exposition of their belief, they unanimously answered: "Know that the faith which we profess is the same as was taught by the Holy and Apostolic See when Gregory the Great sent missionaries to our fathers." In theory, then, the Anglo-Saxon faith was identical with the Roman. We proceed to show that it was also identical in practice.

1. *The Sacrifice of the Mass.*—Everywhere, both in the East and in the West, we meet with the priest who officiates at the "sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ," the altar on which the victim is offered, and the liturgy or form of prayer with which that offering is accompanied. The Britons, before the arrival of the Saxons, had "their altars, the seats of the heavenly sacrifice," and "their priests who stretched out their hands over the most holy sacrifices of Christ" (Gildas, pp. 37, 76, ed. Stevenson, 1838); and the Scots, in the remote isle of Icolmkille, "celebrated the sacred mysteries of the holy sacrifice, and consecrated, according to custom, the body of Christ." (Cummian, "Vita S. Columb." pp. 29, 32.) With some accidental variations, especially in the parts preceding the Canon, the form of the service was substantially the same as in all Churches, Eastern and Western, each carefully preserving the Trisagion or Tersanctus, the invocation, the consecration of the elements, the commemoration of the living and the dead, the fraction of the Host, and the Communion of the faithful. The several improvements which the Pontiffs of the fifth and sixth centuries had introduced in the preparatory part remained for a time unknown to certain ancient Churches which originally had received their liturgy from Rome; hence the variety of rites. Our native writers describe the Mass as the "celestial and mysterious sacrifice, the offering of the victim of salvation, the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ"; they tell us that at the consecration "the elements of the bread and wine are, through the ineffable hallowing of the Spirit, made to pass into the mystery of Christ's flesh and blood"; that

"the bread and wine are then consecrated into the substance of His Body and Blood"; "that the holy and precious Body and Blood of the Lamb, by whom we have been redeemed, are again immolated to God for the benefit of our salvation." (Bede, "Hist." ii. c. 5; iii. c. 2; iv. cc. 14, 22, 28; "Hist. Abb. Gyrven." inter Bedae opera minora, pp. 384, 390, ed. Giles, 1843; Thorpe, "Eccles. Instit." ii., xviii. p. 412, xxiv. p. 420; Bede, "Hom. in Vig. Pasch." p. 31; "Hom. in Epiph." p. 272; Alcuin ad Paulinum, xxxvi.) Numerous canons and rubrics regulated the celebration of Holy Mass. An altar, a paten or dish, and a chalice, all three previously consecrated by a bishop, were required; the offlete, or bread for the consecration, was to be made of the finest flour, without the admixture of any kind of leaven; the wine was to be pure, and to be mixed, according to the practice of every Christian Church, with a small quantity of water. The Italian missionaries would, of course, establish the Roman liturgy in the new Church, but Augustine and his companions had been instructed by St. Gregory not to confine themselves exclusively to the Roman ritual: "Whatever practice you may discover, which in your opinion will be more acceptable to God, establish it in the new Church of the Angles, without considering the place of its origin, whether it be Roman, or Gallican, or any other Church." (Bede, I. c. 27.) How far the missionaries availed themselves of this permission is uncertain. Neither have we means of judging how far the sacrificial service of the Scottish missionaries varied from that of the Romans. One thing, however, is certain: the discrepancy was of no importance, for it never became a subject of controversy between the two parties, like the time of Easter and the form of the tonsure.

2. The "order or course of daily prayer" had in view to supply matter for prayer at the canonical hours, and was therefore more susceptible of variety of form and arrangement than the Mass. Not only in national Churches, but in neighbouring Churches of the same nation, considerable discrepancies existed in the performance of the choral service. In England, however, these discrepancies never led to controversy among the missionaries. In 747, the Council of Cloveshoe, under Archbishop Cuthbert, confirmed the ascendency of the Roman, and effected the abolition of the Scottish forms by the following decree: "The great solemnities of our redemption shall be everywhere celebrated according to the written ritual which we have obtained from Rome, in the administration of Baptism, the celebration of Mass, and in all things thereunto pertaining; moreover, the feasts of the saints through the course of the year shall be kept on the days fixed in the Roman Martyrology, with the chant and psalmody appointed thereto; and nothing shall be permitted to be read or chanted but what is taken from the authority of the Holy Scriptures and allowed by the custom of the Roman Church." After this Council we hear nothing more of the Scottish forms in the Southern province, but in the North they appear to have kept their ground till a much later period. Exact uniformity was never obtained. Discrepancies existed in breviaries of the churches of Sarum, York, and Hereford until the Reformation; and even at the present day the English Benedictine monks make use of the monastic breviary approved by Paul V., while the English Catholic clergy use the breviary of the Church of Rome.

3. *Public Worship.*—Among the Anglo-Saxons, both at the celebration of the sacrifice and during the canonical hours, the whole service, with the exception of certain prayers during the Mass, was chanted by the choir. For the instruction of the people, the Epistle and the Gospel were read, and the sermon was delivered in their native tongue, but God was publicly addressed by the minister of religion in the language of Rome [see art. LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH]. On Sundays and festivals the church service was performed with full solemnity. All servile works—hunting and hawking, travelling, trading, the prosecution of family feuds, litigation, the execution of criminals—were prohibited. Transgressors were liable to the punishments prescribed in the doombook. The clergy were ordered by the Council of Cloveshoe to devote Sunday to the worship of God exclusively and employ themselves in teaching their dependents the rules of a holy life. The duties expected from the laity may be gathered from the following injunction: "It is most right and proper that every Christian man, who has it in his power to do so, should come on Saturday to the church [the Sunday was reckoned from sunset on Saturday to sunset on the following day] and bring a light with him, and there hear the vesper song, and after midnight the uht-song (matins) and come with his offering in the morning to the solemn Mass . . . and after the holy service let him return home and regale himself with his friends, and neighbours, and strangers, but, at the same time, be careful that they commit no excess either in eating or drinking." They were expected not to break their fast or to take any meat before the High Mass (Thorpe, "Eccles. Instit." ii., xxiv. p. 420; xlv. pp. 440–2).

4. *Private Prayer.*—The practice of private prayer is thus taught to the Saxon laity: "It is also to be made known to Christian laymen that every one pray at least twice in the day—that is, in the morning and in the evening. In this wise shall you teach them to pray: First they shall sing (=recite) the

Creed, for it is most likely to open to them the foundation of their true faith; and after he shall have sung the Creed let him say thrice, 'O God that madest me, have mercy upon me,' and thrice, 'O God, have mercy upon me, a sinner.' And this being done, and his Creator alone being worshipped, let him call upon God's saints, that they intercede for him with God; first on St. Mary, and then on all God's saints. . . . And then let him arm his forehead with the sign of the holy rood, that is, let him sign himself, and then, with upraised hands and eyes, let him in his heart thank God for all He has given him, pleasant or unpleasant." (Thorpe, "Eccles. Institt." ii. 418, 420, 424; xxii., xxiii., xxix.)

5. *Baptism.*—The regular manner of administering this sacrament was by immersion; the time, the two eves of Easter and Pentecost; the place, the baptistery, a small building contiguous to the church, in which had been constructed a convenient bath called a font. All the preparatory ceremonies prescribed by the Roman Ritual at this day were in use in England. In the course of time, convenience or necessity led to several changes in the regulations concerning the administration of Baptism. The missionaries baptized their converts in rivers. As single baptisms continued to increase, a font was placed in the church; the time fixed for the rite was, in Northumbria, nine days after birth, in the South thirty-seven days after birth.

6. *Confirmation* was administered to the children at a very early age. Venerable Bede tells how children were brought to St. Cuthbert for confirmation on his episcopal visitations, and how he ministered to those who had been recently born again in Christ the grace of the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands, "placing his hand on the head of each." (Inter Bedae opera minora; "Vita S. Cuthb." ed. Giles, pp. 302, 308.) This and similar passages prove both the grace attributed to this sacrament and the manner in which it was conferred before 700, and are in perfect accordance with the form described in the Pontifical of Archbishop Egbert of York (beginning of 8th century).

7. *The Holy Eucharist.*—From the arrival of Augustine till the Reformation, the English name for the Eucharist was the housel [q.v.] To administer the Eucharist was to housel; to receive it was to go to the housel or to be houselled. We find the word housel under the form of *hunsle* in the Moeso-Gothic version of the Gospels made by Ulfilas about the year 370, twice as translation of *θυσία*, a sacrifice or victim, and once as rendering of *λατρεία*, worship of God in general.[1] With Bede the Eucharist is the saving victim of the Lord's Body and Blood—the victim without an equal—the victim of His blood, the Body that was slain and the Blood that was shed by the hands of unbelievers. Similar language was used in the Scottish Church. The faithful partook of the housel during Mass, immediately after the Communion of the celebrant. The Roman missionaries most probably introduced the custom of weekly communion among their converts; but in the North, the Scottish missionaries had appointed the feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter for general Communion. This arrangement, by directing the devotion of the people to those particular seasons, had led almost to the extinction of frequent Communion. The conditions required of the communicant were that he should come fasting, and that, if he had fallen into sin, he should have confessed it, have submitted to the penance enjoined, and have received the permission of his confessor. (Thorpe, ii. 438, 440.)

8. *The Sacrament of Penance.*—"No man can be baptized twice; but if a man err after his baptism, we believe that he may be saved if he sorrow [behreowsiath] for his sins with tears, and do penance for them as his teacher shall instruct him." (Ælf. "Hom." i. p. 292, "De Fide Catholica.") Penance in the Anglo-Saxon theology comprised four things: sorrow for sin, confession of sin, penitential works, and reconcilement or absolution. Sorrow (behreowsung = a rueing or lamenting) was a real sorrow of heart. Of confession the Saxon homilist says: "We cannot be saved unless we confess sorrowfully what through our negligence we have done unrighteously. All hope of forgiveness is in confession. Confession with true penance is the angelic remedy of our sins." . . . "No man will obtain forgiveness of his sins from God, unless he confess to some of the ministers of God, and do penance according to his judgment. . . . Without confession there is no pardon." (Whelock, "Hist. Bed." pp. 341–3.) "By confession the venom has been extracted: it now remains for the leech to prescribe the manner of cure" (Alcuin, "De Usu Psalmorum," tom. ii. p. 278), which he did by apportioning the measure of punishment to the degree of guilt of the penitent. The penitential, or doom-book, guided the confessor in the imposition of penitential works. There still remained the prayer of reconciliation or absolution. In lighter and secret cases, it was generally given after confession; but where the offence was more heinous, or called for public example, the absolution was deferred for a considerable time, until a great part or the whole of the penance had been performed. [See SHROVE-TIDE, PENANCE, PENITENTIAL BOOKS.]

9. *The Sacraments of Order, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction* were all administered chiefly according to the Roman custom as laid down in the Sacramentaries of Gelasius and St. Gregory, whence they were transcribed into the rituals of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The benediction of virgins who entered the cloister,

[1] "The original sense [of Housel] is sacrifice." (Skeat, *Engl. Dict.*, *sub voc.*)

the coronation of kings, the consecration of churches, are all alike drawn from the same source. These rites are in substance and almost in every detail identical with the form prescribed in the "Rituale Romanum" still used throughout the Catholic Church in the west.

10. *Prayer for the Dead.*—The Anglo-Saxons had inherited from their teachers the practice of praying for the dead—a practice common to every Christian church before the Reformation. They believed that "some souls proceed to rest after their departure—some go to punishment for that which they have done, and are often released by alms-deeds, but chiefly through the Mass if it be offered for them—others are condemned with the devil to hell." ("Sermo ad Pop. in Oct. Pent." apud Whelock, p. 386.) Praying for the relief of the souls in Purgatory was a favourite form of devotion with our ancestors. But they did not only pray for others, they were careful to secure for themselves after their departure the prayers of their friends. This they frequently solicited as a favour or a recompense, and for this they entered into mutual compacts by which the survivor was bound to perform certain works of piety or charity for the deceased. Such covenants were not confined to the clergy or to persons in the higher ranks of life. The numerous gilds, whatever may have been their immediate object, all imposed one common obligation, that of accompanying the bodies of the deceased members to the grave, of paying the soul-scot for them at their interment, and of distributing alms for the repose of their souls. The clerical and monastic bodies offered gildships of a superior description. They admitted honorary associates with a right to the same spiritual benefits after death to which the professed members were entitled. To some the favour was conceded on account of their piety or learning; to others it was due on account of their benefactions. It belonged of right to the founders of churches, to those who had made to them valuable benefactions, or had rendered to them important services, or had bequeathed to them a yearly rent-charge for that purpose. Of all these individuals an exact catalogue was kept, the days of their decease were carefully noted, and on their anniversaries a solemn service of Masses and psalmody was yearly performed. For the benefit of the dead money was distributed among the poor, and slaves were set free. The devotions in behalf of the dead consisted in the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer; the chanting of certain psalms followed by the Collect still in use in the Catholic Church; in the sacrifice of the Mass, which was offered as soon as might be after death, again on the third day and afterwards as often as was required by the friends of the deceased.

11. *Veneration and Invocation of the Saints.*—This practice the Anglo-Saxons had received with the rudiments of the Christian religion. It formed an integral part of their public and private worship. In public they were frequently called upon to celebrate the anniversaries of individual saints, and yearly to keep the festival of All-hallows as a solemnity of the first rank and importance. In private, at their morning and evening devotions, they were instructed to worship God, and then "to pray, first to St. Mary and the holy Apostles, and the holy martyrs, and all God's saints, that they would intercede for them to God." (Thorpe, ii. p. 426.) A high pre-eminence was allotted to the "most blessed Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin St. Mary." (Bede, "Hom. in Purif." p. 173.) Next in rank was St. Peter, to whom Christ had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven "with the chief exercise of judicial power in the Church, to the end that all the faithful throughout the world might know that whosoever should separate himself from the unity of Peter's faith or of Peter's fellowship, that man could never obtain absolution from the bonds of sin, nor admission through the gates of the heavenly kingdom." (Bede, "Hom." p. 199.) Both laity and clergy were solicitous to secure his patronage. They crowded to the churches and altars dedicated to his memory, pilgrimages were made to his tomb, and presents were annually sent to the church in which were deposited his remains, and to the bishop who sate in his chair. Among the other saints, particular honours were paid to Pope Gregory and to Archbishop Augustine as the friends and patrons of the nation. (This sketch is taken almost word for word from "The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, containing an account of its origin, government, doctrines, worship, revenues, and clerical and monastic institutions," by John Lingard, D.D. In this learned and most conscientious work the reader will find ample confirmations and further developments of the facts here stated. See also Rock, *passim.*)

ANIMALS, LOWER. The doctrine of St. Thomas on the nature of the brutes stands midway between the extreme doctrine, held in ancient and revived in modern times, that the brutes have rational souls, and the equally extreme doctrine of Descartes, that they are mere machines. St. Thomas admits that the brutes have souls, by which they live and feel, and know and desire the particular objects which are presented to them. They can store up past impressions in their memory; they can recall absent images by imagination. Further they cannot go. They are incapable of forming abstract ideas, and they have no free will. "In the works of brutes," St. Thomas says, "we see certain instances of sagacity, inasmuch as the brutes have a natural inclination to proceed with the most

perfect order, and, indeed, their actions are ordered with supreme skill." He explains that this skill comes from God, the supreme artificer, and he continues, "On this account certain animals are called prudent and sagacious, although they themselves have no reason or free will, as is clear from the fact, that all animals of one species go to work in the same way." [1]

From this it follows, as will be plain to anyone who has learned the elements of the Thomist Philosophy, that all the operations of the brute soul are performed through the bodily organs. The imagination and the memory are sensitive powers, no less than sight and hearing: it is only the intellect and the will which deal with immaterial ideas, and which act without material organs; and intellect and will are wanting in brutes. From the operations of the soul in brutes St. Thomas infers its nature, in accordance with the philosophic maxim, "essence and operation correspond to each other." [2] As their souls operate through matter, so they spring from matter and perish with it. They are not created by God, but are derived with their bodies from their parents by natural generation.[3] Without matter, they are utterly incapable of operation, and therefore of existence, for nothing can exist unless it acts in some way or other. Hence, their soul is extinguished with the dissolution of the body.[4]

These philosophical principles determine the morality which regulates the conduct of man to the brutes. As the lower animals have no duties, since they are destitute of free will, without which the performance of duty is impossible, so they have no rights, for right and duty are correlative terms. The brutes are made for man, who has the same right over them which he has over plants or stones. He may, according to the express permission of God, given to Noah, kill them for his food, and if it is lawful to destroy them for food, and this without strict necessity, it must also be lawful to put them to death or to inflict pain on them, for any good or reasonable end, such as the promotion of man's knowledge, health, &c., or even for the purposes of recreation. But a limitation must be introduced here. It is never lawful for a man to take pleasure directly in the pain given to brutes, because, in doing so, man degrades and brutalises his own nature. Hence the touching rules in the Old Testament which prescribe mercy on man's part to the beasts. Moreover, we are bound for our own sakes not to inflict long and keen suffering on the brutes, except some considerable good results. If we accustom ourselves to see animals tortured, we are apt to become callous even to human sufferings, and we do wrong in exposing ourselves to such a danger, unless on the weighty grounds of a high benevolence. "A man," says Billuart, "who puts brutes to death in a cruel manner, and delights in their torments, sins venially, by abusing his power as master and lord. For by such cruelty a man accustoms himself to be cruel to his fellow-men; whence we read in Prov. xii. 'the just man knoweth [*i.e.* considers and regards] the souls of his beasts, but the heart of the wicked is cruel.'" [1] (St. Thom. 1ª, q. 96, a. 1, 2ª, 2æ, q. 64, a. 1; Anon. "The Church and Kindness to Animals.")

[1] 1a 2æ, *q.* 13, a. 2. [2] 1a, *q.* 75, a. 3.
[3] 1a, *q.* 118, a. 1. [4] 1a, *q.* 75, a. 3.

ANNATES (*Annatae*) or **FIRST FRUITS.** According to the definition of Ferraris, "Annates are a certain portion of the revenues of vacant benefices which ought, according to the canons and special agreements, to be paid to the Roman Pontiff and the Curia." The portion due in the case of inferior benefices seems to have been, before the Council of Constance, one half of the gross revenues of the first year, and in the case of bishoprics and abbeys, a sum regulated according to "the ancient taxation." At that council a decree was passed after much discussion, of which the general effect was to allow to the Roman Pontiff the first year's income of all dignities and benefices in his gift. The Council of Basle complained of the burden of the "annates," yet when it was a question of maintaining the anti-pope Felix, whom they had set up, they imposed a still heavier burden, in the shape of "first fruits," on the nations adhering to them.

In England the annates were finally transferred from the Pope to the King by a statute passed in 1534. They are still payable to the sovereign in the case of Anglican bishoprics and Crown livings.

Owing to the revolutions which within the last ninety years have so completely altered the face of Europe, annates form, at the present day, a scarcely appreciable portion of the revenues of the Holy See. Their place is supplied more or less imperfectly by voluntary contributions usually called "Peter's Pence" [see that article].

Zahlwein remarks:—"Annates (1) are paid for the support of the Pope, the Cardinals, and other officials. (2) They are applied to defray the expenses of the legates and apostolic nuncios, whom the Popes find it necessary to send to various nations and the Courts of princes. (3) By means of these annates, aid is extended to bishops who have been expelled from their sees, and to princes unjustly dislodged from their thrones." It was probably by means of this fund that the Popes were enabled to extend a generous hospitality for many years to the son and grandson of our James II. (Ferraris.)

[1] Billuart, *De Justit.* Diss. x. a. 1. For the spirit of the O.T. on this matter, see Exod. xx. 10, xxiii. 12, where the beasts, like men, have a day of rest provided for them; Deut. xxv. 4, "thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out thy corn;" xxii. 6, where the Jews are forbidden to take the bird with the brood on which she is sitting.

ANNIVERSARY. An "anniversary" is defined as "that which is done for a deceased person on the expiration of a year from the day of death," and is especially understood of the celebration of Mass for the benefit of his soul. When a testator directs that such an anniversary shall be celebrated, without specifying whether once or oftener, the canon law interprets his intention as being that the foundation shall be *in perpetuum*. If the anniversary falls on a greater double, the Mass of Requiem may be sung; if on a double of the second class, it must be anticipated or postponed. (Ferraris, *Anniversarium*.)

ANNUNCIATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN (*Annuntiatio*, εὐαγγελισμός, χαριτισμός, in old English, "the Salutation"). The word signifies "declaration," or "announcement"—*i.e.* of the fact that God the Son was to be born of Mary—but at the very moment in which the fact was announced, it actually took place; so that, in commemorating the "Annunciation," we really commemorate the Incarnation of God the Word.

St. Luke tells us that the Angel Gabriel was sent by God to Nazareth, where he saluted Mary with the words, "Hail, full of grace" (κεχαριτωμένη). St. Luke speaks of a leper as πλήρης λέπρας, "full of leprosy" (v. 12), with which we may compare λελεπρωμένος applied to Naaman (4 Kings v. 1). The Evangelist speaks of Mary as "espoused" to Joseph, and Calmet, on this ground, thinks that she was still unmarried. But the great majority of Catholic writers believe that the word "espoused" must not be pressed; that Mary, when the angel came, was already St. Joseph's wife, and was living in his house. St. Ambrose, in his commentary on Luke, lib. ii., remarks that the salutation, "Hail, full of grace," was unknown before. "It was reserved for Mary alone. For rightly is she called full of grace, who alone obtained a grace merited by none, save only her, that she should be filled with the Author of Grace." At first, Mary was disturbed by the salutation, and even when told that she was to be the Mother of our Lord, she replied, "How shall this be, since I know not man?" Catholic divines point out that she did not, like Zachary, show want of faith. She accepted the fact, and only inquired about the manner of its accomplishment. According to the common explanation, she had made a vow of virginity, which she was anxious to keep, though, as St. Bernard says, she was willing to surrender it at God's bidding. The angel told her the child was to be conceived by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Mary herself was to supply all which an ordinary mother supplies for the formation of her child's body, so that Mary is truly the Mother of God. The rest was done by the operation of the Trinity, though it is attributed specially to the Holy Ghost, because it was a work of grace and love—grace and love being particularly appropriated to the Holy Ghost. This mystery was accomplished when the Blessed Virgin said "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done unto me according to thy word." Then God the Son was hypostatically united to a human nature.

The Annunciation, as a feast, belongs both to Christ and to His Blessed Mother; but Suarez says, that as the gift of Christ to man was not perfectly accomplished till the moment of His birth, therefore the feast of the Annunciation is to be regarded chiefly as a feast of Mary, that of Christmas as a feast of Christ. The feast of the Annunciation is celebrated on March 25. Some authors—*e.g.* Thomassin and Tillemont—think that this date was chosen simply because it is nine months before Christmas; nine months being the usual period which elapses between conception and birth. Benedict XIV., on the other hand, contends that the 25th of March was known by ancient tradition to have been the actual day. Certainly, St. Augustine, in the fourth book of his work on the Trinity, ch. v., speaks of an ancient tradition to that effect, while the same day is marked for the Annunciation in the Greek Menologies and Menaea, in the Calendars and Martyrologies of the Copts, Syrians, Chaldeans, as well as in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, and generally in the Missals, &c., of the West. It is true that a Council of Toledo, in the seventh century, ordered the feast to be kept on January 18, but the object of the council was, not to fix the true date, but to provide against the inconvenience of celebrating the Annunciation in Lent.

We do not find any certain and express mention of the feast in early writers, though Martène rightly infers from St. Augustine's words, already alluded to, that the custom of celebrating it is very ancient. We find it mentioned by the Council of Trullo (692), and in homilies which pass under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus, and which may belong to the beginning of the first century. The Bollandists even argue from the general diffusion of the feast, that it may have been of Apostolic institution. [See MARY; CHRIST; INCARNATION, Cabrol in DACL; Kellner, "Heortology."]

ANOINTING. [See OILS, HOLY; EXTREME UNCTION, etc.]

ANOMOEAN (from ἀνόμοιος, unlike). Strict Arians who taught that the Father and the Son were unlike. They rejected not only the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, but also the Semiarian compromise that the Son was "like" in substance to the Father. They were sometimes called Eunomians, from Eunomius, one of their leaders. [See ARIUS and ARIANISM.]

ANTEPENDIUM. As mentioned under ALTAR, a "pallium," or frontal, varying in colour according to the season, is to be placed

on the altar. The rubric especially requires this when the altar is not entirely of stone. It is commonly called the antependium, from *ante*, before, and *pendere*, to hang. (Gavantus, p. i. tit. xx.; Rock, i. 183.)

ANTHEM. [See ANTIPHON.]

ANTHONY, ST., ORDER OF. Properly speaking, there is no such Order. For although, as we have seen [ABBOT], Anthony was the patriarch of the monastic family, still he composed no rule; and if certain schismatic convents of Armenians and Copts boast that they possess such a rule, it is always found on examination that it is the rule of St. Basil, or some modification of it.

The Antonines, an order of monks to serve the sick, were founded by Gaston, a gentleman of Dauphiné, towards the end of the eleventh century, when the terrible and mysterious disease called St. Anthony's fire was causing great mortality in the valley of the Rhone. In 1040 Jocelyn, a pilgrim, had brought relics of St. Anthony to the Church of St. Didier la Mothe, near Vienne. Praying before these relics in 1095, Gaston, his son being then dangerously ill, vowed to give his goods to found a hospital if his son got well. The son recovered, and eagerly joined his father in the fulfilment of his vow. They took the monastic habit, and established a hospital for the reception of persons ill of St. Anthony's fire. The order flourished greatly. Boniface VIII. in 1297 ordained that the Antonines should live as canons-regular under the rule of St. Austin. The order subsisted till the Revolution, at which time there were sixty-six Antonines in France: of this number only three became *assermentés*; the rest preferred persecution, exile, and death. (Hélyot: Besse in DThC.)

ANTHROPOMORPHITES. An insignificant sect of the fourth century, called also Audians, after their founder Audius, a native of Mesopotamia. Grounding their heresy on many passages in Scripture, especially in the Old Testament, they maintained that God had a human shape. They died out before the end of the fifth century. When Cassian, towards the year 400, travelled among the monks of Egypt, he found that anthropomorphism, though with a complete absence of heretical intention or perversity, was rife among them; but whether they inherited the tenet from the Audians, or derived it from some other source, is uncertain. (Theodoret, "Hist. Eccl." iv. 9, PG, lxxxii. 1141; St. Augustine, "De Div. Quaest." Ad Simpl. q. vii., PL, xli. 110; "De Civ. Dei," xvi. c. 5, PL, xli. 483.)

ANTICHRIST. A word which, so far as the New Testament is concerned, only occurs in St. John's Epistles. In itself it might mean—"like Christ," or "instead of Christ," as ἀντίθεος signifies Godlike, or ἀνθύπατος pro-consul, but the *Antichrist* of St. John is Christ's adversary. "Ye have heard," he says, "that Antichrist[1] is coming, and now there have been many Antichrists. . . . This is the Antichrist who denies the Father and the Son." In the fourth chapter he makes the characteristic of Antichrist (τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου) consist in not confessing Jesus;[2] and more fully in the seventh verse of the Second Epistle, he places the guilt of Antichrist in his denial that Christ has "come in the flesh." Thus St. John identifies the Antichristian spirit with the Docetic heresy [see DOCETAE], though he seems also to allude to a single person who is to come in the last days. St. Paul, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, is more explicit. He does not, indeed, use the word "Antichrist," but he speaks of a person whom he describes as the "man of sin," "the son of perdition who opposeth and raiseth himself over all that is called God, or is an object of awe, so as to sit in the temple of God, exhibiting himself as God." At present, there is a power which hinders his manifestation. The Thessalonians looked on the "day of the Lord" as already imminent. Not so, St. Paul replies: three things must happen first—an apostasy or defection must occur; the hindrance to the manifestation of Antichrist must be removed, and then Antichrist himself revealed (c. ii.). This "man of sin" is usually called "Antichrist," and to this terminology we shall conform during the rest of the article.

As to this Antichrist, we must distinguish between what is certain and what is doubtful.

It is the constant belief of the whole Church, witnessed by Father after Father from Irenaeus downwards, that before our Lord comes again, a great power will arise which will persecute the Church, and lead many into apostasy. All that is "lawless," all that oppose "lawful authority" in Church or State, partake so far of his spirit, who is called, in the words of the Apostle, the "lawless one" by pre-eminence. But this must not lead us to treat Antichrist as a mere personification of evil, or to forget the universal belief of Fathers and theologians that he is a real and individual being who is to appear before the end of the world.

So much for what is certain. When we come to details, the Fathers, Bossuet says, "do but grope in the dark, a sure mark that tradition had left nothing decisive on the subject." All, or nearly all, are agreed in considering that the "mystery of iniquity already worked" in Nero, that the power which hindered the appearance of Antichrist was the Roman Empire, and that he was to appear as the Messiah of the Jews, and to possess himself of their temple. Further, from very early times, St. Paul's "man of

[1] 1 Ep. ii. 18. The reading ὁ ἀν., "that the Antichrist comes," is that of the received text, but Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles omit the article.

[2] "Every spirit which does not confess Jesus." So the Greek, according to the editions just quoted. The Vulgate has "every spirit which dissolves Jesus" (*qui solvit Jesum*).

sin" was identified with one of the two Apocalyptic beasts, in Apoc. xiii., and with the little horn, in Daniel vii., which roots out the other ten horns, or kings, speaks blasphemies and destroys the saints. A time was expected when the Roman power would be divided into ten kingdoms. Antichrist was to destroy three of these, to subdue the rest, till, after a reign of three and a half years, he, in turn, was destroyed by Christ. It was also commonly held that Antichrist was to be a Jew, of the tribe of Dan, because that tribe is described as a serpent by the dying Jacob,[1] and is omitted from the list of tribes in the Apocalypse.[2] Many other features in the picture might be given. Some regarded Antichrist as generated by Satan; others, as actually Satan incarnate. The Arian persecution in Africa, the domination of Islam, were looked upon as likely to usher in the reign of Antichrist. Among other curious beliefs we may mention that of some among the Béguines [*q.v.*], who supposed that as Lucifer had come from the highest order of angels, so Antichrist would spring from the most perfect Order, viz. the Franciscan. In contrast with these aberrations of fancy, St. Augustine in the West, and St. John Damascene in the East, preserve a marked moderation of tone in discussing this subject.

At the Protestant Reformation, an entirely new view appeared on the field. Even heretics had not ventured to assert that St. Paul, in the "man of sin," meant to describe the Pope. Wyclif, indeed, had called the Pope "Antichrist," while the name was applied to Pope Silvester by the Waldensians, to John XXII. by the Béguines; but the word was used in that vague sense in which everyone who does or teaches evil is an Antichrist. Indeed, till Luther's time it was generally agreed that Antichrist was to be an individual, and this fact, which the plain sense of St. Paul's words implies, is enough of itself to refute the absurd opinion that Antichrist means the line of Popes. All Protestant writers of respectable attainments have now rejected this monstrous interpretation. Yet it is well not to forget that it was once almost an article of Protestant faith, and it was actually made a charge against Archbishop Laud on his trial that he refused to recognise Antichrist in the Bishop of Rome. (Newman, "Essays Critical and Historical," ii. p. 112; "Discussions and Arguments," p. 44; Ermoni in DThC, "Antéchrist.")

(Chiefly taken from Döllinger's "First Age of the Church," Appendix I.)

ANTIDICOMARIANITES (literally "opponents of Mary"). A sect of heretics in Arabia, to whom St. Epiphanius directed an epistle and of whom he gives an account in his work on heresies. ("Heres." lxxviii., PG, xlii. 699–739.) They held, that, after Christ's birth, Mary had other children by St. Joseph. They are said to have derived this error from disciples of Apollinaris. The Collyridians, a sect of the same time and country, also mentioned by Epiphanius, went to another extreme. Women of this sect offered cakes or rolls (κολλυρίδες) in Mary's honour and afterwards partook of them. This superstition first arose in Thrace and Scythia. Against these heresies St. Epiphanius lays down the Catholic principle, that Mary is to be honoured, but God only to be adored. (See MARY; Fleury, xvii. 26; Hefele in "Kirchenlex."; Franzelin, "De Verb. Incarn." thes. xv.)

ANTILOGY. An apparent contradiction between the Old Testament and the New Testament generally, or between one statement and another in the Sacred Writings. (See INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.)

ANTINOMIANS (ἀντί, νόμος, against, the law). Heretics who taught that Christians were not bound by the moral law, notably with regard to sensual acts. St. Paul's doctrine of the liberty of the Christian, justification by faith, and the inefficacity of the works of the law, gave occasion to evil-minded men to wrest his words to mean the total abrogation of the precepts of the moral law, and the permissibility of every form of licence. The Apostle himself in his latter epistles (Eph. iv. 19; 1 Tim. i. 4; iv. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9), St. James (*passim*), St. Peter and St. John (Apoc. ii. 9) all condemn this distortion of his teaching. Nevertheless the evil continued among the Gnostic sectaries, especially the followers of Carpocrates. The Manichaeans also by their rejection of the Old Testament were led into all the excesses of antinomianism. The extent of the heresy may be gathered from the fact that all the early Fathers frequently deal with it. (Tertullian, "Apol." vii. 9, PL, i. 307; Minucius Felix, "Octav." ix., PL, iii. 263; Clem. Alex. "Strom." iii. 2, PG, vii. 1112; Origen, "Cont. Cels." vi. 2, PG, xi. 1333; Eusebius, "Hist." iv. 7, PG, xx. 330, and later St. Epiphanius, "Heres." xxvi., PG, xli. 330, and St. Augustine, "Haer." lxx. PL, xlii. 44.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone and the depreciation of works gave rise to a fresh outbreak of antinomianism. One of his followers, Johannes Agricola, pushed the principles to their extreme consequences, which were strongly disavowed by Luther himself. The doctrine spread into England and was keenly discussed in the seventeenth century by Crisp, Richardson, and Hutchinson in favour of it, and by Cudworth, Bull, and Baxter against it.

The Council of Trent condemned those who taught that "the ten Commandments nowise appertain to Christians" and that

[1] Gen. xlix. 17. [2] Apoc. vii. 5.

" a man, though justified and ever so perfect, is not bound to observe the commandments of God or of the Church" (Sess. vi. can. 19, 20). (Besides the Fathers mentioned, see Bellarmine, "De Justificatione." See also COMMANDMENTS.)

ANTIOCH. The city in which the disciples of our Lord were first called Christians. (Acts xi. 26.) It was the chief centre of the Gentile Church and here the chief apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and other apostolic men, such as St. Barnabas, laboured. Besides this, Antioch had a title to special pre-eminence in the fact that it was for a time the actual see of St. Peter, who founded the Church and held it, according to St. Jerome, for seven years. He was succeeded by St. Evodius and St. Ignatius. Moreover, the civil greatness of the city combined with its traditional glory, as St. Peter's see, to give it a high rank among the Churches of the world. It is no wonder, then, that Antioch should have been regarded in early times as the third among the episcopal cities of the Catholic world. The difficulty rather lies in the fact that the third, instead of the second, place was assigned to it, and that it ranked after Alexandria, the see of St. Mark. This apparent anomaly may be explained by the civil superiority of Alexandria, and this is the solution actually given by Baronius; or, again, it may be said that St. Peter only fixed his see at Antioch for a time, whereas he placed his representative St. Mark as the permanent bishop of Alexandria.

However, the bishops of Antioch did not even maintain their rank as third among Christian bishops, though it was theirs by ancient privilege. At the Second and Fourth Councils, they permitted the bishop of Constantinople to assume the next place after the Roman bishop, so that Antioch became the fourth among the patriarchates. Shortly after the Fourth General Council, Antioch fell lower still. Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople in St. Leo's time, ordained a patriarch of Antioch, and this infringement of the independence which belonged to Antioch as a patriarchate came to be regarded as a settled custom.

The patriarchate of Antioch embraced the following provinces: Phoenicia prima et secunda, Cilicia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Osroene, Euphratesia, Syria secunda, Isauria and Palestine. It is doubtful whether Persia was subject to it. Antioch claimed jurisdiction over Cyprus, but the latter asserted its independence at the Council of Ephesus (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 334), and at a later date Anthimus, metropolitan of Cyprus, resisted Peter the Fuller, who claimed authority as patriarch of Antioch. Anthimus professed to have found the body of St. Barnabas in the island and so to have proved the apostolic foundation of his Church. The territory of Antioch was abridged further by the rise of the patriarchate of Jerusalem. At Chalcedon, Juvenal of Jerusalem secured the three Palestines as his own patriarchate. This he did by an agreement with Maximus of Antioch, which was ratified by the council and the Papal legates.

The bishop of Tyre held the first place among the metropolitans subject to Antioch; he was called *πρωτόθρονος*, and he had the right of consecrating the new patriarch, though in the middle of the fifth century, as we have seen, this privilege was usurped by Constantinople. The patriarch consecrated the metropolitans; they consecrated the bishops, though Pope Leo wished that even bishops should not be consecrated without the patriarch's approval.

Under the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius at the end of the fifth century, Monophysite patriarchs were placed at Antioch, and this Monophysite patriarchate lasts to the present day, though the patriarch's residence was removed to Tagrit and later to Diarbekir. There was a Greek orthodox patriarch, who generally resided at Constantinople, but he too fell away in the general defection of the Greeks from Catholic unity. This schismatic patriarchate of the orthodox Greeks still continues. At the end of the eleventh century, the conquests of the crusaders led to the establishment of a Latin patriarchate.

At present, besides the Syro-Monophysite or Jacobite, and the Greek schismatic patriarch, there are—the Latin Catholic patriarch, who, at present, does not really govern any Church in the East; the Greek Melchite patriarch, for the united Greeks; the Syrian patriarch, for those of the Syrian rite who returned in the seventeenth century from Monophysite error to the Church; the Maronite patriarch, who has authority over all Maronite settlements. (From Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus," tom. ii. *De Patriarchatu Antiocheno*; Moroni, "Dizionario," *sub voc.*; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches.")

Among the many councils assembled at Antioch, special importance belongs (1) to three councils held between 264 and 267-8 against Paul of Samosata. At the third council, in 267-8, Paul was deposed and his formula that the Son was of one substance (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father condemned, probably because Paul meant by it, that the Son pre-existed only as an attribute of the Father, not as a distinct Person, just as reason in man is a mere faculty, not a distinct person. The fathers of the council addressed an encyclical letter to Dionysius of Rome, Maximus of Alexandria, and to the other bishops. Dionysius died that same year, but his successor, Felix I., published a decisive statement of the Catholic faith against the errors of the heresiarch. Paul, however, maintained possession of the

episcopal house; whereupon the orthodox applied to the emperor Aurelian, who decreed that the bishop's house was to belong to him "with whom the Italian bishops and the Roman see were in communion." (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 195.)

(2) To the Synod *in encaeniis*, held in 341. It consisted of 97 bishops, met to consecrate the "Golden Church" begun by Constantine the Great; whence the name *ἐν ἐγκαινίοις* (the dedication, cf. Jn. x. 22). The majority of the fathers held the Catholic faith, and had no thought of betraying it; and hence their 25 canons relating to matters of discipline attained to great authority throughout the Church. But they were deceived by the Eusebian party [see ARIANISM], renewed the sentence of deposition against Athanasius, and put forth four Creeds, which though they approach the Nicene confession, still fall short of it by omitting the decisive word "consubstantial." (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 702.)

Apart from its influence as a patriarchate and as the meeting-place of councils, Antioch also wielded great powers over the Church as *a school of theology and of Scriptural exegesis*. This school already existed in the fourth century, when Dorotheus and Lucian—who died, as a martyr, in 311—were its chief ornaments. The Antiochenes were learned and logical, the enemies of allegorical interpretation and of mysticism, but their love of reasoning and their common sense degenerated at times into a rationalistic tendency, so much so that Theodore of Mopsuestia has ever been regarded as the forerunner of Nestorius. But, undoubtedly, Antioch rendered great services in the literal interpretation of Scripture. Unlike the Alexandrians, the great scholars of Antioch turned aside from allegorical interpretations, and were distinguished for their critical spirit and grammatical precision. Among their foremost commentators were—Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus (d. about 394), formerly priest of Antioch, whose writings, though vehemently denounced for their Nestorian tendency, and no longer extant, once enjoyed a vast reputation; John Chrysostom, the greatest of all literal expositors; Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), like Diodorus, inclining to Nestorianism, but gifted with talents which can still be discovered even in the fragments and Latin translations of his commentaries which survive, and known as "the commentator" *par excellence*; Theodoret (d. about 458), whose commentaries on St. Paul are "perhaps unsurpassed" for "appreciation, terseness of expression and good sense."[1] (Vailhé and Ermoni in DThC; Leclercq in DACL; Fouard, "S. Pierre.")

ANTIPHON. The word signifies "alternate utterance," a well-known ornament of ancient drama. St. Ignatius, one of the Apostolic Fathers, is believed to have first instituted the method of alternate chanting by two choirs, at Antioch. In the time of Constantine, according to Sozomen, the monks Flavian and Diodorus introduced it among the Greeks. In the Latin Church it was first employed by St. Ambrose at Milan in the fourth century, and soon became general. But in process of time the word came to have a more restricted sense; according to which it signifies a selection of words or verses prefixed to and following a psalm or psalms, to express in brief the mystery which the Church is contemplating in that part of her office.

In the Mass, the Introit (introduced by Pope Celestine I., 422–432, "Lib. Pont.," i. 230), the Offertory, and the Communion, are regarded as Antiphons. But it is in the canonical hours that the use of the Antiphon receives its greatest extension. At vespers, matins, and lauds, when the office is a double [see FEASTS], the Antiphons are doubled—that is, the whole Antiphon is said both before and after the psalm or canticle. On minor feasts, the Antiphons are not doubled; then the first words only are said before the psalm, and the whole at the end of it. Liturgical writers say that the Antiphon means charity; and that when it is not doubled, the meaning is that charity, begun in this life, is perfected in the life to come; when it is doubled, it is because on the greater feasts we desire to show a more ardent charity. Except the Alleluias, few Antiphons are sung in Paschal time, for the joy of the season inflames of itself, and without extraneous suggestion, the charity of the clergy. On most Sundays the Antiphons at vespers are taken from both Testaments, but in Paschal time only from the New. On the greater Antiphons, see the article ADVENT.

The Antiphons of the Blessed Virgin formed no part of the original Church office; they came into the breviary later. They are four in number, one for each season of the year. The first, "Alma Redemptoris," sung from Advent to Candlemas, was written by Hermannus Contractus, who died in 1054. Chaucer's beautiful use of this in the Prioresses Tale shows how popular a canticle it must have been with our forefathers. The second, "Ave Regina," sung from Candlemas to Maundy Thursday, was written about the same time, but the author is unknown. The third, "Regina Coeli, laetare," is used in Paschal time; and the fourth, "Salve Regina" (to which, as is well known, St. Bernard added the words "O clemens," &c.), written either by Pedro of Compostella or Hermannus Contractus, is sung from Trinity to Advent. (Leclercq in DACL, *Antienne.*)

ANTIPHONARY. The book in which the antiphons of the breviary, with the

[1] Lightfoot on Galatians, p. 230.

musical notes belonging to them, are contained.

ANTIPOPES. In the first twelve centuries of her existence the Church was disturbed some twenty-five times by rival claimants of the Papacy. The strife thus originated was always an occasion of scandal, sometimes of violence and bloodshed, but in most cases it was easy for men of honest will to distinguish between the true Pope and the Antipope or false claimant. It was very different in the great schism of the fourteenth century. For forty years, two and even three pretenders to the Papacy claimed the allegiance of Catholics: whole countries, learned men and canonized saints, ranged themselves on different sides, and even now it is not perhaps absolutely certain who was Pope and who Antipope.

It is usually said that Novatian, who became the leader of a schismatical party at Rome in 251, was the first Antipope [see NOVATIANISM], but Döllinger ("Hippolytus and Callistus," Engl. Tr. p. 91 *seq.*) argues with weighty reasons that he was anticipated thirty years before by Hippolytus, the supposed author of the "Philosophumena" (see also D'Alès, "La Théologie de Saint Hippolyte"). In the election of Felix II. (A.D. 355–6) a new element appears which was often to manifest itself again—viz. the influence of the Court. The Arian Emperor Constantius, after removing Pope Liberius from Rome, compelled three disreputable bishops (*κατασκόπους · οὐ γὰρ ἂν τις εἴποι ἐπισκόπους*) "to establish as bishop in the palace a certain Felix, who was worthy of them." So Athanasius writes ("Ad Monach. et Hist. Arian." 75. PG, xxv. 784) only three years after the event, and we can scarcely doubt that his account is accurate in the main. It is accepted, *e.g.*, by Natalis Alexander (Diss. xxxii. a. 3 in Sæc. iv.), Hefele-Leclercq (i. 879), and many other Catholic authorities. But Felix is commemorated as a saint in the Latin Church on July 29, and Pagi ("In Annal. Baron." ad ann. 356, n. 3, ad 357, n. 16 *seq.*) tries to show that he was no Arian intruder, but succeeded Liberius upon his resignation. After Felix, we meet with no more heretical Antipopes, although Laurentius (498) was supported by the Byzantine Court in the belief that he would approve the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno [see HENOTICON].

Indeed, for many centuries Antipopes were upheld simply by factions among the clergy and people, who had the power of election. Thus Eulalius (418–19) was supported by a minority of clergy and people, and by the Prefect Symmachus; he was finally expelled by the Emperor Honorius (Fleury, "H. E." xxiv. 7 *seq.*). Laurentius (498) had a party of the people and Festus the patrician on his side; the case was decided against him by the Arian king Theodoric (*ib.* xxx. 48). Dioscorus (530) was raised by popular faction and died a month afterwards (*ib.* xxxii. 21). Pascal (687–692) gained a party among the people and the favour of John, Exarch of Ravenna, by bribery (*ib.* xl. 39). The tumultuous mob which chose John (844) abandoned him almost immediately (*ib.* xlviii. 15). The deputies of the Emperor Lothair and the arms of the Frankish soldiers enabled the usurper Anastasius to defy the true Pope Benedict III. for a brief space in 855[1] (*ib.* xlix. 26). A new complication occurred in 964. Benedict V. does not deserve to be called Antipope. He was duly elected by the Roman people. But the Romans had sworn in the previous year that they would not proceed to elect a Pope except with the Emperor's consent and according to his wishes. Benedict was degraded and humbly confessed his sin (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 817 *sqq.*). In the two following centuries we find a number of Antipopes raised to this bad eminence by the violence of popular and baronial factions in the darkest age of the Church's history. Such were Franco, a deacon of the Roman Church, who took the title of Boniface VII. and usurped the Roman bishopric in 975 and again in 984 (Fleury, lvi. 36, lvii. 12); John XVI. (Philogathus), who won his place by bribery in 997 (*ib.* lvii. 49); a certain Gregory who headed a party after a contested election in 1012 (*ib.* lviii. 35). It was believed till quite lately that the Church in the middle of the eleventh century was distracted for the first time by the claims of three rival Popes. The recent investigations of Steindorff have shown this supposition to be inaccurate, and his conclusions are accepted by Hefele in his second edition. The following seem to be the facts of the case. In 1033 the Count of Tusculum raised his son, a boy of twelve, to the Papal throne. He called himself Benedict IX. In 1044 this "devil on the chair of Peter" was overthrown in a popular uproar, and Silvester III., not without simony, succeeded to his place. He in turn, after the lapse of a year, resigned in favour of Gregory VI., an excellent man, though apparently he bribed Benedict to resign. Although therefore there were not three rival Popes, still there were three parties in the Roman Church and some reason to fear that a triple schism might arise. It was this fear which induced the German King

[1] At this time the fabulous Pope Joan is said to have reigned. The story first appeared in a book by the French Dominican Stephen de Bourbon (d. 1261); then in early MSS. of the history of Martinus Polonus, also a Dominican (d. 1279). The work of Polonus was the popular history of the Middle Ages, and obtained universal belief for the legend. It found a place in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romæ*, a sort of handbook for strangers visiting Rome. Nay, acquiescence in the fable induced John XX. to style himself "John XXI." It was not till the fifteenth century that doubts arose, and the Calvinist Blondel (*Joanna Papissa*, Amstelodam. 1657) first demonstrated the unhistorical character of the legend. He was followed by Leibniz (*Flores Sparsi in tumulum Papissæ*, Goetting. 1758), and by nearly all historians since. (Döllinger, *Papstfabeln*, 1 *seq.*)

Henry III. to interfere. A council of Sutri deposed Gregory and Silvester, Benedict was deposed the same year in a synod of Rome, and Suidger of Bamberg, at the recommendation of the king, was canonically elected. He took the title of Clement II. (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 981 *sqq.*).

The election of the Antipope Cadalaus (the name is spelt in many ways), known as Honorius II., has greater and wider interest, connected as it is with the general history of the Church. The party of reform chose Alexander II. Beatrice of Canossa was zealous in his cause, and he was acknowledged as true Pope in 1062 at a synod of Augsburg. But many feared the strong measures a good Pope might take against the simony and concubinage prevalent among the clergy. The Lombard bishops were determined to have a Pope who came from the Paradise of Italy (*i.e.* Lombardy), and who would have patience with human weakness. A powerful party at Rome was at one with them, at least on the latter point. Thus it came to pass that Cadalaus, bishop of Parma, a man of licentious life, was chosen Pope at a council of Basle by the Lombard prelates and Roman deputies in 1061, took the title of Honorius II., and was invested by the young King Henry IV. with the insignia of the Papacy just twenty-eight days after the cardinal bishops had elected Alexander II. The schism was a formidable one. The German Court abandoned the cause of Cadalaus at the synod of Augsburg, but he found favour even after that with the Empress Agnes and with the king, and he had money and arms at his command. He died in 1072 (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 1216–67 *seq.*).

Next comes a series of Antipopes in the long strife between the Empire and the Papacy. Guibert of Ravenna, the favourite of Henry IV., was recognized by the Ghibelline party as Clement III.; he was followed by the Antipopes Theodoric and Albert. In like manner Burdinus of Braga, under the Emperor Henry V., became the Antipope Gregory VIII. (Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," i. p. 767). Anacletus II., a son of Peter Leone and of Jewish family, was chosen by a party among the cardinals in 1130, but by means of simony. His opponent, Innocent II., won the allegiance of the Catholic world as a whole, but Anacletus was upheld by the Normans in Calabria, by the Duke of Aquitaine, and others. After his death in 1138, his party transferred their homage to another Antipope, Victor IV. (*ib.* 771–3). Once more under Frederick I., the war between the Imperial and Papal parties called new Antipopes into existence. The first of these, also called Victor IV., had won the votes of the Ghibelline majority among the cardinals. He was acknowledged by a synod of Pavia in 1160, and the true Pope, Alexander III., took refuge in France. Another Antipope, Paschal III. (Guido Clemens), followed in 1164, and another, Calixtus III. (John de Struma), in 1168. Frederick ceased to maintain the schism after the peace of Venice in 1177, and the Antipope himself submitted to Alexander III. Some of the Barons tried to continue the schism by declaring Lando Siterio Pope, but the attempt failed utterly and at once, and Pope Alexander, who died in 1181, had seen the fall of no less than four pretenders to the Papacy.

For about two centuries no Antipope disturbed the Church's peace, but in 1378 the election of Urban VI. occasioned a schism rightly called the great, since it was the most grievous ever known. Gregory XI. had just brought the "Babylonish captivity" of Avignon to an end. There were sixteen cardinals present at Rome, of whom eleven were Frenchmen, four Italians, and one, Peter de Luna, a Spaniard. Gregory, a few days before his death, had empowered them to hold a conclave at any place and without waiting for their colleagues (Raynald. ad. ann. 1378, n. 2). On April 7, 1378, they assembled in the Vatican. Their task was far from easy. It would have been natural for them to elect a Frenchman, but on the other hand, the Romans earnestly demanded a Roman or at least an Italian Pope. On April 8, Bartholomew of Prignano, archbishop of Bari, was elected, and he was crowned on Easter Sunday under the title of Urban VI. French contemporary writers with scarcely an exception represent the cardinals as constrained by violence. They were told by the populace that they must elect an Italian or die; nor were signs wanting that the Roman mob meant to keep their word. There are, however, very strong reasons for refusing belief to these French accounts. Dietrich of Niem, a German and an official in the Papal Court at the time, assures us that the election was perfectly free, that the people did indeed beg the cardinals to promote an Italian, but used no force or threats, and that the tumult did not occur till the election was over. Dietrich must have known the truth, and there is every ground to think he told it, for he was by no means an enthusiastic admirer of Pope Urban. The testimony of St. Catherine of Sweden, given at length by Raynaldus (ad ann. 1379, n. 20) is to the same effect. She was present in Rome at the time, and talked over the matter with many of the cardinals. But the most conclusive document is the letter also given in full by Raynaldus (ad ann. 1378, n. 19), which the sixteen electors addressed on April 19 to their brother-cardinals at Avignon. They declare that they had chosen Urban freely and unanimously, and we know that they acknowledged him for several months without a protest.

However, Urban's harshness and imprudence alienated the Sacred College, and in August of that same year the French cardinals

declared that the election had been constrained, and renounced all allegiance to Urban, whom they called "an apostate" and "an accursed Antichrist" (Raynald. ad ann. 1378, n. 48 *seq.*) They persuaded three out of the four Italian cardinals to join them at Fondi, where, on September 20, the Cardinal of Geneva was elected, and became Clement VII. Urban found himself deserted by every cardinal, for the fourth Italian member of the college (Tebaldeschi) was dead. All the cardinals at Avignon accepted Clement, who soon after established himself, and was acknowledged Pope in France, Lorraine, Savoy, Scotland, Naples, and Spain. The rest of the Catholic world belonged to the obedience of Urban. St. Catherine of Siena was eager in the cause of Urban; St. Vincent Ferrer equally so for the Popes of the other line. Urban was followed by Boniface IX. (1389–1404); Innocent VII. (1404–6); Gregory XII. (1406–15). On Clement's death in 1394, he was replaced by the famous Peter de Luna, Benedict XIII.

The Council of Pisa in 1409 tried to remove the scandal of a double line of Popes anathematizing each other and dividing the allegiance of Christendom. In session xv. both Popes were deposed, and in the nineteenth, Alexander V. was elected. For a time this made matters worse, for neither Gregory nor Benedict admitted the validity of the sentence, so that there were now three claimants of the Papacy—viz. Gregory XII., Benedict XIII., and Alexander V. Still, Alexander's successor, John XXIII., was accepted by the Emperor Sigismund, and by the greater part of the Church.

Another attempt at peace was made by the Council of Constance. It annulled the pretensions of all three Popes. Of these, Gregory resigned willingly. John was deposed in session xii., May 1415, and Benedict XIII. in session xxvii., two years later. Martin V. was then chosen Pope by the twenty-three cardinals and six deputies from each of the four nations into which the council was divided.

Here the schism virtually ended, and Martin V. ruled over all Catholics. Nevertheless, Benedict XIII. held out at the Castle of Peñiscola, on the Catalonian coast. He had received the deputies who brought him the sentence of deposition with solemn protest; he maintained to the last that the little church of his obedience was the ark of salvation, and that he himself was the centre of unity. With his last breath in 1423 he bade his cardinals provide for the election of a successor, which they did by promoting the Canon Muñoz[1] as Clement VIII. He, however, resigned the tiara in 1429, and allowed his cardinals to elect "Otto Colonna, known in his obedience as Martin V." Muñoz became Bishop of the Balearic Isles

This is not the place to discuss the merits of the rival claimants—a question on which canonists, theologians, religious orders, and, as we have said, even saints were divided. Suffice it to say that the Avignon claimants are not counted in the list of legitimate pontiffs. Clement VII. (1523–1534) and Benedict XIII. (1524–1730), in taking their names and titles as Roman pontiffs, disregarded the two Avignon Popes Clement VII. (1378–1394) and Benedict XIII. (1374–1415, died 1424); but Alexander VI. recognized the Pisan Pope Alexander V. (1409–1410). No Pope has assumed the name of John since the Pisan Pope John XXIII. When unity was restored, Martin V. and his successors recognized the acts of government and grace of both the Avignon Popes. The latter are never styled antipopes, but are designated under the formula "called popes in their obedience."

Amadeus, Count and afterwards first Duke of Savoy and Count of Geneva, was the last of the Antipopes. He was chosen by the Council of Basle, then schismatical, in 1439, and crowned at Basle in the following year. He submitted in 1449 to Pope Nicholas V., who made him cardinal and perpetual vicar of the Holy See in the territories of Savoy, Basle, Strasburg, &c. He died at Ripaille in 1451. (See the histories of the Church such as Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Hergenröther; and for the Great Schism. Salembier, "Le Grand Schisme" (good bibliography). On the dogmatic questions see Franzelin, "De Ecclesia," p. 230.)

ANTISTES. A title frequently applied in ecclesiastical history, and in the prayers of the Church, to a prelate or bishop. Cf. 2. Par. (Chron.) xxix. 34 (Vulg.).

APOCRISIARIUS (ἀποκρίνεσθαι, to answer). Ecclesiastical, but chiefly Papal, emissaries to the Court of the Emperor were designated by this name from the fourth to the ninth century. So long as the civil power persecuted the Church, there was no place for such officials; but after the conversion of Constantine, the recognition by the Roman emperors of the divinity of Christianity and the claims of the hierarchy gave rise to numberless questions, within the borderland of the civil and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which it was important for the Popes to press on the notice of the emperors, and obtain definite *answers* upon, so that a practical adjustment might become possible. The Apocrisiarius, therefore, corresponded to the Nuncio or Legate *a latere* of later times, and was usually a deacon of the Roman Church. Gregory the Great resided in this character for three years at Constantinople in the reign of the Emperor Mauricius. After the middle of the eighth century we hear no more of such an emissary, because the adoption of

[1] There were only four "cardinals" in Benedict's obedience. Three chose Muñoz; a fourth elected himself, and took the title "Benedict XIV." He was defended by the Count of Armagnac.

the extravagances of the Iconoclasts by the imperial Court led to a breach with Rome. But when Charlemagne revived the Empire of the West, similar diplomatic relations arose between him and the Holy See, which again required the appointment of Apocrisiarii. It appears that under the first Frankish emperors the imperial archchaplain was at the same time Papal Apocrisiarius. Subsequently the name was given to officials of Court nomination, who held no commission from Rome; and in this way the title in its old sense came to be disused, and was replaced by Legatus [see LEGATE] or Nuncio. (See the various texts given by Ducange in his Glossaries; Thomassin, I. ii. 107–111; also Pargoire in DACL.)

APOCRYPHA (from *ἀπόκρυφος*, hidden). It corresponds with the Jewish word גנוז, which the Jews applied to books withdrawn from public use in the synagogue, on account of their unfitness for public reading.[1] But the later Jews had also the notion that some books should be withdrawn from general circulation because of the mysterious truths they contained.[2]

The early Fathers used "apocryphal" to denote the forged books of heretics, borrowing, perhaps, the name from the heretics themselves, who vaunted the "apocryphal"[3] or "hidden" wisdom of these writings. Later—*e.g.* in the "Prologus galeatus" of Jerome—apocryphal is used in a milder sense to mark simply that a book is not in the recognized canon of Scripture; and Pope Gelasius,[4] in a decree of 494, uses the term apocryphal in a very wide manner, (1) of heretical forgeries; (2) of books like the "Shepherd of Hermas," revered by the ancients, but not a part of Scripture; (3) works by early Christian writers (Arnobius, Cassian, &c.) who had erred on some points of doctrine. We need scarcely add that the Protestant custom of calling Wisdom, Machabees, &c., "Apocrypha," is contrary to the faith and tradition of the Church. [See CANON OF THE SCRIPTURE.]

The name is now usually reserved by Catholics for books, laying claim to an origin which might entitle them to a place in the canon, or which have been supposed to be Scripture, but which have been finally rejected by the Church. In the Old Testament the most important apocryphal books are—3 and 4 Esdras, both of which are cited by early writers as Scripture, the latter being also used in the Missal and Breviary; 3 and 4 Machabees; the prayer of Manasses, which is found in Greek MSS. of the Old Testament, and is often printed, in a Latin version, in the appendix to the Vulgate; the book of Enoch (*cf.* Jude 14), which Tertullian regarded as authentic (it only exists at present in an Ethiopic version); a 151st Psalm attributed to David, which is found in Greek MSS., and in the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions of the Psalms; eighteen psalms attributed to Solomon, written originally, according to some scholars, in Hebrew, according to others, in Greek.[1]

There is a great mass of New Testament apocryphal literature. Some books, such as the "Epistle of Barnabas," the two "Epistles of Clement," the "Shepherd of Hermas," may in a certain sense be called apocryphal, because, though not really belonging to Scripture, they were quoted as such by ancient writers, or were inserted in MSS. of the New Testament. Some other books mentioned by Eusebius—viz. the "Acts of Paul," the "Apocalypse of Peter," the "Teachings of the Apostles" (*διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*) [see APOSTLES, TEACHING OF], seem to have belonged to this better class of apocryphal literature. Besides these, Eusebius mentions apocryphal books in circulation among heretics—viz. the "Gospels" of Peter, Thomas, Matthias; the "Acts" of Andrew, John, and the rest of the Apostles.[2] Fragments remain of the ancient Gospels "according to the Hebrews," "of the Nazarenes," "according to the Egyptians," of the preaching and Apocalypse of Peter, &c., and have been repeatedly edited.[3]

Later times were no less fruitful in apocryphal literature, and we still possess a great number of these later forgeries, entire and complete. They have been edited by Fabricius in the work already named; by Thilo, "Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti," 1831, of which work only the first volume, containing the apocryphal Gospels, appeared; by Tischendorf ("Evangelia Apocrypha," 1876, second edition enlarged; "Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha," 1851; "Apocryphal Apocalypses," 1866); Martin, "Les Apocryphes de l'A. Test."; Bousquet and Amann, "Les Apocryphes du N. Test."; and by Charles, "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament." This is not the place to attempt an enumeration of these apocryphal books, but we may mention some which enjoyed a special popularity in the Church, and exercised a marked influence on Catholic literature. A number of apocryphal Gospels treat of the infancy and youth of our Lord, and of the history of his blessed Mother and foster-father. Among these the "Protevangelium of James" holds the first place. ("Évangiles Apocryphes," i.; "Protévangile de Jacques," ed. Michel.) It describes the early history of Mary

[1] Buxtorf. *Lex. Chald. et Rabbin.* sub voc

[2] 4 Esdr. xiv. 46.

[3] Tertull. *De An.* 2. *PL*, ii. 649. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 4. 29; *PG*, viii. 1133. Euseb. *Hist.* iv. 22.

[4] Fleury, *Hist.* xxx. 35; but see also Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 940.

[1] See Reusch, *Einleit. in das A. T.* p. 176.

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 25.

[3] By Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* (1703–91); Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum*, Oxoniae (1700); Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra Canonem receptum* (1866).

our Lord's birth at Bethlehem, and the history of the wise men from the East. This gospel was much used by the Greek Fathers; portions of it were read publicly in the Eastern Church, and it was translated into Arabic and Coptic. It was prohibited for a time among the Latins, but even in the West it was much used during the Middle Ages. Other Gospels, such as the Arabic "Evangelium Infantiae Salvatoris," contain legendary miracles of our Lord's infancy. We have a second class of apocryphal Gospels which treat of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. Of this class is the "Gospel of Nicodemus." It is probably of very late origin, but it was a favourite book in the Middle Ages. The Greek text still exists, but it was also circulated, before the invention of printing, in Latin, Anglo-Saxon, German, and French. Closely connected with this Gospel are a number of documents which have sprung from very ancient but spurious "Acts of Pilate." These ancient Acts, which were known to Justin and Tertullian, have perished, but they called forth several imitations which still survive. The one which is best known is a letter of Lentulus to the Roman senate describing the personal appearance of our Lord. It is a forgery of the Middle Ages.

Further, apocryphal literature is rich in "Acts of the Apostles," and here, as in the apocryphal Gospels, we find early but spurious Acts, revised and enlarged, and so originating fresh forgeries. Thus the "Acts of Paul and Thecla," in their existing form, are the recension of a very early work—forged as early at least as Tertullian's time. The fullest of all these "Acts" is the "Historia Certaminis Apostolorum." It can scarcely be older than the ninth century, but it is of considerable value, because the author has made diligent use of earlier Acts, some of which have perished.

Of apocryphal Epistles we have, among others, *a letter of St. Paul to the Laodiceans* (only existing in Latin), which, though rejected by Jerome, was accepted as canonical by many great Latin theologians of a later day, won a place in many copies of the Latin Bible, and for more than nine centuries "hovered about the doors of the sacred canon." [1] We may also mention a letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and another of the Corinthians to St. Paul (both only in Armenian); letters supposed to have passed between St. Paul and Seneca (known to Jerome and Augustine); spurious letters of the Blessed Virgin, to St. Ignatius, to the inhabitants of Messina, &c. &c.

Lastly, we have apocryphal Apocalypses of Paul (called also ἀναβατικόν; see 2 Cor. xii. 1), Thomas, Stephen—nay, even of St. John himself. (Migne, "Dict. des Apocryphes"; Bardenhewer-Godet, "Les Pères de l'Eglise," i. 184 *sqq.*)

[1] Lightfoot, *Ep. to Colos.* p. 365.

APOLLINARIANISM. Apollinaris was the son of a grammarian, also called Apollinaris, who migrated from Alexandria to Laodicea, where the younger Apollinaris was born, and of which city he afterwards became bishop. He was distinguished, not only for his great literary knowledge and skill, but also for his austerity of life. He was a voluminous author. He wrote in defence of the Christian religion against Porphyry, and showed like zeal against the Arians, who in revenge inflicted a cruel wrong upon him. He was dear in his youth to St. Athanasius, and he was in friendly relations with SS. Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus. Hence, for a long time the Catholics were unwilling to believe that the errors attributed to him were really his. Athanasius wrote against his heresy without mentioning his name, and at the Alexandrian Council of 362, the Apollinarians seem either to have retracted their errors for the moment, or else to have deceived the Catholic bishops.[1] But "towards 375 or 376," says Fleury, "their errors manifested themselves so plainly as to make further toleration impossible. The Egyptian bishops exiled in Palestine for the faith opposed [Apollinaris] vigorously," [2] and St. Basil wrote against the heresiarch. Apollinaris was condemned in a Roman synod under Pope Damasus in 374. Two years later, the same Pope, in another Roman synod, anathematized the heresy and deposed Apollinaris with his two disciples Timothy and Vitalis, Apollinarist bishops at Alexandria and Antioch.[3] They were condemned again in the first canon of the Second General Council and their assemblies were forbidden by Theodosius.

Apollinaris was not always consistent with himself, and it is not easy to distinguish his doctrine from later accretions, which it may have received through his followers. A full account of his doctrine so far as it can be ascertained will be found in Petavius,[4] from whom we have taken the following summary:—

First, Apollinaris, like the Arians, denied that our Lord had a human intelligence. He admitted that Christ had a soul by which He lived and felt, but he said that the place of the intellect and spirit were supplied by the eternal Word. A human intelligence, he argued, would have been useless to our Lord, and inconsistent with His sinlessness, because a created intelligence must needs be peccable. Here Apollinaris virtually denied that Christ is perfect man, and destroyed all real belief in the Incarnation.

Next, he, or at least his followers, held that our Lord's flesh was of one substance with His divinity, so that the divinity actually

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 966.
[2] *Hist.* xvii. 25.
[3] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 981, 984.
[4] *De Incarnat.* i. 6.

suffered and died. They denied that He took flesh from the Blessed Virgin, asserting that Christ brought His body with Him from heaven, and that this body existed "before the ages." On this point, the Apollinarians repeated an old Gnostic error, and were the forerunners of the Monophysites. They objected to the Catholic doctrine, according to which Christ is true man, because they thought it introduced a fourth person over and above the three Persons of the Trinity. As Apollinaris denied the humanity of Christ by depriving Him of an intelligent soul, so he did in reality deny His divinity, for a Godhead which can die or suffer is no Godhead at all. (See Petav. *loc. cit.*; Fleury; Newman, "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical," 257 *seq.*)

APOLOGIST. The word is used generally to denote writers who defend Christianity and the Church from attack. It is also applied in a special sense to those Christian writers of the first four centuries, who vindicated the faith and discipline of Christ from the torrent of obloquy to which they were exposed in Pagan society. Such were Aristides, Justin Martyr, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, &c., besides others, such as Quadratus and Melito, whose works have not come down to us. In the Middle Ages St. Thomas wrote his "Summa Contra Gentiles" to defend the Church against Mahometan rationalism. The spread of Deism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries called forth many able works in defence of Revelation, such as Butler, "Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution of Nature"; Paley, "Evidences of Christianity" and "Natural Theology"; Leibnitz, "Theodicée"; Gerbert, "Demonstratio Veræ Religionis"; Bergier, "Traité Historique et Dogmatique de la Vraie Religion." The great modern discoveries in astronomy, geology, biology, and archæology have given occasion to difficulties against revealed religion which have been dealt with by successive writers. Wiseman's "Connection between Science and Revealed Religion" did good work in its day, and is still worth reading. Though Newman has left no regular apologetic treatise his works are invaluable for the principles of defence, especially his "Grammar of Assent," "Idea of a University," and "Development of Christian Doctrine"; Schanz, "A Christian Apology" and Hettinger, "Natural Religion" and "Revealed Religion"; Guibert, "In the Beginning"; Gerard, "The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer"; D'Alès, "Dict. Apologétique de la Foi Catholique," "Revue Pratique d'Apologétique"; Freppel, "Les Apologistes Chrétiens au IIe Siècle"; Allard, "Hist. des Persécutions"; Harnack, "Die Ueberlieferung der Griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts"; Otto, "Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum sæc. II.")

APOLOGY. (1) As stated in the previous article, the word is used for a defence of the Church against infidel attacks.

(2) The name "Apology" is also given to certain prayers said by the priest either at the beginning of the Mass or at the Offertory, or even at odd times during the Mass. This apology is a sort of confession or self-accusation for presuming to celebrate the Divine Mysteries. It is not found before the seventh, or the sixth century, though the prostration before the Mass or at the beginning of the Mass in the Gallican liturgy is clearly the origin of the apologies. However, the prostration, still retained by the Roman Church in the Good Friday rite, may reasonably be supposed to have existed in some kindred form from the beginnings of Christianity. We have it still as the *Confiteor* said with bowed head and body at the foot of the Altar before Mass. Of its nature it is a kind of private preparation for celebrating, whence a bishop does not complete his robing by taking the maniple till he has finished it. A Carthusian priest for the *Confiteor* retires from the front of the altar and bows down with his face to the "piscina," that is, to the wall in the corner on the Gospel side. In Rome, where from perhaps the seventh century Mass began with a procession during which the Litany was sung, the celebrant on reaching the altar-steps hastened to prostrate himself in humble supplication, leaving the choristers to finish their chant. This is still done on Holy Saturday and on Whitsun-Eve. (Cabrol, in DACL.)

APOSTASY. It is of three kinds: that from the Christian faith; that from ecclesiastical obedience; and that from a religious profession, or from holy orders. An apostate from the faith is one who wholly abandons the faith of Christ, and joins himself to some other law, such as Judaism, Islam, Paganism, &c. It is a mistake, therefore, to brand as apostasy any kind of heresy or schism, however criminal or absurd, which still assumes to itself the Christian name. While the Turks were in the heyday of their power, and had great command over the Mediterranean, the captivity of Christians among them, and apostasy resulting from such captivity, were matters of everyday occurrence; hence a great number of decisions and opinions respecting the treatment of apostates, on their wishing to return to Christianity, may be found in the writings of canonists. The second kind of apostasy, that from ecclesiastical obedience, is when a Catholic wilfully and contumaciously sets at nought the authority of the Church. Such apostasy, if persisted in, becomes Schism [*q.v.*]. The third kind is that of those who abandon without permission the religious—

order in which they are professed: as when Luther abandoned his profession as an Augustinian, and married Catherine Bora. He is also an apostate who, after having received major orders, renounces his clerical profession, and returns to the dress and customs of the world, "an act which entails ecclesiastical infamy, and, if there is marriage, excommunication." (Ferraris, *Apostasia*; St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 12; see also the commentaries on the bull "Apostolicae Sedis," and the works on moral theology in the treatise "De Censuris," especially, Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vii. n. 421.)

APOSTLE (from *ἀπόστολος*, one who is sent). The word is not much used in classical Greek except to denote "a naval expedition." In the LXX it occurs only once, 3 Kings xiv. 6, where Ahias says to the wife of Jeroboam "I am a hard messenger (*ἀπόστολος*) to thee." It was, however, in common use among the later Jews, who applied it to the emissaries sent by the rulers of the race on any foreign mission. These "apostles" formed a council round the Jewish patriarch, and executed his orders abroad. Probably our Lord adopted the word from the current language of his time.[1]

The name is given in the New Testament first of all to the twelve whom our Lord chose. "The names of the twelve apostles," St. Matthew says, "are these: the first, Simon," &c. But it is by no means restricted to them: Matthias and Paul were of course Apostles, though not of the twelve; so was Barnabas.[2] Moreover, St. Paul seems to bestow the name on the seventy disciples and also upon Andronicus and Junias.[3] Certainly, in the writings of the Fathers and in the office of the Church the word is used of persons like Silas, Timothy, Luke, and others who were associated with Paul in his work.[4] Finally, the word Apostle in the New Testament still retains its wide and original meaning of messenger.[5]

It is plain, however, from Scripture and tradition, and from the very fact that the Church was an organized body, that the office of Apostle was something definite and distinct. It has been argued that an Apostle, in the strict sense, had to be taken from those who had seen our Lord, and that the office of the Apostolate was always accompanied with the power of working miracles. Neither of these points can be proved. No doubt, it was providentially arranged that the Twelve should be able to give personal witness to the resurrection, and St. Paul himself appeals to his having seen our Lord as proof of his equality with the older Apostles. No doubt, God did confirm the teaching of the Apostles by giving extraordinary efficacy to their words, and setting his seal to it by miracles. But this is no proof that the essential character of the Apostolate depended either on the gift of miracles or on having seen our Lord. There are, however, three marks of the Apostolic office which necessarily belong to it, and which, taken together, separate it from all other ecclesiastical dignities. First, the Apostles were bishops, and so had the sacrament of order in all its fullness; they were able to consecrate and ordain, to confirm, &c. Next, either mediately, through the ministry of man, or immediately from God Himself, they had received a commission to preach the Gospel throughout the world. They were to be witnesses to Christ "even to the end of the earth." Thirdly, they received full and perfect power of binding and loosing, of founding Churches, of ordaining bishops and other ecclesiastics, throughout the world. This universal jurisdiction, however, they were obliged to exercise in union with St. Peter, who was the centre of unity and head of the Church, and in subordination to him. Further, this universal jurisdiction was peculiar to themselves; they could not—except in a certain modified sense, which will be explained presently—transmit it to their successors. It is Peter only, who had any individual successor in his primacy and his universal jurisdiction. In episcopal order and in universal jurisdiction (*i.e.* in two out of the three notes of an Apostle) the bishops of Rome are the successors of St. Peter. Other bishops succeed the Apostles in order only, not in universal jurisdiction. But the episcopate conjointly have universal jurisdiction, and so together represent the Apostolic college. This jurisdiction they exercise in subordination to the Pope, as the Apostles exercised theirs in subjection to St. Peter. (See Petav. "De Hierarch." i. 5 and 6; Bainvel in DThC; Harnack, "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," i. 319 *sqq.*)

APOSTLES' CREED. [See CREED.]

APOSTLES, FEASTS OF. Before the fifth century the Roman calendar contained no festivals proper to any of the Apostles except that of SS. Peter and Paul, on June 29. Low Sunday—the Gospel of which recalls the grant of spiritual powers by the risen Christ to the assembled Apostles—was often called in antiquity "the Sunday of the Apostles." In the Sacramentary of Pope Leo *all* the Apostles are commemorated on June 29; for in the Mass for that day there is a collect which runs "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui nos omnium apostolorum merita sub una tribuisti celebritate venerari." Hence the "Festival of the Twelve Apostles" (*Σύναξις τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*) came to be observed in the Greek Church on June 30. The feast of the "Division of the Apostles," referring to their final dispersion from Jerusalem thirteen years after the Ascension, occurs in the Roman

[1] Lightfoot on Galat. 92 *seq.*
[2] Acts xiii. 2, 3; Galat. ii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 5.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 7; Rom. xvi. 7.
[4] See Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*, and Estius on Rom. i.
[5] Philipp. ii. 25.

calendar on the 15th of July. The feast of SS. Philip and James was fixed on the 1st of May, after the translation of their relics into the "Basilica omnium Apostolorum" at Rome in the sixth century; November 30th was fixed as the feast of St. Andrew by a bull of Boniface VIII. in 1295. (Duchesne, "Christian Worship," pp. 277–283; Zimmerman, in DACL.)

APOSTLES, TEACHING OF THE TWELVE. (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀπ., commonly called the "Didache.") Referred to in "De Aleatoribus," ch. iv., and by Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." i. 20, 100) and Origen ("De Princ." iii. 2–7); it was at length discovered in 1883 at Constantinople by Bryennios. It consists of two parts, the one moral (i.–vi.) the other disciplinary and liturgical (vii.–xv.) The first part is a sort of parable of the two roads—the one of life, the other of death—describing the good and evil acts which respectively lead to each. The second part treats of baptism, fasting, the Eucharist, the hierarchy—consisting of apostles, prophets, teachers, bishops, and deacons. The mention of the eucharistic sacrifice (θυσία) on the Lord's day is especially noteworthy (ch. xiv.). The work concludes with an exhortation to be on the watch for the coming of the Lord (ch. xvi.). The whole Didache is of a very primitive character, and hence many critics place it as early as the later years of the first century (Petersen, Langen, Funk, Batiffol, &c.). Harnack, however, attributes it to the period 130–160. There are many editions: Harnack, Leipzig, 1884 and 1893; Funk, Tübingen, 1901; Rendel Harris reproduced the MS. in facsimile, Baltimore, 1887. (Jacquier, "La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres," 1891; Hemmer, "Les Pères Apostoliques," 1907.)

APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER. [See PRAYER, APOSTLESHIP OF.]

APOSTOLIC CANONS. A tradition long prevailed that these Canons were dictated by the Apostles themselves to St. Clement of Rome, who committed them to writing. Accurate research has dispelled this notion. Their real value and the antiquity that should be assigned to them are still much disputed. Daillé the Calvinist, astounded at the important, or rather, essential, place which they assign to bishops in the Christian economy, strove to prove that they were a work of no earlier date than the fifth century. The Anglican divines Beveridge and Pearson examined with great learning and power the question of the origin of these Canons, and endeavoured to prove that they must have been compiled not later than the end of the second or beginning of the third century. The latest German researches (see Kraus' "Real Encykl.") tend to the conclusion that, as collections, that of the first fifty Canons cannot be dated earlier than the middle of the fourth, while the remainder must be assigned to the sixth century. Bunsen, in his work on "Hippolytus and his Age," printed a translation of the Canons and also of several versions of the Constitutions, with a commentary, the intent of which is to show that these "know of no sacrifice of the Mass, acknowledge no definition of the Catholic Church," and, generally, are in "flagrant contradiction" with the later canon law. The temperate statement of Soglia seems to come much nearer the truth. From these Canons, he says, it may be clearly seen and proved, "that the ordinations of bishops, presbyters, and other clerics are no growth of a later discipline, that the dogma of the oblation and sacrifice of the Mass is not new, nor the distinction between clergy and laity, nor the power of a bishop over his clergy, nor excommunication, nor many other similar institutes, which have been assailed by heretics on the score of novelty."

The Apostolic Canons are usually found in MSS. appended to the last or eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions [*q.v.*]. In some copies they are but fifty in number, in others eighty-five. The collection of fifty exists in a Latin form, having been translated by Dionysius Exiguus from the original Greek towards the end of the fifth century. These fifty were always regarded in the West as authoritative in a sense in which the remaining Canons were not; in the East no such distinction was made between them and the other thirty-five. From the analysis made by Drey ("Neue Untersuchungen," &c.) it would appear that twenty-two out of the whole number substantially embody injunctions and rules contained in the extant apostolic epistles; ten are closely connected, both in time and import, with these; twenty date from the age of the great persecutions; and the remainder are assignable to the Nicene and post-Nicene periods. With regard to their contents, "the greater number, 76 out of 85, relate to the clergy, their ordination, the conditions of consecration, their official ministrations, orthodoxy, morality, and subordination, also to their temporalities, and to the relation of the diocese to the province; so that it is clear that the regulation of the discipline affecting ecclesiastical persons was the main object of the collection."

With regard to the authority that should be assigned to them, while on the one hand the Emperors Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian, the Council of Ephesus, and especially St. John Damascene (who ranks them with the Canon of the New Testament), are all in their favour, the consensus of opinion against them, since the sixteenth century, when they were first critically examined, is very strong. It is urged that Eusebius and St. Jerome are silent, though if such a collection of Canons had come down from

the Apostles, they must have known of them; also that in the controversy (third century) between Pope Stephen and St. Cyprian, neither party appealed to them, though, had they been generally known, and believed to be genuine, they would at once have decided the point in dispute. Again, it is plain that many things mentioned in them —*e.g.* metropolitans, division of dioceses, distinction of Church from episcopal property, &c.—are of post-Apostolic age. Thirdly, they teach in many places a doctrine which it is impossible to ascribe to the Apostles, as when (No. 17) they forbid only that a man who has been twice married *after his baptism* should be admitted into the ranks of the clergy, whereas the letter of Innocent I. (404) to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, proves that a second marriage disqualified from ordination, even when the first had been contracted *before* baptism; or (No. 66) when they lay down an unwise rule on fasting; or (Nos. 46, 47) enjoin as to the re-baptism of heretics the contrary of that which Stephen, following the true apostolic tradition, maintained in the dispute with Cyprian. Either therefore it must be said that the Church teaches a doctrine and discipline repugnant to what the Apostles taught—an assertion which would be impious—or it must be allowed that these Canons, in their entirety at least, cannot be ascribed to the Apostles.

That Bunsen should have thought that these Canons breathed a spirit alien from that of the Roman Church is extraordinary. In them we view the Catholic Church as one body, attaching great importance to unity, knowing its own mind, imposing a strict discipline on all its members lay and clerical, just as we see the Church in communion with Rome doing at this day. The thirty-fifth Canon, enjoining on bishops obedience to their metropolitans in the interest of that "unanimity" by which God is glorified, foreshadows—one might almost say, suggests —the language of the Leos and the Gregories concerning the chair of Peter, for what could prevent dissension among the metropolitans, unless they, too, had some one to look up to and obey? (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 1203; Nau in DThC.)

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS (*διαταξεις* or *διαταγαι*). Eight books, devoted to the discussion of ecclesiastical affairs. They profess to contain the words of the Apostles written down by St. Clement of Rome. The spurious character of the book was soon evident to Catholic scholars, such as Baronius, Bellarmine, and Petavius, who were at one, at least on the main point, with Protestants like Daillé and Blondel. But it is more difficult to say when the foundation of the book was laid, and when it took its present form. It is evidently a compilation. The first six books are an adaptation of the Didascalia [*q.v.*] of the Apostles belonging to the third century. The first thirty-one chapters of book vii. are adapted from the Didache [*q.v.*]; the remainder from unknown liturgical texts. Book viii. is from several sources, mainly from the so-called Egyptian Church Order, which is itself derived from the Canons of Hippolytus. These different portions have been put together by one and the same writer, who was probably a Syrian, a semi-Arian and a contemporary of Valens (364–378).

There are editions by Lagarde, 1862; Pitra, "Juris Ecclesiastici Graecorum Historia et Monumenta," tom. i. 1864. See also Funk, "Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen," 1891; Bardenhewer, ed. Godet-Verschaffel, ii. p. 195 *sqq.*

APOSTOLIC DELEGATE. This is a papal representative usually sent to countries which have no regular diplomatic relations with the Holy See. He has power to give final sentence in appeals from diocesan and metropolitan courts; but the appellant may go directly to the Holy See, if he chooses, instead of to the Delegate. The most important example of this form of delegacy is that established in the United States in 1893. The Apostolic Delegates have been Mgr. Satolli (1893–1896); Mgr. Martinelli (1896–1904); Mgr. Falconio (1902–1909). All of these were afterwards made Cardinals. The present Delegate is Mgr. Bonzano. Mgr. Zaleski is Apostolic Delegate to India; Mgr. Stagni to Canada and Newfoundland; and Mgr. Cerretti to Australasia. [See LEGATE; NUNCIO.]

APOSTOLIC FATHERS. A name given to the Christian authors who wrote in the age succeeding that of the Apostles. Funk's edition of the Apostolic Fathers (2nd ed Tübingen, 1901) contains the following:— (1) The "Didache," or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" [see APOSTLES, TEACHING OF THE TWELVE]. (2) An epistle falsely ascribed to St. Barnabas the Apostle, the date of which cannot be more definitely fixed than between 70–137 (Funk). According to Funk and Bardenhewer probably 96–98. (3) The two so-called letters of Clement: the first, although bearing no name, is admittedly the work of Clement of Rome (Eusebius, Clem. of Alex.); the second is a homily rather than a letter, and its probable date the middle of the second century (Funk, Batiffol); the author is unknown. (4) The letters of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch: seven letters in the shorter Greek recension are genuine, and date from the early part of the second century. (5) A letter of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, disciple of St. John. It is addressed to the Church of God at Philippi; probably it was written shortly after the death of St. Ignatius—certainly between 107–155. (Funk, Batiffol.) (6) An account of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, given by

the contemporary Church of Smyrna shortly after St. Polycarp's death (155). (7) A few fragments of Papias' (contemporary of Polycarp) exegetical treatise on the Words of the Lord (written 130) and a minute fragment of Quadratus, a disciple of the Apostles (according to Eusebius). (8) A letter to Diognetus, of which the author is unknown. At one time ascribed to the middle of the fifteenth century; it is now universally referred to the second century. (9) The "Shepherd" of Hermas, an apocalyptic discourse in which an angel is introduced under the figure of a shepherd exhorting to repentance. According to Muratori and the Hippolytus Chronicle, it was written by Hermas, the brother of Pope Pius, and is therefore placed between 140–156. The great edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Cotelerius appeared at Paris, 1672. Lightfoot's exhaustive labours embraced Clement (1869; new ed. 1890), and Ignatius and Polycarp (1885; 1889). (Migne, PG, i., ii., v.; Gebhart, Harnack, and Zahn, "PP. Apostolicorum Opera," 1878; Hemmer, "Les Pères Apostoliques," 1907; see also Bardenhewer, "Les Pères de l'Eglise," ed. Godet-Verschaffel, liv. I.)

APOSTOLIC UNION. An association of secular priests who observe a simple rule embodying the common duties of their state as missionaries living in the world among their people. This rule fixes the spiritual exercises, parochial duties, and studies of the priest. A bulletin is kept in which the observance of the regulations is noted each day and sent every month to the diocesan superior. Founded by the Ven. Bartholomew Holzhauser in the seventeenth century, it was revived in France about forty years ago, and has received special commendation from Pius X. who was formerly one of its members. [See "Études Ecclésiastiques," the organ of the association.]

APOSTOLICAE CURAE. The Bull in which Leo XIII. condemned the validity of Anglican Orders [*q.v.*]

APOSTOLICAE SEDIS. A Bull of Pius IX., dated October 12, 1869, dealing with ecclesiastical censures. [See CENSURE; EXCOMMUNICATION.]

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. [See ORDER, HOLY.]

APOSTOLICI. A sect of Gnostics who pretended to imitate the Apostles in absolutely renouncing the world. They held matter to be altogether corrupt and impure, and consequently rejected marriage, though they appear not to have been averse to irregular connections. In the twelfth century a sect appeared in the Rhineland, and also in France, which took the same name, and held to a great extent the same doctrines; but these Apostolics allowed of marriage. They were always reviling the hierarchy, the corruption of which they declared to be so great as to have vitiated all the sacraments of the Church except that of Baptism. A similar sect, calling themselves "Apostolic Brethren," appeared in North Italy towards the end of the thirteenth century; their leaders, Segarelli and Dulcino, both suffered at the stake. (See Milman's "Latin Christianity," vii. 360.)

APOSTOLICUS. The word was applied to bishops generally in the ancient Church. Then it was restricted to metropolitans or primates; thus Pope Siricius writes (about A.D. 390), "ut extra conscientiam sedis apostolicae, id est, primatis, nemo audeat ordinare." Even Alcuin, writing at the beginning of the ninth century, uses the word in this sense. Yet long before this the use of the term "sedes apostolica" κατ' ἐξοχήν, for the see of Rome (comp. Bede's "Hist. Eccl." *passim*), had laid a foundation for the restriction of the term Apostolicus to the Roman Pontiff. From the ninth century onwards we find it applied only to the Popes. The Council of Rheims (1049) recognized the right of the Pope to this title, "quod solus Romanae sedis pontifex universalis ecclesiae primas esset et Apostolicus," and excommunicated an archbishop of Compostella for assuming to himself "culmen Apostolici nominis," the eminence of the Apostolic name. (Kraus' "Real Encykl."; Smith and Cheetham.)

APPAREL (PARATURA). A small ornament stitched on to the upper part of the amice and also on various parts of the alb [*q.v.*] It was generally of the same colour as the vestment, but of richer material and more elaborately worked. (See ALB; Rock, i. p. 358 *sqq.*)

APPARITION. [See VISION.]

APPEAL. He who appeals has recourse to the justice of a superior judge from what he conceives to be the unjust sentence of an inferior judge.

Appeals may be either judicial or extra-judicial. A judicial appeal is from the sentence of a judge acting as a judge. An extra-judicial appeal is from the injurious action of any superior, whereby the appellant thinks his rights are infringed—*e.g.* in a case of disputed patronage, or abusive exercise of power. In these cases as the extra-judicial appeal is not *in* the cause, but *begins* or lays the foundation for the cause, it is not, properly speaking, an appeal at all. But there is one kind of extra-judicial appeal which is really such; it is when the appeal is made from a judge who has not decided judicially—*e.g.* who has given sentence without hearing the arguments of counsel or the evidence of witnesses when these were required or allowed by the law. In this case the appeal is extra-judicial (for it is made against an arbitrary act, rather than a motived judgment), yet it is a true appeal, for it is made from a judge to a judge.

The *object* of appeals is the redress of injustice, whether knowingly or ignorantly committed. An appeal need not imply that the original sentence was unjust, for the production of new evidence in the superior court may change the aspect of a case, and cause a decision which was just on the assumption of one set of facts to be justly set aside on the discovery of further facts.

Appeal can be made from any judge recognizing a superior; thus no appeal is possible, in secular matters, from the decision of the sovereign power, or the highest secular tribunal, in any country, for these, in such matters, recognize no superior. Again, there can be no appeal from the Pope; "for he, as the vicar of Christ, recognizes no superior on earth, and it is of the essence of an appeal that it be made from a lower to a higher judge, by whom the sentence of the first may be corrected."[1] Those who appeal from the judgment of the Pope to a future general council, of whatever rank or condition they may be, are formally excommunicated in the bull "In Cœna Domini." Nor can appeal be made from a general council legitimately convened and approved, "because it, being in union with the Roman Pontiff who approved it, represents the whole Church, from the sentence of which there can be no appeal."[2]

As a rule, appeals should proceed regularly, through all the intermediate jurisdictions, to the supreme tribunal; but canon law admits of many exceptions to this. "In the first place, all persons are at liberty to appeal to the Pope immediately, passing over all intermediate judges, in ecclesiastical and spiritual causes; and those subject to his temporal rule can do so in temporal causes also."[3] The reason is, that the Pope is "the ordinary judge of all Christians, having concurrent power with all ordinaries." Many other cases are specified in the canon law, in which appellants are authorized to appeal to a higher court at once, passing over the intermediate jurisdictions.

At the same time there are numerous causes in which no appeal is permitted; these are summed up in the following lines, which are a sort of *memoria technica*:—

Sublimis judex, scelus, exsecutio, pactum,
Contemptus, et res minimae, dilatio nulla,
Clausula quae removet, res quae notoria constat,
Et textus juris clarus, possessio, fatum.

There can be no appeal from a "sublimis judex," such as the Pope, or the sovereign authority in a state. "Scelus": that is, those convicted of criminal offences and who have confessed their guilt have no appeal. "Exsecutio": that is, when the cause has become a "res judicata," the execution of the sentence cannot be stayed by appeal; this seems to be a particular case of "fatum." "Pactum": if the parties have consented to a compromise during the progress of the suit, there can be no appeal. Contempt of court by a contumacious refusal to appear to the judge's citation is another cause which deprives a litigant of the right to appeal; as is (in civil causes) the utterly insignificant nature of the point raised, according to the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*. "Dilatio nulla": that is, in things which do not admit of delay, there can be no appeal—at any rate, no such appeal as would have the effect of suspending the execution of the sentence; as in a case about opening a will, or issuing supplies of food to soldiers, and the like. "Clausula quae removet": that is, when the original suit was conducted by delegation from the supreme tribunal under the clause "appellatione remota," the ordinary right of appeal is annulled. The next two cases explain themselves; by "possessio" is meant that brief enjoyment of the subject of litigation which does not prejudice in an appreciable degree the right of the other party; and by "fatum" those prescribed terms and dates which are otherwise named "fatalia," and the exact observance of which is necessary in order that an appeal may proceed. For instance, unless an appeal against a sentence be lodged within ten days from its delivery, it cannot be made at all.

Finally, no appeal having suspensive effect lies from a sentence of excommunication, nor from legitimate disciplinary correction of a superior paternally administered without legal process. (Ferraris, *Appellatio*; Taunton, *Appeal.*)

APPELLANTS. This was the name given to the party among the French clergy, headed by the Cardinal de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, and four bishops, who *appealed* to a future general council against the constitution *Unigenitus* (1713), by which the Holy See had condemned a hundred and one propositions of a more or less Jansenistic character, extracted from the writings of the Père Quesnel. [JANSENISM.]

APPROBATION. The formal judgment of a prelate, that a priest is fit to hear confessions. It does not involve jurisdiction—*i.e.* a bishop does not necessarily give a priest power to hear confessions in his diocese, because he pronounces him fit to do so, though in fact a bishop always or almost always gives a secular priest jurisdiction at the time he approves him. This approbation by the bishop, or one who has quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, is needed for the validity of absolution given by a secular priest, unless the said priest has a parochial benefice.[1] The bishop who approves must be the bishop of the place in which the confession is heard, and this approbation may be limited as to persons, time, place, and circumstances.

[1] Ferraris, *Appellatio*, art. iii.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* § 10.

[1] *Concil. Trident.* xxiii. 15.

Regulars, in order to confess members of their own order, require the approval of their superiors; to confess seculars, that of the bishop of the diocese. (Ferraris, *Approbatio*; Taunton; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." vi. 542; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." v. 270–293.)

APPROPRIATION. [See TRINITY, D. 5.]

APSE (Greek, ἁψίς, a wheel or arch). Nothing is known of the shape of the Christian churches which were built before the time of Constantine. Assuming, therefore, that ecclesiastical architecture dates from the fourth century, the apse may be considered as one of its primitive features, for it already existed in many of the basilicas or halls of justice or commerce, which were freely placed at the disposal of the bishops by the civil power (but see the art. BASILICA). It was the semicircular termination of the basilica, in which sat the judges; the same construction may often be seen in French courts of justice at this day. When utilized for Christian worship, its extreme end was occupied by the bishop's chair; the seats of the clergy, following the semicircle, were on his right and left; the altar was in the middle of the apse, or just in front of it; and beyond the altar was the choir. In the Byzantine style, which arose in the East after Constantine had transferred the seat of empire to his new city on the Bosporus, the apse was retained; a notable instance of this may be seen in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, built in the sixth century. It appears also in the old Byzantine churches at Ravenna, and also in several churches on the Rhine, of later date but in the same style. In France and England the apse, in all large churches at least, still held its ground, though it occasionally took a triangular or a polygonal form. Norwich Cathedral is perhaps the finest example of the round apse that we have in England. The cathedral of Durham, of which the nave and choir were finished, much as we now see them, about the beginning of the twelfth century, had originally an apse, but on account of a failure in the masonry this was taken down and the present magnificent chapel of the Nine Altars substituted in the thirteenth century. In the later styles which followed the Norman, the French builders as a rule retained the apse, while the English generally abandoned it for the rectangular form. (Oudin, "Manuel d'Archéologie"; Simpson, "Hist. of Architectural Development," ii. 148; DACL, *Chevet.*)

AQUARII. [See ENCRATITAE.]

ARCANI, DISCIPLINA. [See DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET.]

ARCHANGEL. [See ANGEL.]

ARCHBISHOP (Gr. ἀρχιεπίσκοπος). The word first occurs in the fourth century; St. Athanasius speaks of himself and also of Alexander, his predecessor in the see of Alexandria, under this name. In earlier times those bishops who had suffragan bishops depending on them, and exercised spiritual jurisdiction within a certain geographical area which was their *province*, were called metropolitans. As Christianity extended itself, the bishops of the more important cities under the metropolitans came themselves to have suffragan bishops under them, to whom *they* were metropolitans. It became necessary, therefore, to find some new title for the old metropolitans, and the terms *primate, exarch* [see those articles] and *archbishop* came into use. In the West the name "archbishop" was scarcely heard before the ninth century. For a time the words patriarch and archbishop appear to have been used interchangeably. At present the terms "archbishop" and "metropolitan" have the same meaning, except that the latter implies the existence of suffragans, whereas there may be archbishops without suffragans, as in the case of Glasgow.

In the Middle Ages the archbishops possessed an ample jurisdiction: they had the right of summoning provincial councils; they could judge their suffragans as a tribunal of first instance, and hear on appeal causes referred to them from the episcopal courts within the province. The jurisdiction of a metropolitan over his suffragans in *criminal causes* was transferred by the Council of Trent (sess. xiii. De Ref. c. 8) to the Holy See; in *civil causes* it remains intact. Provincial councils, owing to the difficulties of the times, have been less frequent in recent times than formerly; but, by the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. 2, De Ref.), metropolitans are bound to convene them every three years. An archbishop can receive appeals from his suffragans in marriage cases, and (with the authority of the provincial council) visit any suffragan's diocese. The right also devolves upon him of appointing a vicar capitular on the decease of a suffragan bishop, if the chapter fail to appoint one within eight days. Two venerable insignia still mark his superior dignity—the *pallium* with which he is invested by the Holy See, and the *double cross* borne on his "stemma" over his arms. An archbishop has the right of carrying his cross throughout his province, except in the presence of the Pope or a Cardinal Legate. Until the archbishop has received the *pallium* he can only style himself *A. electus*; and, although confirmed and consecrated, he cannot convoke a council, consecrate chrism, or exercise any other acts of higher jurisdiction and order.

Gregory the Great, while giving to St. Augustine personally jurisdiction over all English and British sees, designed to make London and York metropolitan sees, with twelve suffragans under each (Bede, "Hist. Eccl." i. 29). But the priority of Kent in receiving the Gospel led to the primatial see

being fixed at Canterbury, not at London; and the troubled state of the North long deferred the arrangement proposed for York, and never even in the end suffered it to attain the dimensions contemplated by Pope Gregory. For a short time in the eighth century, while Mercia was a powerful kingdom, Lichfield was raised by the Holy See to metropolitan rank. Similarly the see of St. David's in Wales received the pall for a brief period in the twelfth century. At that time there were two archbishops (at Canterbury and York), with thirteen and two suffragans respectively. (Henr. Hunt. "Hist. Ang." i. 5.) After the change of religion the archiepiscopal dignity remained in abeyance in England, till revived in the person of Nicholas Wiseman, who was created the first archbishop of Westminster, in 1850. [See METROPOLITAN; PRIMATE; HIERARCHY; Ferraris, *Archiepiscopus.*]

ARCHDEACON (Gr. *ἀρχιδιάκονος*). At a very early period it was the practice for a bishop to select one of the deacons of his church to assist him both in the divine worship and in the administration of the diocese. As was natural, his choice fell, not necessarily upon the senior deacon, but upon him in whose ability and firmness he could most confide. Thus we read of Eleutherus as the deacon of Pope Anicetus, in the second century; of St. Laurence the deacon of Sixtus II. in the third; and of St. Athanasius, who as the deacon of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, attended him at the Council of Nicaea. The name "Archdeacon" first occurs in the writings of St. Optatus of Milevis (about 370). The importance of the office continually grew, and we learn from St. Jerome that in his time it was considered a degradation for an archdeacon to be ordained priest. It was the duty of the archdeacon, under the bishop's direction, to manage the Church property; provide for the support of the clergy, the poor, widows, orphans, pilgrims, and prisoners; to keep the list of the clergy &c. An able archdeacon, as was to be expected, often succeeded to the see on the death of the bishop who had appointed him. At first there was but one archdeacon, but in the immense dioceses which the conversion of the Western nations caused to arise, the episcopal duties could not be effectually performed—so far as the temporal side of them was concerned—without the appointment of several archdeacons as the bishop's delegates. That they could gradually be invested with the jurisdiction possessed by the bishop, and ultimately even receive independent powers, was a natural consequence of this state of things. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries their power rose to its height. About 1100 Remigius, upon transferring his episcopal throne from Dorchester to Lincoln, divided his vast diocese into seven archdeaconries, in each of which the archdeacon resided in the chief town of his province with quasi-episcopal state, and exercised a jurisdiction which was often formidable even to laymen. Armed with such high privileges, the archdeacons began to encroach on the authority of the bishops, and this led to their downfall. Long before this the Church had ordered that archdeacons on their appointment must receive priestly consecration; now a series of councils in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries occupied themselves with limiting their powers and bringing them back into a due subordination to the bishops; finally, the Council of Trent confirmed and extended these restrictions, taking from the archdeacons and giving back to the bishops that jurisdiction in matrimonial and criminal causes which had been the chief source of their influence. Amongst ourselves the office of archdeacon was not revived on the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850; the functionary who now most nearly corresponds to the archdeacon of the primitive Church is the bishop's vicar-general [see that article]. (Ferraris, *Archidiaconus*; Thomassin, i. 570–575.)

ARCHES, COURT OF. An ancient court, in which the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury is still exercised by a judge known as the Dean of Arches. It received its name from Bow Church in Cheapside (*S. Maria de Arcubus*), in which its sittings were wont to be held. (See Hook's "Church Dictionary.") By a clause in the Public Worship Act (1877) the office of Dean of Arches is merged in that of the judge appointed under that Act. There is an appeal from the sentence of this court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which now represents the old Court of Delegates, and practically, as representing the Crown, upholds the doctrine of the royal supremacy by deciding without appeal all spiritual causes that may be brought before it. (Phillimore, "Eccl. Law of the Church of England"; Stephen, "Commentaries on the Laws of Engl." bk. v. ch. iv.)

ARCHIMANDRITE. [See ABBOT.]

ARCHIVES, ARCHIVIST (Greek *ἀρχεῖα*). The utility of the preservation of public records was fully understood by the ancients; the record office at Rome, which Virgil alludes to ("populi tabularia vidit" G. ii. 502), was an enormous building. Episcopal archives have probably been kept from the very beginning of the Church. The archivist or Protoscriniarius of Rome was an important personage: besides having charge of a large portion of the records, he was the head of all the secretaries and notaries of the Roman Court. A decree of the Congregation of the Council of Trent (1626) specifies what ought to be preserved in an episcopal archive—namely, the processes and proceedings in all causes tried in the bishop's court; episcopal

sentences, precepts, decrees, mandates, &c.; reports and registers of all kinds relating to ecclesiastical affairs within the diocese; and complete inventories of Church property, movable and immovable. (Ferraris, *Archivium.*)

ARCHPRIEST (Gr. ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος). The chief of the presbyters, as the archdeacon was the chief of the deacons. The name dates from the fourth century. The archpriest was usually the oldest of the priests attached to the cathedral; yet instances are not wanting of their being chosen by the bishops for special qualifications, without regard to seniority. The principal function of the archpriest was, during the illness or absence of the bishop, to replace him in the Church offices. He occupied the place of the bishop in the ceremonies of public worship, as the archdeacon did in the administration of the diocese. As population increased, a rural archpriest was placed in each of the larger towns, who was to the local clergy what the archpriest of the cathedral was to the cathedral clergy. In course of time the latter came to be called the *dean*, the former *rural deans*. The privileges of archpriests, like those of archdeacons, were often usurped by laymen in the ages after Charlemagne. Great divergences grew up in different countries, with regard to the duties, rank, and privileges assigned to them. In later times they appear to have been superseded to a great extent by *vicars forane* [*q.v.*].

Towards the end of the reign of Elizabeth, the Holy See, finding that the Catholic clergy in England were much in need of a recognized head, yet unwilling to send a bishop, lest the government should take it as an excuse for fresh cruelties against the Catholics generally, appointed George Blackwell superior of the English mission, with the title and authority of "Archpriest." A consultative body of twelve assistant priests was nominated at the same time. This was in 1598. After some years Blackwell took a course about the new oath of allegiance which displeased the Holy See, and he was superseded (1608) by Birkhead. Towards the end of the reign of James, and after Birkhead had been succeeded by a third archpriest, Harrison, the violence of the persecution being now much abated. Gregory XV. decided that the time was come to send a bishop to England. The first vicar-apostolic was accordingly appointed, in 1623. (Ferraris, *Archipresbyter*; Thomassin, pt. i., bk. ii. 3–6; Dodd, "Church Hist. of England" (ed. Tierney), iii. p. 43 *sqq.*)

ARCOSOLIUM. [See CATACOMBS, p. 127.]

ARISTOTLE. [See PHILOSOPHY.]

ARIUS AND ARIANISM. The heresy of Arius consisted in the denial of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father, and so virtually of Christ's true and eternal Godhead. In opposition to this error, the first Nicene Council defined that the Son is "only-begotten, born of the Father, *i.e.* of the Father's substance;" that He is "not made," as creatures are, but that He is "consubstantial" with the First Person of the Blessed Trinity. The council added a condemnation under anathema of certain Arian propositions, in which this heresy was summed up. To understand them, we must know something of the way in which Arianism arose and spread; and this, again, we cannot do till we have acquainted ourselves with the teaching on the mystery of the Trinity which prevailed in the early Church. We shall take the points in order, reserving for the close of the article an account of Arianism in its later developments.

1. It might seem as if there could be little need of dwelling on the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Every Christian is bound to know and believe the doctrine of the Trinity, and it cannot be supposed that the early Fathers and Martyrs of the Church were ignorant of a fundamental doctrine of the faith. Scripture, too, sets the matter at rest. Our Lord proclaims the unity of His nature with that of the Father. "I and the Father are one." "The Father is in me and I in the Father." "The Word was with God," St. John says, "and the Word was God." Now, in one sense it is true that Arius could find no support for his heresy in the Ante-Nicene age. Scripture declared and the Church taught from the beginning three propositions from which the whole of the Nicene definition follows by logical consequence: viz. first, that the Son is distinct from the Father; next, that the Son is God; and, thirdly, that there is but one God. All this is certain, but it is also true that the Ante-Nicene Fathers often used inaccurate language on this subject; that we do not find in them the full and developed doctrine of the Trinity, as the Nicene Council defined it; and that this explains to a certain extent the success of Arianism and the calamities it brought upon the Church. Nor need we wonder at these defects in the teaching of the early Fathers. They were not and could not be content with the simple enunciations of the propositions enumerated above: they endeavoured (and how could they do otherwise?) to reconcile the apparent contradictions which they involve, and to recommend them as reasonable to those outside the Church. And in this part of their work they were not secure from error. One or two leading instances will be given of the errors into which many of them fell when, instead of merely delivering the tradition which they had received, they began to speculate and reason about it. A difficulty met them the moment they began to consider the eternity of the Son. A son is generated, and generation postulates a beginning: how, then, could the Son be eternal? They did not cut the knot, as

Arius did, by denying the eternity of the Son, because the Catholic faith saved them from such an error; but still many of them did introduce a theory inconsistent with the unchangeable simplicity of God. The Word they admitted, was eternal, but many of them—all, indeed, except St. Irenaeus and the Fathers of the Alexandrian school—denied that He had always been Son. With us, the word is conceived first of all in the mind and then comes forth as articulate sound. So, they maintained, the divine Word had always been in the bosom of the Father (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος); afterwards He issued forth as the first-begotten of all creation (λόγος προφορικός), and by this procession or generation became the Son. They were led into similar error in considering the relation of the Word to creatures. Down to St. Augustine's time the Fathers generally attributed the divine apparitions in the Old Testament to God the Son, and this interpretation led some into erroneous ideas on the subordination of the Son to the Father. Thus Justin speaks of a "God *under* the maker of the universe," and argues that the "maker and Father of all" could not "have left the region above the sky and appeared in a little corner of the earth." [1] Tertullian speaks of a "son visible according to the measure of his derivation," [2] while language of the same import was used by Origen and Novatian.[3] Another source of erroneous language arose in the third century. The Sabellians denied a real distinction between Father and Son, and in his anxiety to establish the distinction between these divine Persons, Dionysius of Alexandria, in the year 260, compared the relation of the Father and the Son to that between a vine-dresser and the vine, asserted that the Son was "made by God" (ποίημα τοῦ θεοῦ) that he was "foreign to the essence of the Father" (ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν), and "did not exist till he was made." In the same year, another Dionysius, bishop of Rome, on account of charges brought by certain orthodox prelates against his namesake of Alexandria, summoned a synod at Rome, and issued a memorable document to the bishops of Egypt and Libya. "Had the Son," the Pope argues, "been created, there would have been a time when He was not; but the Son always was." Thereupon, the Alexandrian bishop, in two letters which he sent to Rome, explained away his former inaccurate language, showed that his adversaries had taken a one-sided view of his teaching, and distinctly confessed the Son's eternity. This case is instructive in several ways. It shows that early Fathers, who used words which sound like Arianism, were very far from the Arian belief; and it is evidence of the vigilance with which the successor of St. Peter watched, as his supreme office required him to watch, over the deposit of the faith.[1]

2. The orthodox doctrine had been maintained in Alexandria by subsequent bishops, when, about the year 318 or 320, Arius began to put forward a heresy which engaged all the energies of the Church for more than half a century. He is said to have been a Libyan by birth; he had twice joined the Meletian schism, but had been reconciled to the Church, and was exercising the office of a priest in Alexandria. The bishop Alexander, Socrates tells us, was discoursing to his clergy on the Trinity in Unity. Arius, who was distinguished for his learning and logical skill, contradicted the bishop, urged that the Son, because begotten, must have had "a beginning of existence"; that there was a time when he did not exist (ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν); and that he was made, like other creatures, out of nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἔχει τὴν ὑπόστασιν). If we add to this that, according to Arius, the Son was liable to sin in his own nature, and that his intelligence was limited, we have a complete statement of the Arian doctrine. He not only held that the Father was separated from the Son by a priority of time—or rather like time, since time in the proper sense began with the Son—but he denied that the Son was from the Father's substance. He did not merely reject the word ὁμοούσιος or consubstantial, as an orthodox synod at Antioch had done in 269,[2] but also the other language in which early Fathers had expressed the same idea.

Arius won many to his side: in particular he was supported by the famous Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had great influence on Constantine. He had friends among the other bishops of Asia, and even among the bishops, priests, and nuns of the Alexandrian province. Meanwhile, he was condemned in two Alexandrian synods and obliged to leave the city. He took refuge first in Palestine, afterwards in Nicomedia; he gained the favour of Constantia, the emperor's sister, and he disseminated his doctrine among the populace by means of the notorious book which he called θάλεια, or "entertainment," and by songs adapted for sailors, millers, and travellers. At first Constantine looked on the whole affair as a strife of words, and sent Hosius of Cordova to Alexandria, that he might restore peace between Arius and his bishop. This attempt failed, and the First General Council met at Nicaea (325). It anathematized Arius, with all who affirmed "that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he was made out of nothing; that he was of another substance or essence [than the Father]; that he was created, or

[1] Justin. *Dial.* 60, *PG*, vi. 611.
[2] *Adv. Prax.* 14, *PL*, ii. 171.
[3] Petav. *De Trinit.* viii. 2, 4 *sqq.*

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 341, *sqq.* See on the whole subject, Petavius, *De Trin.*; Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, and *Causes of the Success of Arianism.*
[2] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 202. We are of course aware that the fact of this rejection has been doubted, but we cannot believe there is any serious ground for questioning it.

alterable or changeable." This symbol was adopted after many disputes, in which the deacon Athanasius, then only twenty-five years old, was the great champion of the faith. Arius and those who refused to anathematize him were banished.

However, when the cause of Arianism seemed desperate, it suddenly revived. Constantia pleaded this cause with her brother on her death-bed. Constantine asked Athanasius (bishop of Alexandria since 328) to restore Arius to Church communion. This the great confessor firmly refused, and, though the Emperor did not insist, Athanasius was grievously calumniated, and exiled to Treves. Other opponents of the heresy met with like treatment. Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra were deposed. The Emperor called Arius to Constantinople, with the view of restoring him to the communion of the Church. It is right to add, that Arius had assured the Emperor, on oath, that the doctrine for which he had been excommunicated was not really his. Before, however, he had attained his end, a sudden death struck him down as he walked through Constantinople escorted by his followers. He died in the year 336, the eightieth of his age.

Arius was dead, but his heresy still prospered. Constantius, who came to the throne in 337, recalled Athanasius next year to Alexandria. Soon, however, a charge of Sabellianism was brought against the saint; he fled for his life from his episcopal city, and took refuge in Rome, when Pope Julius in a synod solemnly acquitted him. But a council at Antioch confirmed his deposition, and drew up four confessions of faith, in which the word "consubstantial" was studiously omitted. Through favour of Constans, who ruled the West, a council met at Sardica in 343 or 344, declared their adherence to the Nicene Creed, and restored Athanasius, with Marcellus and others, to their sees. In spite of the fact that the Arian or Eusebian bishops held a counter-council at Philippopolis, the Sardican decrees enjoyed an almost oecumenical authority, and Constantius permitted the return of Athanasius to Alexandria. However, after the death of his brother Constans, Constantius renewed his persecution of the Catholics. At Arles and Milan synods condemned Athanasius, while Pope Liberius and other bishops who would not subscribe the condemnation were exiled. Again an intruder seized the episcopal throne of Alexandria, and Athanasius, in 356, sought an asylum with the Egyptian monks.

This temporary triumph of Arianism proved its ruin. The heretics presented an appearance of unity so long as they were engaged in a struggle for life or death with the orthodox. No sooner did they feel themselves secure than they began an internecine conflict with each other. The strict Arians, led by Aëtius, a deacon, and a bishop Eunomius, taught that the Father and Son were unlike, and that the latter was made out of nothing. They were also known as Eunomians, Anomoeans (from *ἀνόμοιος*, unlike), or Exucontians, because they said the Son sprang from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*). Another party, known as Semiarians, a name they received about 358, when they held a famous synod at Ancyra, confessed that the Son was "like in substance to the Father" (*ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν*). (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 903.) Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Macedonius, and Auxentius of Milan, were the most noted among them. A third party, led by Ursacius, Valens and Acacius (from whom they are sometimes called Acacians), rejected the phrase "like in substance or essence," and contented themselves with the vague statement that the Son was "like" the Father. The Council of Ancyra, as we have seen, was Semiarian. The second Sirmian synod, in 357 (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 899), condemned the Semiarian as well as the orthodox formula, while Semiarianism secured a fresh victory in the third council held at the same place. Pope Liberius, under fear of death, is believed by many to have subscribed this third Sirmian formula, while at the same time he anathematized those who denied that "the Son is in essence and in all things like to the Father." [See LIBERIUS.] In 359 the Emperor did his utmost to establish Semiarianism, but his efforts were in vain. The Eastern bishops, 160 in number, met at Seleucia; 400 Western bishops at Rimini. The latter stood firm at first to the faith defined at Nicaea, but they were overcome by threats and by bodily suffering. At last both the Eastern and Western council subscribed a formula, in which the word "essence" was rejected altogether as unscriptural, and the Son was defined to be "like the Father in all things."

This defeat of the Semiarians by Arians inclined the former to accept the Nicene faith, and at a council held at Alexandria in 362 Athanasius, who had returned to his see on the accession of Julian the Apostate, received many of them into communion. The Acacians, on the other hand, allied themselves with the strict Arians. Arianism found a powerful supporter in the Emperor Valens (364–378), who expelled Athanasius from his see. This was his fifth exile. But the palmy days of the heresy were over. His people insisted on the recall of Athanasius to his see, in which he remained till his death, in 373. Ambrose in the West, and in the East the three Cappadocian Fathers, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa, fought the battle of the faith. The orthodox Emperor Theodosius secured the peace of the Church, and the Nicene decrees were enforced again by the General Council of Constantinople (381).

So much for the history of Arianism among the subjects of the Roman Empire.

It had still a great part to play among the Barbarians. The West Goths received Christianity in the Arian form through their great missionary Ulfilas (consecrated bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia in 341), and Valens allowed a part of their nation to settle in Thrace on the condition that they became Arians. Soon after, the East Goths in Italy, the Vandals in Africa, the Suevi in Spain, the Burgundians in Gaul, the Lombardians who emigrated to upper Italy, became Arians. The Vandal persecution of the Catholics, which rivalled that of Diocletian in severity, began under Genseric in 427 and lasted till 533, when the Byzantine general Belisarius conquered Africa. In Spain, which had fallen under the power of the West Goths, Hermenegild, son of the king, fell a sacrifice to the Arian fanaticism of his father, in 584. Hermenegild's brother Reccared, who began to reign in 586, became a Catholic and established the faith in Spain, with the help of a great council which met at Toledo in 589. About a century earlier, Clovis, with 3,000 of his Franks, had received Catholic baptism, and the triumph of the Frankish arms sealed the fate of Arianism.

(The literature of Arianism is enormous. For the Patristic age see Bardenhewer (ed. Godet-Verschaffel), "Les Pères de l'Église," t. ii.; for Arianism generally, Newman "Arians of the Fourth Century"; W. Barry, in "Cath. Enc."; Le Bachelet, in DThC.)

ARLES, COUNCILS OF. (1) In 314, assembled chiefly to settle the Donatist disputes. This council represented the entire Western Church. The number of the bishops who met is uncertain, and the acts have perished. But we know that the Holy See was represented there by two priests and two deacons, and Constantine himself says he assembled "very many bishops from diverse and almost innumerable districts." Among them were three from Britain. It appears from the letter of the Council to Pope Silvester, that the Donatists were condemned, and Caecilian, the orthodox bishop of Carthage, acquitted. A synod at Rome in the previous year had given the same decision. The council also decreed that Easter should be observed on the same day throughout the world, the day to be notified by the Pope (Can. 1); that baptism conferred with the proper form was valid even if given by heretics (Can. 8); that a bishop should be consecrated by three others (Can. 20); that a married priest or deacon who lived with his wife should be deposed (Can. 29) (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 275).

(2) In 353 a council at Arles was terrified by the Emperor Constantius into a condemnation of St. Athanasius (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 869). Various other synods which met in the same place are mentioned by Hefele-Leclercq. [See DONATISTS.]

ARMENIAN CHRISTIANS. The native legends recount the preaching of the Gospel to the Armenian nation by Thaddeus, one of the seventy disciples, but the conversion of the Armenian people as a whole was brought about by their great apostle, Gregory the Illuminator, whose efforts were supported by King Tiridates III., just at the beginning of the fourth century. It is clear from Eusebius ("H. E." ix. 8) that the work of conversion was very rapid. Gregory established the chief see at Etchmiadzin, near Mount Ararat: he and his successors were consecrated by the Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and the title they took—viz. Catholicos—signified that they were the general procurators and representatives of the see of Caesarea in Armenia (Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus," i. 1355). Early in the fifth century the golden age of Armenian literature began. Isaac the Great and Mesrob (both Catholics) invented the Armenian alphabet and translated the Bible from the Syriac Peshitto into Armenian, afterwards improving their work by collating it with good MSS. of the LXX (Hexaplar text) and the Greek New Testament. The work of translating Fathers, as well as works of Aristotle, Philo, Porphyry, &c., from Greek and Syriac was carried on with great zeal. This literary activity was accompanied by other changes of a very different kind. The brave Armenian nation had preserved its independence, but in 390 Armenia was divided between the Byzantine and Persian empires, and East Armenia, the larger and more fruitful part of the country, fell to the portion of the latter Power. In 430 the very shadow of a national monarchy disappeared, and ever since the Armenians have been subject in succession to Persians, Arabs, Turks, and Russians. They were scattered far and wide by the Mongol invaders, and their unity, like that of the Jews, has consisted in the common bond of race, language, literature, and religion. After the Persian conquest the Armenian Catholicos became independent of Caesarea, and this change was followed by another of much greater moment, The opposition of the Armenians to the Council of Chalcedon, mainly due to the mission of Samuel, whom the Syrian Archimandrite Barsumas sent to the Armenian Church, was clearly displayed in the synod of Vagarshiabad, A.D. 491. The schism was consummated at the Synod of Dovin in 596 (see Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1077), where the statements of Pagi, Mansi, &c., are corrected from the National History published at Venice in 1785), and has endured ever since, though Greek influence induced the Iberian and Colchian bishops to sever themselves from the Armenian Catholicos. True, a union between the Armenians and the orthodox Greeks was effected at a council of Karin (the modern Erzeroum) in 628, but it did not last long. The Armenians held

fast to the Monophysite doctrine—viz. that in Christ there was but one nature—the external differences increased the opposition between them and the Greeks. Some of these, such as the addition of the words "Who wast crucified for us" in the Trisagion, and probably the use of pure wine, without the addition of any water, in the Mass, were connected with their theological views. Besides this, they maintained the old Eastern custom of celebrating Christ's birth and His epiphany on one day—viz. January 6. They used leavened bread at the altar, ate lacticinia in Lent (Syn. in Trull. can. 32, 56). They were also charged by the Greeks with making the priesthood into a caste, and only ordaining sons of priests (*ib.* can. 32); and further, with a semi-Jewish practice of cooking flesh in the sanctuary and giving portions of it to the priests (*ib.* can. 99).

The Catholicos lives at Etchmiadzin, which has belonged since 1828 to Russia. He is chosen from the metropolitans by the synod, with the consent of the Armenian bishops and of all Armenians present at the place, and the election must be confirmed by the Czar. He is enthroned in his cathedral by the Metropolitan of Siunic. It is his office to watch over religion and discipline; he consecrates the chrism for his bishops, which he does only once in seven years, and he can convene a national council. In matters of importance he must consult his synod. He is Bishop of Ararat. His distinctive dress consists in a silk veil, with gold fringes, which covers his head and shoulders, and is called *kogh*, and in a pallium folded five times over his breast. The patriarchal cross and torch are carried before him, and he uses everywhere the staff of the vartabed or doctor. He is chiefly supported by a poll-tax on all adults within his diocese, contributions, stole-fees, &c. from the revenues of the monastery at Etchmiadzin, and the gifts of pilgrims to the shrine of St. Gregory. There are twelve archbishops and bishops, four vartabeds or doctors, sixty monks in priest's orders, and 500 other monks in the great monastery just mentioned. The archbishops, bishops, and archimandrites residing there form his synod. Deputies from the Armenian nation are added to their number at the election of a patriarch.

Next come the patriarchs, who are now almost independent of the Catholicos. The patriarchal sees arose from the constant change of the chief see during the disasters of the nation, and also from the dispersion of the Armenians after the Mongol invasion in the fourteenth century. The Patriarch of Constantinople (bishopric since 1307, title of patriarch since 1481) holds the first rank amongst the patriarchs, and is only inferior in name to the Catholicos. He is chosen by the Armenians, lay as well as clerical, at Constantinople, and gets his berat from the Porte. He can consecrate the holy oil, and can appoint and consecrate metropolitan bishops throughout the Turkish dominions except at Jerusalem. The church property is under his control, but he must administer it with the advice of a synod of twenty lay members chosen by the Porte. He has also a synod of ecclesiastics for spiritual matters. He has secular jurisdiction over the members of his Church, and he represents not only the Armenians but also the Syrian Jacobites before the Turkish Government. The Patriarch of Sis (title granted 1441) is supposed to be chosen by the twelve neighbouring bishops, who, however, really follow the popular choice, which takes place under the influence of the Turkish Government. His jurisdiction extends over Lesser Armenia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia. He receives the holy oil from the Catholicos. The Patriarch of Jerusalem (title since the middle of the seventeenth century) is chosen by his suffragan bishops, with the consent of the clergy. He has very limited power, for he leaves the consecration of bishops and of the holy oil to the Catholicos, and he can be called to the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarch of the island of Aghtamar (1114) has little power, and his jurisdiction scarcely extends beyond the shores of the lake of Van. He is chiefly maintained by the monastery on the island.

The metropolitans, according to the canons, are empowered to consecrate their suffragans and the holy oils, but these rights are now reserved to the Catholicos, or else to the patriarch, and the metropolitans only differ from other bishops by wearing a gold mitre, a triple pallium, a longer staff, and an archiepiscopal ἐπιγονάτιον, which the Armenians call *goncher*, suspended from the girdle. A monk cannot, except by dispensation, become a bishop, and the bishops are usually chosen from the unmarried vartabeds or doctors. The patriarch may nominate, but usually the bishops are chosen by the clergy and fathers of families. The election is confirmed, and the bishop consecrated by the Catholicos or patriarch. The rite of consecration closely resembles that of the Greeks, but the Armenians anoint the head and thumbs of the elect with chrism, and he receives a ring as one of his insignia. Bishops also wear a mitre[1] like that of the Latins, and they do not use the σάκκος of the Greeks (see VESTMENTS OF THE GREEKS). The bishop appoints the chorepiscopi; convents, schools, hospitals, &c., are subject to him; no altars may be set up or relics exposed for veneration without his leave.

The priests are divided into two classes, that of the vartabeds (vardapets) or doctors, who are again subdivided into many grades and who remain unmarried, and the parish priests. The former are far more highly

[1] Introduced in 1084 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 313.)

esteemed. A staff is the mark of their office, and their chief duty consists in preaching. They live by collections made after the sermon. The ordinary clergy are married, taken from the humbler classes and trained either by a parish priest or at a monastery. The Armenians have the same minor orders as the Latins, and, like them, they reckon the subdiaconate among the greater orders. A priest is elected by the people, who, however, invariably accept the candidate proposed by the lay administrator of the church property; he must then be approved by the bishop. The priestly vestments are alb, girdle, maniple, stole, chasuble (like the Roman cope); but they also have a collar of gold or silver stuff called *vagas*, from which a sort of metal amice is suspended with the figures of the twelve Apostles upon it, and they wear a high cap with gold or silver crosses. The priest says Mass with covered head till the Trisagion, when he removes his cap, amice, and sandals. Priests live by stole-fees and by offerings in kind at Epiphany and Easter. They also get subsidies from the fund for pious uses. But they are very poor, and generally have to follow some trade.

The Armenian schismatic monks follow the rule of St. Basil, but their fasts are stricter than those of the Greek religious. They have many monasteries, and at least one large convent of nuns—viz. on Mount Sion. Fortescue estimates the number of schismatic Armenians at 4,000,000.

United Armenians.—Some of the Armenians in Cilicia were united with the Catholic Church by Latin missionaries sent there by John XXII. But much more was done by Jesuit missionaries and the Mechitarists among the Armenians scattered from the fourteenth century onwards throughout other countries, and at present there are about 100,000 Catholics of the Armenian rite.

In 1742, Benedict XIV. appointed a patriarch for the Armenians in Cilicia and the Lesser Armenia. In 1830 Pius VIII. nominated a primate at Constantinople for the Armenians in European Turkey; and, owing to the progress of Catholicism in the nation, Pius IX. in 1850 empowered the Primate Anthony Hassun to erect six suffragan dioceses. The Pope himself nominated the bishops, and a schism seemed likely to ensue. In 1866 Hassun was chosen patriarch by the bishops of the Cilician patriarchate. Pius IX. confirmed the election, united the patriarchal and primatial dignities, transferred the patriarchal residence to Galata, near Constantinople, provided for the election of the patriarch by the bishops to the exclusion of the laity, and regulated the affairs of the Armenian Church by the bull "Reversurus," of July 21, 1867. Some Armenians thought the rights of the nation injured by this bull, and a formal schism arose in 1870; more than thirty-five of the clergy and many of the laity were excommunicated by the Pope. The schism, however, won about 4,000 adherents; a schismatical patriarch was elected, and most of the church buildings and goods passed into their hands. They repudiated the decrees of the Vatican Council. In 1879 the schismatical patriarch Kuppelian made his submission to Leo XIII. Many of the clergy and laity followed his example, and Monsignor Hassun was acknowledged as patriarch by the Porte till he was made cardinal in 1880, and replaced by Monsignor Azarian. At present twenty dioceses are subject to the Armenian Patriarch. He has no authority over Armenians in Russia and Austria. Russia has many Armenian inhabitants in the Crimea, Kazan, and the Ukraine. Pius VII. sent them a vicar-apostolic in 1809, and the Concordat of 1847 provided for the erection of Armenian bishoprics at Cherson and Kaminiek. This arrangement, however, owing to the troubles with the Russian Government, has not been carried out. Austria has about 14,000 United Armenians. Those in Siebenbürgen, who came there in 1671, and continued for a time Monophysites, are under the Latin bishops. The archbishopric of Lemberg was erected for the Armenians of Galicia in 1635; and Pius VII., by a brief in 1819, agreed that the emperor should nominate one of three candidates proposed by the Armenian people. The Armenians who settled in Hungary after the capture of Belgrade by the Turks in 1521 are placed under the Mechitarist monks.

The United Armenian monks belong to the order of St. Anthony. The Mechitarists will be described in a separate article. (Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients," Hergenröther in "Kirchenlexikon"; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," part iv.; Streit, "Atlas," p. 68.)

ARMENIAN RITE. [See LITURGIES, p. 530.]

ARTICLES, FUNDAMENTAL. [See DOGMA, p. 278.]

ARTICLES, ORGANIC. [See CONCORDAT.]

ARTICLE OF FAITH. [See DOGMA.]

ASCENSION, FEAST OF. According to Etheria ('Peregrinatio," ed. Geyer, p. 93), the Ascension was kept at Jerusalem on the same day as the descent of the Holy Ghost. But the feast had been kept from time immemorial on St. Augustine's day, and he attributes its institution to the Apostles. We have a sermon among the works of St Chrysostom (PG, lii. 775), preached on Ascension Day. St. Augustine calls it Quadragesima, because kept forty days after Easter; the Greek name Tessaracostes or Tetracostes was given for the same reason. Gregory of Tours mentions a procession which used to be held on this day, in memory of that which the Apostles made from Jerusalem to Bethany and the Mount of

Olives. It was also the custom in ancient times to bless the bread and new fruits in the Mass of this day.

The practice of lighting the paschal candle in solemn Mass till the feast of the Ascension was established throughout the Franciscan Order by a decree dated 1263. In 1607 the Congregation of Rites ordered that the paschal candle should be lighted when Mass is sung and in vespers, on Easter Sunday, Easter Monday, Easter Tuesday, on the following Saturday, and on Sundays till Ascension Day, when it is extinguished after the Gospel. The rite symbolizes Christ's departure from the Apostles. (Benedict XIV. "De Festis"; Cabrol in DACL.)

ASCENSION OF CHRIST. Our Lord ascended into heaven forty days after His resurrection, and therefore, according to the common reckoning, on a Thursday. The opinion of Chrysostom that the Ascension took place on a Saturday, is quite singular. He ascended by His own power—not indeed, St. Thomas remarks, by the power proper to a natural body, but by the virtue proper to Him as God and by that which belongs to a blessed spirit. Such an ascension, St. Thomas continues, "is not against the nature of a glorified body, the nature of which is entirely subject to the spirit." Christ ascended from Mount Olivet in the presence of His disciples, whom He blessed as He parted from them. He took His seat at the right hand of God, the sitting posture symbolizing his rest from toil and His judicial power; the "right hand" of God denoting, according to many of the Fathers, the equality of Jesus Christ God and man with God the Father: according to some other writers, signifying that as man He holds the next place to God in heaven. Angels, as has been generally inferred from the sacred narrative, attended Him in His ascent, and the souls of the just, who had been detained in Limbo, entered heaven with Him. Thus "ascending on high, he led captivity captive."

Theologians give many reasons for our Lord's ascension. The glory which He receives in heaven is due to the merits of His sacred humanity. For Christians, too, it was "expedient that he should go." Faith is exercised by the fact that we can no longer see our Lord: His ascent into heaven is the pledge that we shall follow Him if we are worthy. Above all, according to the constant teaching of the Fathers, Christ exercises His priestly office in heaven. Just as the high-priest on the day of Atonement offered sacrifice without on the brazen altar, and then with the blood of the sacrifice and with burning incense, entered the holy of holies, so the high-priest of the new law, having offered Himself as a sacrifice on Mount Calvary, continually presents His merits and exhibits His sacred wounds before the Eternal Father. Whether He as man actually prays for us, is uncertain. Of course He does not pray as the saints do, for they are creatures, and ask of God what they cannot give by their own power. And the words "Christ, pray for us," could not be lawfully used, on account of the scandal and confusion they would create. But it is quite possible that Christ, as Petavius[1] expresses it, by "a voluntary condescension" still prays for us, as He did while on earth. (Benedict XIV., "De Festis"; St. Thom. 3ª, q. 57.)

ASCETAE (Gr. ἀσκέω, ἀσκητής). The belief that through bodily "exercise," and a strict discipline imposed on the senses, it was in the power of man to perfect his moral nature and rise to spiritual heights not otherwise attainable, had been common both among Jews and Pagans for some time before the coming of Christ. Philo's account of the Essenes is well known—a Jewish sect of mystical and ascetic tenets, much diffused in Palestine in the first century before Christ, with its initiations, grades, and secrets, living in villages because of the luxury and immorality of the towns, renouncing marriage, and following rules of strict temperance in regard to food, sleep, and whatever else nature craves. The Therapeutae in Egypt were a similar sect. Their name—and that of the Essenes is said to have the same meaning—signifies *healing*, for they believed that their discipline healed the *concretam labem* of the soul's impurity.

In the Pagan world similar doctrines were widely held by the Stoics. Both among them and the Essenes the doctrine of the two principles, the persuasion that matter was essentially evil, and that he was most perfect who was freest from the blasting touch of animal existence, coloured largely both their theories and their practice. The Christian Ascetes could not so deem of that fleshly nature of which Christ their divine Lord had deigned to be a partaker: to master the lower nature was their aim, not to eradicate it; desire and fear, joy and grief, they did not regard as in themselves evil, but as to be brought by discipline into a strict subordination to the true end of man, which is to know and love God, and do His will. The means which they employed were voluntary chastity, fasting, perseverance in prayer, voluntary poverty, and maceration of the flesh. In the Apostolical Constitutions (Kraus, p. 96) the Ascetae are mentioned as an intermediate order of Christians between the clergy and the laity. As a general rule, they did not go out of the world, like anchorites and monks, but strove to live a perfect life in the world. Abuses after a time appeared, particularly in regard to the γυναῖκες συνείσακτοι (*subintroductae*), women who lived under the same roof with Ascetae for the benefit of their instruction and example.

Modern life, especially when permeated

[1] *De Incarnat*, xii. 8.

with Baconian ideas respecting the true task of man in the world, is pointedly unascetic. A series of portraits of men who lived in the Middle Ages, when law was weaker than at present, but the sense of the necessity of self-control stronger, reveals a type of countenance in which the calmness of self-conquest, gained by the Christian ἄσκησις, is far more frequently visible than in later ages. [See the next article.]

ASCETICAL THEOLOGY. A name given to the science which treats of virtue and perfection and the means by which they are to be attained. Whereas mystical theology deals with extraordinary states of prayer and union with God, ascetical writers treat of the ordinary Christian life. Their teaching is based upon that of our Lord, "the way, the truth, and the life," and it has followed the development of the other branches of theology through the patristic, mediaeval and modern periods. The Fathers, who were themselves admirable examples of asceticism, wrote more for hermits and monks, but did not neglect the consideration of persons in the world. They describe at length the perfect life and the means of attaining it; but they do not deal with it in scientific fashion, any more than they did with dogmatic theology. It was the Schoolmen who studied the principles and theory, and defended these against the pseudo-ascetics of their day and the opponents of asceticism generally. The moderns combine the practical and theoretical elements of the foregoing periods, and adapt them to the altered circumstances of modern life. Only a few of the writers can be mentioned here. Among the Fathers: Clement of Alexandria, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and, especially, St. Gregory the Great and St. Bernard. Among the Schoolmen: Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas Aquinas. Among the moderns: Thomas a Kempis ("Imitation of Christ"), Scupoli ("Spiritual Combat"), St. Ignatius, St. Theresa, and St. Francis of Sales. (See PERFECTION; Migne, "Enc. Theol." xxvi., "Dict. d'Ascéticisme," ii. 1467 (for bibliography); Suarez, "De Religione," tr. iv. and vii.; Benedict XIV., "De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et de Beatorum Canonizatione"; Scaramelli, "Ascetical Directory," Eng. tr.; Faber, "Growth in Holiness"; Dublanchy in DThC, *Ascétique, Ascétisme*; Hamon in DAp.)

ASEITY (*a* by, *se* self). A mode of existing of or by oneself, independently of all else. It involves the negation of extrinsic causality and the affirmation of absolute existence. Aseity excludes not only all external principles, but also the notion that God is constantly giving Himself existence ("Das absolute Werden" or "Selbstverwicklichung," Self-realisation). God cannot produce Himself any more than any other being can. Aseity is the first distinguishing attribute which we conceive of the Divine Substance, and from which we infer the other attributes. [See GOD.] (St. Thomas, 1ª, q. 13, a. 11; Franzelin, "De Deo Uno," thes. 20; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 175.)

ASH WEDNESDAY. The first day, according to our present observance, of the forty days' fast of Lent. But that it did not come within the quadragesimal period in primitive times we know from the testimony of Gregory the Great, who, in speaking of the fast, describes it as of thirty-six days' duration—that is, as extending over six weeks, from the first Sunday in Lent to Easter Day, omitting Sundays. Thirty-six days are nearly a tenth part of the year, and thus, by observing the fast, Christians were thought to render a penitential tithe of their lives to God. Lent, therefore, at the end of the sixth century, began on the first Sunday, and we know from the Sacramentary of Gelasius that the practice was the same at the end of the fifth century. At what time Ash Wednesday and the three following days were added to the fast has not been precisely ascertained. It is true that in the Sacramentary of Pope Gregory there is a Mass for Ash Wednesday, under the heading "Feria IV., caput jejunii" (beginning of the fast); whence it might be inferred that Pope Gregory, in spite of the words cited above, had himself before his death sanctioned the alteration in question. But this would be an unsafe conclusion, for one of the best MSS. of the Sacramentary does not contain this heading. However this may be, a Capitulary of the Church of Toulon (714) and the liturgical work of Amaury (about 820) describe the Lenten usage as identical with our own. There can be no difficulty in understanding the motive of the change; for by the addition of the four days preceding the first Sunday, the number of fasting days before Easter (the Sundays being omitted) becomes exactly forty, and accords with the fasts recorded of Moses and Elias, and with that of our Saviour in the wilderness of Judea.

The office for Ash Wednesday opens with the solemn ceremony which has given the day its name.[1] After an introit and four collects, in which ashes are blessed, and pardon and mercy are implored for the penitent, the faithful approach and kneel at the altar rails, and the priest puts ashes upon the head of each, saying, "Memento, homo, quia pulvis es, et in pulverem reverteris" ("Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return," cf. Gen. iii. 19.) The ashes are obtained by burning the palms of the previous year. The Lenten pastorals of Bishops, regulating the observance of the season, usually pre-

[1] In French, *Mercredi des Cendres*; in German, *Aschermittwoch*.

scribe that the fast on Ash Wednesday shall be more rigorously kept than on any other day in Lent except the four last days of Holy Week.

The administration of the ashes was not originally made to all the faithful, but only to public penitents. These had to appear before the church door on the first day of Lent, in penitential garb and with bare feet. Their penances were there imposed upon them; then they were brought into the church before the bishop, who put ashes on their heads, saying, besides the words "Memento," &c., "age poenitentiam ut habeas vitam aeternam" (Repent [or, do penance], that thou mayst have eternal life). He then made them an address, after which he solemnly excluded them from the church. Out of humility and affection, friends of the penitents, though not in the same condition, used to join themselves to them, expressing in their outward guise a similar contrition, and offering their foreheads also to be sprinkled with ashes. The number of these persons gradually increased, until at length the administration of ashes was extended to the whole congregation, and the rite took its present form. ("Dict. of Antiq.," Smith and Cheetham; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," pp. 12, 60, 84; Gihr in "Kirchenlex.")

ASPERGES. A name given to the sprinkling of the altar, clergy, and people with holy water at the beginning of High Mass by the celebrant. The name is taken from the words, "Asperges me," "Thou shalt wash me, O Lord, with hyssop," &c. (Ps. l. 9) with which the priest begins the ceremony. During the Easter season the antiphon "Vidi aquam" is substituted. This custom of sprinkling the people with holy water is mentioned in the Canon of a synod quoted by Hincmar of Rheims, who lived at the beginning of the ninth century.

ASPERSION. [See BAPTISM.]

ASSESSOR. A person appointed to assist a judge in coming to a decision. The assessor has no jurisdiction, and the judge while bound to hear his advice is not bound to follow it. "In England and the United States the members of the Committee of Investigation are assessors or counsellors of the Bishop; their advice is an essential part of the proceedings. It has to be inserted in the records of the acts of the commission, and has to be considered by the metropolitan in case of appeal. Hence as true assessors the individual members of the commission may be challenged as suspect of bias or otherwise unfavourably prejudiced against one or both of the disputants; but the grounds of suspicion must be proved, not presumed." (Taunton.)

ASSUMPTION. After the death of her divine Son the Blessed Virgin lived under the care of St. John. It is not quite certain where she died. Tillemont conjectures from a passage in a letter of the Fathers assembled in the General Council of Ephesus that she was buried in that city, but the common tradition of the Church represents her as having died at Jerusalem, where her empty tomb was shown to pilgrims in the seventh century. In any case, it is certain that she really died, and that her exemption from sin original and actual did not prevent her paying this common debt of humanity. The very fact that she had received a passible nature rendered her liable to death. Except for the special gift of immortality which he received from God, Adam would have died in the course of nature, even if he had never sinned; and St. Augustine declares that our Blessed Saviour would have died by the natural decay of old age, if the Jews had not laid violent hands upon Him.[1]

Still, although the Blessed Virgin tasted of death, her body was preserved from corruption and it was united to her soul in the kingdom of heaven. The Church signifies her belief in this fact by celebrating the feast of her Assumption on the fifteenth of August. There is no distinct assertion of the *corporal* assumption in the prayers of the feast, but it is plain that the Church encourages and approves this belief from the fact that she selects for the lessons during the octave a passage from St. John Damascene in which the history of this corporal assumption is given in detail. This pious belief is recommended by its intrinsic reasonableness; for surely it is natural to suppose that our Lord did not suffer that sacred body in which He himself had dwelt and from which He had formed His own sacred humanity to become a prey to corruption. It is confirmed by the testimonies of St. Andrew of Crete, of St. John Damascene, and of many ancient Martyrologies and Missals, cited by Butler in his note on this feast. It is, moreover, a striking fact that, notwithstanding the zeal of the early Church in collecting and venerating relics, no relics of the Blessed Virgin's body have ever been exhibited. Much weight, too, must be given to the common sentiment of the faithful. "Admirable," says Petavius, "is the admonition of Paulinus of Nola, an author of the greatest weight, who bids us adhere to the common voice of the faithful, since the spirit of God breathes upon them all."[2]

The corporal assumption is not an article of faith. Still Melchior Canus sums up the general teaching of theologians on this head when he says:—"The denial of the Blessed Virgin's corporal assumption into heaven, though by no means contrary to the faith, is still so much opposed to the common agree-

[1] Billuart, *De Myster.* Diss. xiv. a. 1.
[2] Petav. *De Incarnat.* xiv. 2.

ment of the Church, that it would be a mark of insolent temerity." [1]

The feast, according to Butler, was celebrated before the sixth century in the East and West. The Greeks called it *κοίμησις* or *μετάστασις*; the Latins, *dormitio, pausatio, transitus, assumptio.* (Bellamy in DThC; Thomassin, "Traités des Festes," p. 415; Benedict XIV., "De Festis"; Renaudin, "De la Définition Dogmatique de l'Assomption"; Kellner, "Heortology.")

ASSUMPTIONISTS. Their proper title is "Augustinians of the Assumption." They are a congregation of Augustinian Hermits [*q.v.*] founded by Père Alzon at Nîmes, and approved by Pius IX. in 1863. Their special work is to combat the spirit of irreligion in Europe and to bring back the Eastern schismatics to the unity of the Church. For these purposes they have devoted themselves to education, especially of poor students for the priesthood, and to the dissemination of good newspapers and good books. In their Eastern work they have adopted, as far as possible, every means to conciliate the susceptibilities of the natives, by conforming to the various rites, and they have distinguished themselves by their knowledge of Oriental languages. They have a magnificent establishment outside the walls of Jerusalem, for the reception of pilgrims, and for the training of their scholastics (Notre Dame de France). Their activity against infidelity in France led to their expulsion from that country in 1900. Their foreign works are, however, in a flourishing condition. They have established a number of houses in the south of England. (Taafe, in "Cath. Enc.")

ASSUMPTION NUNS. An Institute of teaching Sisters founded in France in the first half of the nineteenth century by a pious lady, Eugénie Milleret de Brou, which has spread not only through France but in Spain and England, and has now flourishing houses in Central America, the Canary Islands, the Philippines, and even in Denmark. The Institute is distinct altogether from that of the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption founded by the Assumptionist Fathers and from that of the Little Sisters of the Assumption, revered in London and elsewhere on account of their labours among the poor.

ASTROLOGY. The doctrine of the Church on this matter is clearly laid down by St. Thomas. There is nothing contrary to the faith in holding that the stars affect the bodies of men, and so indirectly cause passions to which most men will give way. Taking this influence of the heavenly bodies for granted (and its existence or non-existence is a question of physical science, not of theology), an astrologer may make probable guesses at the truth. But he cannot predict with certainty our future actions, for it is of faith that the will in all cases remains free.

Astrology was forbidden to the early Christians. A law of the emperor Honorius condemned astrologers to banishment. The practice of astrology was condemned in 1586 by a bull of Sixtus V. (S. Thom. 1ª, q. 115, a. 4; Fleury, "Hist." vi. 20; xxii. 19; clxxvii. 66.)

ASYLUM. A place to which a criminal, pursued by the ministers of justice, may escape, and where so long as he remains he cannot be arrested. Such asylums, the inviolable character of which was nearly always connected with some notion of the religious sanctity of the spot, were common among the nations of antiquity. Rome, says the legend, grew out of an asylum for malefactors of every description; and Moses (Deut. xix. 2) appointed cities of refuge, whither men who had committed involuntary homicide might flee and be safe. The same privilege passed over to the Church, and was sedulously respected by the Christian emperors. Theodosius punished the violation of the protective sanctity of a church as a crime of lese-majesty. But the immunity from the consequences of crime arising from the extended assertion of the principle of sanctuary led to many abuses, and by the legislation of Justinian those guilty of certain specified crimes were to find no right of asylum in the churches.

For particulars as to the immunities long enjoyed by certain famous English sanctuaries—*e.g.* St. Cuthbert's franchise, Beverley, and Westminster—see the article SANCTUARY.

ATHANASIAN CREED. [See CREED.]

ATONEMENT. [See REDEMPTION.]

ATTENTION. The attention required for the valid and lawful administration or reception of the sacraments is closely connected with the subject of intention [see SACRAMENTS, p. 745]. It is clear that, speaking generally, some sort of attention, advertence, or consciousness is necessary. In the case, however, of the baptism of infants and the anointing of the dying, attention is impossible.

Theologians also discuss the sort of attention required during the recitation of the Breviary. According to De Lugo ("De Sacram. Euch.," disp. xxii. sect. 2) the Church requires nothing but a complete and suitable recitation of the canonical hours; any occupation which might interfere with this is forbidden. Attention to the meaning of the words is not in itself commanded. Such would seem to be the opinion of St. Thomas ("In IV. Sent." D. xv. q. 4, a. 2). (See Lehmkuhl. "Theol. Mor." ii. 633; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." iv. p. 310; Oblet in DThC.)

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD. [See GOD.]

ATTRITION, as distinct from contrition, is an imperfect sorrow for sin. Contrition is

[1] *De Locis Theolog.* xii. 10, fin.

that sorrow for sin which has for its motive the love of God whom the sinner has offended. Attrition arises from a motive which is indeed supernatural—that is to say, apprehended by faith—but which still falls short of contrition. Such motives are—the fear of hell, the loss of heaven, the turpitude of sin. By this last, we understand the turpitude of sin as revealed by faith. We may also, for the sake of clearness, exclude from our definition that kind of sorrow which theologians call *serviliter servilis*—the sorrow which makes a man renounce sin because he is afraid of hell, while at the same time he would be ready to offend God if he could do so without incurring the penalty.

All Catholics are bound to hold that attrition, as explained above, is good and an effect of God's grace. This is clear from the words of our Lord, "Fear him who can destroy both body and soul in hell"; from the declaration of the Council of Trent, that attrition which proceeds from considering "the baseness of sin or from the fear of hell and punishment, if it excludes the purpose of sinning and includes the hope of pardon, . . . is a true gift of God and an impulse of the Holy Spirit";[1] and from subsequent pronouncements of the Popes, particularly of Alexander VIII. The council put forward this Catholic truth against Luther, and succeeding Popes against the Jansenists.

Further, the Council of Trent teaches[2] that attrition does not of itself avail to justify the sinner. Sin which separates the soul from God is only annulled by love which unites it to Him.

But a question was long keenly debated among Catholic divines, viz. whether if a man comes with attrition to the sacrament of penance and receives absolution, this avails to restore him to God's grace. The negative opinion was held by the French clergy in their assembly general of the year 1700, and prevailed in the universities of Paris and Louvain. On the other hand, the affirmative, according to which a sinner who receives absolution with attrition is justified through the grace which the sacrament confers, has always apparently been the commoner tenet in the schools. It rests on the strong argument that as perfect contrition justifies without the actual reception of the sacrament of penance, it is hard to see why this sacrament should have been instituted, if perfect contrition is needed to get any good from it. Alexander VII. in 1667 forbade the advocates of either opinion to pronounce any theological censure on their opponents. But at present the opinion that attrition with the sacrament of penance suffices is universally held. St. Alphonsus calls it "certain." ("Theol. Mor." l, vi. n. 440; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." v. p. 24; Lehmkuhl, "Theol. Mor." ii. nn. 274, 284, *sqq.*)

[1] Sess. xiv. cap. 4. De Poenit. [2] *Ibid.*

AUDIANS or AUDEANS. [See ANTHROPOMORPHITES.]

AUDITOR OF ROTA. [See ROTA.]

AUGUSTINIAN CANONS. The pretensions to high antiquity made by this order, or on its behalf, have involved the history of its origin in much obscurity. Their commencement has been ascribed to some supposed resolution taken by the Apostles to renounce all private property and live in common. This being difficult of proof, the foundation of the order was at least confidently referred to St. Augustine of Hippo, whose rule, it was said, the regular canons had never ceased to follow. But it cannot be shown that St. Augustine ever composed a rule, properly so called. He did, indeed, write a treatise "De Moribus Clericorum," and he also wrote a letter (No. 109 al. 211, PL, xxxiii. 958 *sqq.*) in which he laid down a rule of life for the religious women under his direction, not binding them to strict enclosure, but requiring them to renounce all individual property. But when and by whom the injunctions contained in this letter were adapted to communities of men, are points which have never been cleared up. Moreover, it has been urged that if St. Augustine promulgated a rule and founded congregations which have had perpetual succession ever since, it seems impossible to explain how St. Benedict should have been universally regarded for centuries as the founder of Western monachism.

In one sense, indeed, the regular Canons of St. Austin may lay claim to an antiquity with which no other order can compete; for, as canons, they grow out of an institution and a way of life which reach nearly to the apostolic age. [CANON.] Considered, however, as a particular institution, the mode in which they arose has been thus explained. Discipline having become much relaxed among the canons of the various cathedrals in the Frankish empire, a council held at Aix-la-Chapelle in 816 drew up a rule for their observance. But as this rule did not absolutely prohibit the acquisition or enjoyment of private property, abuses again crept in; and the Popes Nicholas II. and Alexander II, strenuously assisted by St. Peter Damian, held councils at Rome in 1059 and 1063, by the decrees of which the rule of Aix-la-Chapelle was amended, and in particular the canons were bound to a community life and to the renunciation of private property (Fleury, "Hist. Eccl." lxi.). Even after these councils, the canons of many churches lived in much the same way as before; those, therefore, who obeyed the rule prescribed, by way of distinction from the recalcitrants, were called regular canons. The rule itself after a time was commonly described as the rule of St. Augustine, apparently because it was held to be in conformity with his 109th letter and the general spirit of his teaching.

The adoption of this rule facilitated the formation of independent bodies of regular canons, neither connected with cathedrals nor with collegiate churches, as had hitherto been the case; accordingly, soon after the beginning of the twelfth century, we read of the foundation of societies of canons, following the rule of St. Augustine, in several countries of Europe. In England these canons—who were regarded as monks, not as friars—were very popular and had many houses; they were called Black Canons. At the time of the Dissolution there were about 170 of their houses in England; two out of their number, Waltham and Cirencester, were presided over by mitred abbots. Newstead Abbey, the birthplace of the poet Byron, was originally an Augustinian house.

In Ireland this order was even more popular than in England, holding there, in fact, much the same prominent position that the Benedictines held amongst ourselves. D'Alton puts the number at 223 monasteries and 33 nunneries. The Augustinian priors of Christ Church and All Hallows, Dublin, and of the monasteries at Connell, Kells, Louth, Athassel, Killagh, Newtown, and Raphoe, had seats in the Irish parliament. (Hélyot; Dugdale's "Monasticon.")[1]

[1] *List of English Houses of Austin Canons existing at date of suppression.*

Nunneries and cells are indicated by *n* and *c.*

Aldebury (Surr.)
Anglesey (Cambr.)
Ashby Canons (Northants.)
Bamburgh (Northumb.)
Barlynch (Som.)
Barnwell (Cambr.)
Beeston (Norf.)
Berdon (Essex)
Bethgelert (Caern.)
10. Bilsington (Kent)
Bissemede (Beds.)
Bliburgh (Suff.), *c.* to St. Osith
Bodmin (Corn.)
Bolton in Craven
Bourn (Linc.)
Bradenstoke (Wilts.)
Bradley (Leic.)
Bradley Mayden (Wilts.)
Breamore (Hants.)
20. Bredon (Leic.)
Bridlington (York)
Brinkburn (Northumb.)
Brooke (Rutl.)
Bruton (Som.)
Buckenham (Norf.)
Buckland Minchin (Som.), *n.*
Burcester, Bicester (Oxf.)
Burnham (Bucks.), *n.*
Burscough (Lanc.)
30. Butley (Suff.)
Bysham, or Bisham (Berks.)
Caldwell (Beds.)
Calke (Derb.), *c.* to Repton
Calwich (Staff.)
Campsey (Suff.), *n.*
Canterbury, St. Gregory's
Cartmel (Lanc.)
Chacomb (Northants.)
Chich St. Osith (Essex)
40. Chirbury (Salop)
Cirencester (Glouc.)
Cokesford (Norf.)
Colchester
Conishead (Lanc.)
Cornbury (Heref.), *n.*
Cornworthy (Devon.), *n.*
Crabhouse (Norf.), *n.*, *c.* to Castle Acre
Cumbwell (Kent)
Darley (Derb.)
50. Dorchester (Oxf.)
Drax (York)
Dunmow (Essex)
Dunstable (Beds.)
Ellesham (Linc.)
Erdbury (Warw.)
Felly (Notts.)
Ferriby, North (York)
Fineshade (Northants.)
Fiskerton (Notts.), *c.* to Thurarton
60. Flanesford (Heref.)
Flixton (Suff.)
Flitcham (Norf.)
Fristoke (Devon.)
St. German's (Corn.)
Gloucester, St. Oswald
Goring (Oxf.), *n.*
Grace Dieu (Leic.), *n.*
Gresley (Derb.)
Guisborough (York)
70. Haghmon (Salop)
Haltem Price, near Cottingham (York)
Hartland (Devon)
Hastings (Suss.)
Haverfordwest (Pemb.)
Hawood (Beds.), *n.*
Helagh Park, near Tadcaster (York)
Hempton (Norf.)
Herringfleet (Suff.)
Hexham (Northumb.)
80. Hickling (Norf.)
Huntingdon
Hyrst in Axholme (Linc.)
Ipswich, Trinity
Ivychurch (Wilts.)
Ixworth (Suff.)
Kenilworth (Warw.)
Keynsham (Som.)
Kirkby Beller (Leic.)
Kirkham (York)
90. Kyme (Linc.)
Lanercost (Cumb.)
Latton (Essex)
Launceston (Corn.)
Launde (Leic.)
Laycock (Wilts.), *n.*
Leedes (Kent)
Leicester, St. Mary Pre.
Leigh (Devon), *n.*
Leighs, Little (Essex)
100. Letheringham (Suff.), *c.* to Ipswich
Lilleshall (Salop)
Llanthony Abbey (Monm.)
Llanthony (Glouc.)
London, St. Barth.
London, Trinity
London, Elsing Spittel, now Sion College
Lymbroke (Heref.), *n.*
Markby (Linc.)
Marsh (Devon.), *c.* to Plympton
110. Marton (York)
Maxstoke (Warw.)
Merton (Surr.)
Mickleham (Suss.)
Missenden (Bucks.)
Mottisfont (Hants.)
Newburgh (York)
Newenham (Beds.)
Newstead (Linc.)
Newstead (Notts.)
120. Nocton (Linc.)
Northampton, St. James'
Norton (Chesh.)
Nostell (York)
Oseney (Oxf.)
Ouston (Leic.)
Oxford, St. Mary's Coll.
Pentney (Norf.)
Plympton (Devon)
Porchester (Hants.)
130. Ratlinghope (Salop), *c.* to Wigmore
Reigate (Surr.)
Repton (Derb.)
Rocester (Staff.)
Ronton Abbey (Staff.)
Royston (Herts.)
Shelford (Notts.)
Southampton
Southwark, St. Mary Overy
Stafford, St. Thomas à Becket
140. Stone (Staff.)
Stonley (Hunts.)
Studley (Warw.)
Tandridge (Surr.)
Taunton (Som.)
Thornholm (Linc.)
Thornton Curtis (Linc.)
Thremhall (Essex)
Thurgarton (Notts.)
Tockwith (York)
150. Torksey (Linc.)
Tortington (Suss.)
Trentham (Staffs.)
Ulverscroft (Leic.)
Waybourne (Norf.)
Walsingham (Norf.)
Waltham (Essex)
Warter (York)
Warwick
Wallow, near Grimsby (Linc.)
160. Westacre (Norf.)
Weybridge, near Acle (Norf.)
Wigmore (Heref.)
Wombridge (Salop)
Woodbridge (Suff.)
Woodkirk, or West Ardsley (York), *c.* to Nostell
Worksop (Notts.)
Wormegay (Norf.)
Wormsley (Heref.)
Worspring (Som.)
170. Wroxton (Oxf.)
Wymondley, Little (Herts.)

AUGUSTINIAN HERMITS. The remarks made in the foregoing article on the Canons apply equally to the pretensions to an historical descent from St. Austin made by the Hermits who bear his name. In point of fact the order originated in a union of several existing congregations effected in 1265 under the direction of Pope Alexander IV. Their houses soon became very numerous, and the usual variations in regard to the strict observance of their rule, followed by reformations of greater or less fame, made their appearance. They were regarded as friars, not as monks, and were expressly aggregated to the other orders of friars by Pius V. in 1567. Their house at Wittenberg had the dubious honour of counting Martin Luther among its members. The Augustinian Hermits are said to have possessed in the sixteenth century three thousand convents with thirty thousand friars, besides three hundred nunneries following a similar rule. But during the French Revolution an immense number of their houses were dissolved.

In England, according to Tanner, there were about thirty-two houses of Augustinian Hermits at the Dissolution. The most celebrated was the friary at Oxford, which educated many distinguished men; here Erasmus lodged with his friend Prior Charnock when he visited Oxford. A grey crumbling gateway in New Inn Hall Lane alone is left to mark the spot. Capgrave, the well-known hagiographer, was an Augustinian Hermit. (Dugdale's "Monasticon.")[1]

AUREOLE (from *aureolus*, golden, gilt, of golden colour). 1. In Christian art it is the gold colour surrounding the whole figure in sacred pictures, and representing the glory of the person represented. It is distinct from the nimbus, which only covers the head. The aureole (also called *scutum, vesica, piscis*, &c.) was usually reserved for pictures of the three divine Persons, of Christ, and of the Blessed Virgin along with the Holy Child. (Kraus, "Real-Encykl.")

2. In theology, it is defined as a certain accidental reward added to the essential bliss of heaven, because of the excellent victory which the person who receives it has attained during his warfare upon earth. It is given, according to St. Thomas, to virgins, martyrs, and to doctors and preachers. Virgins have triumphed with special glory over the flesh; martyrs, over the world, which persecuted them to death; preachers, over the devil, whom they have driven, not only from their own hearts, but also from those of others. (St. Thom., Suppl. q. 96; Ortolan in DThC.)

AURICULAR CONFESSION. Addressed to the ear; made privately in the ear of the confessor. It is so called in opposition to public, general, confession of sins. "Although Christ has not forbidden that a person may confess his sins publicly, nevertheless this is not commanded by a divine precept; neither would it be very prudent. . . . Secret sacramental confession which was in use from the beginning in Holy Church and is still in use, has always been commended by the most holy and most ancient fathers with a great and unanimous consent" (Council of Trent, sess. xiv. c. 5). Anyone may, however, write down his sins and hand the paper to the priest, saying: "I confess what I have written in this paper." Confession by letter to an absent priest was condemned by Clement VIII. (1602). Confession by telephone or gramophone would seem to be invalid for the same reason, viz. because the two parties are not morally or physically present. [See CONFESSION, SACRAMENTAL; PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF; Slater, "Mor. Theol." ii. p. 163.]

AUTOCEPHALI (*αὐτοκέφαλοι*). A name given by Greek canonists to metropolitans who were not subject to a patriarch. Such were the metropolitans of Cyprus, who contrived to free themselves from subjection to the Patriarch of Antioch; or, again, the archbishops of Bulgaria, who were independent of Constantinople. (Thomassin, i. iii. c. 41.)

AUTO DA FÉ. [See INQUISITION, SPANISH.]

AUXILIARY BISHOP. [See BISHOP AUXILIARY.]

AUXILIIS, DE. A congregation specially instituted by Clement VIII. in 1594 for the examination of the question concerning the "helps" or "assistances" of grace. [See GRACE, p. 393.]

AVE MARIA. This familiar prayer, called also the Angelical Salutation, consists of three parts—(1) the salutation of the Archangel Gabriel, *Ave* [Maria] *gratia plena, Dominus tecum*; (2) the words of Elizabeth to our Lady, *benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui*; (3) an addition made by the Church, *Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus nunc et in hora mortis nostrae*. Parts 1 and 2 seem to have come into common use as a formula of devotion towards the end of the twelfth century; the use of them is enjoined by the Constitutions of Odo, bishop of Paris, in 1196. The third part gives a compact and appropriate expression of the feelings with which Christians regard the Blessed Virgin. The words *nunc. . . . nostrae* are said to have come from the Franciscans; the rest of the verse is believed to have first come into use in the middle of the fifteenth century. The whole Ave Maria as it now stands is ordered in the breviary of Pius V. (1568) to be used daily before each canonical hour and after compline. (Thurston, in the "Month," Nov. 1901; Berlière, *Angélique* (*Salutation*) in DThC.)

AVE REGINA. [See HYMNS; ANTIPHON.]

AZYMITES (*ἀ* priv., *ζύμη*)., By this term the Greek Schismatics designate Christians of the Latin Church, because the latter use unleavened bread in the administration of the Eucharist. In the Western Church the point has never been regarded as of vital importance; the priest is only enjoined *sub gravi* to use unleavened bread; and the Council of Florence declared (1439) that after

[1] *List of English Houses of Austin Hermits existing at date of suppression.*

Atherston (Warw.)
Boston (Linc.)
Bristol
Canterbury
Droitwich (Worc.)
Gorleston (Suff.)
Hull (York)
Huntingdon
Leicester
10. Lincoln
London
Ludlow (Salop)
Lynn (Norf.)
Newark (Notts.)
Newcastle-on-Tyne
Northampton
Norwich
Orford (Suff.)
Oxford
20. Penrith (Cumb.)
Rye (Suss.)
Shrewsbury
Stafford
Stamford (Linc.)
Stoke Clare (Suff.)
Thetford (Norf.)
Tickhill (York)
Warrington (Lanc.)
Winchester
30. Woodhouse (Salop)
York

consecration the body of our Lord was really present (*veraciter confici*) whether the bread used were made with or without leaven. But the Greek ecclesiastics who assented to this article were ill received by their countrymen on their return to Constantinople (Gibbon, ch. lxvii.), and this point of using or not using leaven is still one of the marks of difference between East and West. The original propriety of using or not using leaven turns mainly on the question whether Maundy Thursday was within the period of the Azymes; on which see EUCHARIST, p. 328. (Hergenröther in "Kirchenlex.," and "Photius," iii.; Parisot in DThC.)

B

BACCANARISTS (or PACCANARISTS), or Regular Clerks of the Faith of Jesus. The object of this congregation, founded at the end of the last century by one Baccanari or Paccanari, a native of the Trentino, was to revive the suppressed Society of Jesus under another name. In 1798, having obtained ecclesiastical approval for his project, Baccanari with twelve companions took possession of a country house near Spoleto, and commenced a monastery. They wore the Jesuit habit, and made the three simple vows, to which they afterwards added a fourth vow of unconditional obedience to the Pope. Many others joined them, and they had branches in France and even in Holland. But as the prospect of a speedy revival of the Society of Jesus grew brighter, members of Baccanari's congregation began to desert him, some joining the Jesuit colleges which had never ceased to subsist in Russia, others repairing to the kingdom of Naples, where the Society was re-established in 1804. Finally, in 1814, the Jesuits being everywhere restored, the remaining Baccanarists applied for admission into the order, and the Congregation of the Faith of Jesus came to an end. (Crétineau-Joly, "Hist. de la Compagnie de Jésus," v. 399.)

BACHELOR. [See DEGREES.]

BAIUS. A famous theologian of the University of Louvain, who anticipated the errors of Jansenius. His real name was Michael Bay. He was born at Melin, in the Low Countries, in 1513. He studied at Louvain, where he taught philosophy and took his Doctor's degree. In 1551 he became Professor of Scripture, and in 1563 he was sent to the Council of Trent by the King of Spain, returning in the following year to the university. He won great repute by his undoubted learning and by his blameless life, and honours were heaped upon him. In 1578 he was made chancellor of the university, and, at a later date, General Inquisitor for the Netherlands. He continued to teach till his death, in 1589.

However, his life was a stormy one. Baius deserted the scholastic method and did much to revive the study of the Fathers. No one, of course, could justly blame him for promoting patristic learning. But he marred the services which he might well have rendered to the Church, by exaggerating and misinterpreting the Augustinian doctrine on grace. His lectures excited opposition especially among the Franciscans, and several propositions taken from his oral teaching were delated to the Sorbonne and condemned there. In 1563 and 1564 he published various treatises on free will, original justice, justification, &c. Three years later, Pius V. condemned 76 propositions, representing on the whole the opinions of Baius, although some are not actually contained in his works. These propositions were condemned "in globo et respective," as heretical, erroneous, suspicious, rash, scandalous and offensive to pious ears—*i.e.* each of these propositions merited one of these censures, but no particular censure was attached to any one proposition. The name of Baius was not mentioned in the bull, which was communicated privately to the theological faculty at Louvain, without being promulgated. Various disputes arose on the authority and sense of this bull which need not detain us here. Gregory XIII. confirmed the bull of his predecessor, and again condemned the propositions. The famous Jesuit Toletus took the constitution of Gregory to Louvain, where it was read before the assembled university. Thereupon Baius acknowledged that many of the condemned propositions were to be found in his writings. "I condemn them," he said, "according to the intention of the bull, and as the bull condemns them." Toletus, it is reported, frequently declared that he had never met a more learned or more humble man.

The following are the chief heads of the erroneous system which Baius maintained. He regarded original justice, including the perfect subjection of the lower nature, as a part of human nature, not as a free gift of God to our first parents. Starting from this principle, he held further that eternal life would have been due to Adam, in the event of his perseverance, as a matter of rigorous justice, excluding grace and mercy altogether. Consequently, man, after the fall, was, till restored by grace, mutilated in nature and capable only of sin. Baius did not deny the

freedom of the will in terms, but he did so in effect, for he made it consist in the mere absence of external restraint. Man chose to sin, but he could not choose anything else. The Benedictine Gerberon published the works of Baius with the documents relating to the controversy in a quarto volume at Cologne in 1696. (See Kuhn, "Dogmatik," vol. iv. p. 319 *seq.*; Scheeben, "Dogmatik," ii. sect. 161, and in "Kirchenlex."; Le Bachelet in DThC; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 428, ii. 239; Linsenmann, "Michael Baius und die Grundlegung des Jansenismus," Tübingen, 1867.)

BALDACCHINO, BALDACHIN, BALDAQUIN. A canopy, such as is often suspended over the high-altar, usually hanging from the roof of the church, though sometimes, as at Rome, it rests on four pillars.

From the time when Constantine began to build sumptuous churches, the altar-table was overshadowed by a canopy made in the form of a cupola and surmounted by a cross. It was adorned with sculptures and rested on columns of precious material. This canopy was named *ciborium*, *κιβώριον*, from its resemblance to the bowl of a cup, and the Blessed Sacrament was placed in a vessel suspended by a cord from the interior of this canopy.

The name Baldacchino is said to have come into use in the Middle Ages and to be derived from Baaldak, the name by which Babylon (Bagdad ?) was known during the time of the crusades. Baaldak or Babylon was celebrated for the manufacture of fine silken stuffs, and with these the canopy was frequently hung. (Rock, "Hierurgia," ii. 316 *sqq.*)

Baldacchino is also used as the name of the canopy which is carried over the priest who bears the Blessed Sacrament in procession on Holy Thursday, Corpus Christi, &c. (Gavantus; Ferraris.)

BALM, BALSAM. [See CHRISM.]

BANNER. An ecclesiastical banner is one in which the stuff, whether of silk or linen, on which religious persons, objects, or mottoes are depicted, is not nailed to the staff, as in the case of an ordinary flag, but to a traverse bar which is attached to the staff and with it forms the figure of a cross. Of this kind were the cavalry standards (*vexilla*) used in the Roman army. At the head of the staff, above the banner, and also in those *signa militaria* which were without a banner, was fixed some emblem possessing significance in the eyes of the soldiers, as an eagle, or a serpent, or a ball, or a bronze figure of Victory, or of Mars, or of the reigning emperor. Constantine, after his vision, and the victory which followed over Maxentius, ordered that the sacred standard (*labarum*, *q.v.*) which had been shown to him should be adopted throughout the army, the eagle or other figure at the head of the staff being replaced by the sacred monogram ☧ or ☧, representing the first two letters of the Greek ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. The Christian apologists —*e.g.* Minucius Felix and Tertullian—are fond of drawing attention to the resemblance which a Roman military standard bore to a cross. The adoption of the *labarum* would at once satisfy the large and ever-increasing number of Christians in the imperial armies, and not displease the Pagan soldiers, because the traditional shape was not departed from.

Banners are chiefly used in processions, but they are also hung round or near the altar, their prime significance being in all cases that they show forth the victory of Christ.

In the military orders [see that article] a practice was introduced for each knight at the time of his admission to hang up his banner in the church; hence the banners which may be seen in Henry VII.'s Chapel, Westminster, in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and other places. ("Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiq.," Smith; Smith and Cheetham; Heuser in "Kirchenlex.")

BANNS. The proclamation of intended marriage, in order that if anyone is aware of an impediment, he may state it to the ecclesiastical authorities, and so prevent the celebration of the wedding. Such proclamations were introduced first of all by the custom of particular places, but it was not till 1215 that they were imposed, at the Fourth Lateran Council, by a general law binding the whole Church.[1] The Council of Trent[2] orders the banns to be proclaimed by the parish priest of the persons who intend to marry, during Mass on three continuous festivals. At the same time, it permits the ordinary to dispense from the obligation of proclaiming the marriage, for a grave reason. According to theologians and the S. Congregation of the Council, the banns must be proclaimed in the parish church of the contracting parties, and in each parish church if they live in different parishes, at the principal Mass on three continuous Sundays or holidays of obligation—or at least on days when there is sure to be a concourse of people in the church. It is generally held that if the marriage does not take place within two months, or at most four, of the last publication, the banns must be proclaimed anew. (Taunton; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vi. 427–447; Gasparri, "De Matrim.")

BAPTISM (from *βαπτισμός*, dipping, or immersion[3] in water). A spiritual meaning was given to baptism by St. John the Baptist, who baptized or immersed his disciples in the Jordan, to signify the repentance and renewal by which the whole man was to be cleansed and purified. The Talmud of

[1] Fleury, *Hist.* lxxvii. 52. [2] Sess. xxiv. c. 1.
[3] *Tingere* is the corresponding Latin word used by Tertullian.

Babylon[1] mentions a baptism of Jewish proselytes, but it is impossible to say when this rite arose. In any case, it is certain that when our Lord made baptism the rite of initiation into His Church, He employed a symbolism already familiar to the Jews. But Christ exalted the act to a dignity beyond the baptism of John, changing the "baptism of penance" into the sacrament of regeneration. The Gospels do not tell us when Christian baptism was instituted, and a great variety of opinions has prevailed upon this point among the Fathers and theologians of the Church. After Christ's Passion and Resurrection, or at latest after Pentecost, the precept of receiving baptism became binding on all human beings.

After this sketch of the history of the institution and promulgation we may go on to consider the sacrament as it exists in the Church. We shall treat of the following points in order: viz. the essentials in the administration of the sacrament, its effects, its necessity, and the ceremonies with which it is given.

I. Under the first head questions occur as to the matter, the form, the minister, and the subject of baptism. (*a*) The matter is water, or, rather, washing with water. The Scripture makes it clear enough that water is to be used, but it is not so plain at first sight that the sprinkling or pouring of water will suffice. In Apostolic times the body of the baptized person was immersed, for St. Paul looks on this immersion as typifying burial with Christ, and speaks of baptism as a bath.[2] Immersion still prevails among the Copts and Nestorians, and for many ages baptism was so given among the Latins also, for even St. Thomas, in the thirteenth century, speaks of baptism by immersion as the common practice (*communior usus*) of his time.[3] Still the rubric of the Roman Rituale, which states that baptism can be validly given by immersion, infusion, or aspersion, is fully justified by tradition. Persons on a sick-bed, in danger of death, were baptized where they lay without immersion. This baptism was always considered sufficient, and in case of recovery they had only to get the ceremonies supplied and to be confirmed.[4] [See CLINICAL BAPTISM.] It is only necessary for the validity of the sacrament to pour the water once—for although a threefold infusion or immersion has been given from the earliest times, still here, too, we meet with exceptions, for Gregory the Great allowed the Spanish Church to continue its custom of baptizing by one immersion.

(*β*) The form or words used in the sacrament are "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or words equivalent to these. Thus the Greek form "The servant of Christ N. is baptized in the name," &c., is valid, as appears from the instruction of Eugenius IV. to the Armenians, and from subsequent decisions of the Holy See. A form similar to that of the Greeks is used by all the Orientals, except the Copts, Abyssinians, and Maronites, who approximate to the Latin form.[1] Many great theologians suppose that the Apostles, for a time, in virtue of a special dispensation, baptized simply in the name of Christ (Acts ii. 38; viii. 12, 16, &c.); but this opinion seems to rest on a questionable interpretation of passages in the New Testament.[2]

(*γ*) The minister of baptism, says Eugenius IV., in the instruction quoted above, "is a priest, to whom in virtue of his office it belongs to baptize." The Roman Rituale prescribes that baptism should be given by the parish priest of the place, or by another priest appointed by him, or by the Ordinary. A deacon is the extraordinary minister of solemn baptism. The Pontifical mentions baptizing as one of his duties, a duty, however, which he can lawfully exercise only by delegation from the bishop or priest. But besides this, in case of necessity, anyone, even a heretic or Jew, may baptize if he uses the proper matter and form, and intends to do what Christ ordained; and even if no such necessity exist, baptism so given, although unlawful, is still valid. That one who is not a priest may baptize is clear from the fact that Philip the deacon did so, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles. Tertullian expressly says that baptism can be given "by all."[3] The 38th Canon of the Council of Elvira, in 306, assumes the same truth. There was, however, a difficulty in early times about baptism given outside of the Church—viz. by heretics. St. Cyprian and Firmilian denied, St. Stephen, the contemporary Pope, affirmed its validity. The Pope appealed in favour of his view to Apostolic tradition. It is needless to say that the Pope's teaching prevailed. The great Council of Arles in 314 decided for the validity of heretical baptism and the Fourth Lateran Council defined it. The 19th Canon of the Council of Nicaea in no way contradicts this article of faith, for, though it orders the disciples of Paul of Samosata to be rebaptized, these heretics had in all probability corrupted the form of baptism.[4]

[1] Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, p. 318. The Jewish baptism is fully described by Buxtorf, *sub voc.* טְבִילָה. See also Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. vii. p. 255.

[2] Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 26 (λουτρῷ).

[3] It has been denied that the Greeks and other Orientals baptize by immersion. The child is, indeed, according to the common Oriental rite, placed in the font; but the actual baptism is by infusion of water on its head. Billuart, *De Bapt.* i. 3, where Goar is quoted. Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium*, p. 17. St. Thom. 3a, q. 66, a. 7. According to Fortescue, however, "the Orthodox always baptize by immersion. The priest . . . dips the child three times, having turned its face to the East." (*The Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 420.)

[4] Euseb. *Hist.* vi. 43, with the notes of Valesius.

[1] Denzinger, *loc. cit.* p. 18.

[2] De Augustinis, *De Re Sacram.* i. 352.

[3] *De Bapt.* 17. *PL*, i. 1213.

[4] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 615, where an alternative explanation is given.

(δ) *The Recipient of Baptism.*—All human beings, even infants and adults who have never had the use of reason, are capable of receiving this sacrament. Adults are bound by the precept of Christ to come and be baptized; parents and guardians are bound by the same precept to bring their children, or other persons in their charge, who have not come to the use of reason, and to have them baptized. In the Middle Ages and in modern times various sects have repudiated infant baptism. It is difficult to give strict proof from Scripture in favour of it, nor can it be denied that in the early ages persons often deferred their own baptism or that of their children, except in danger of death, from a dread of incurring the responsibilities of the Christian life. At the same time the Catholic doctrine that children are to be baptized may be inferred from Scripture, and is abundantly justified by tradition. Thus we read of the Apostles baptizing whole houses (*e.g.* Acts xvi. 33); and the very fact that our Lord promises His kingdom to children shows that He did not mean to exclude them from the sacrament of regeneration. The early Fathers supply the needed comment on Scripture. We have an explicit testimony for infant baptism in St. Irenæus. "Christ," he writes, "came to save all—all, I say, who through Him *are born again to God*, infants and little ones, and boys and young men, and the aged."[1] In a letter written by St. Cyprian and sixty-four bishops assembled in council, an answer is given to the question whether the baptism of children must be deferred, on the analogy of circumcision, till the eighth day. The bishops answer unanimously in the negative. If, the saint argues, adults are admitted to the font, how much more should those be baptized at once who have not sinned, except so far as by natural descent from Adam they have contracted in the moment of birth the infection of ancient death, who for this very reason come more easily to the remission of sins, because it is the sins of another, not their own, which are remitted to them.[2]

II. *The Effects of Baptism.*—(α) It remits all sin, original and actual. "Be baptized," St. Peter said,[3] "everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins." "I believe in one baptism," says the Nicene Creed, "for the remission of sins."

(β) It remits all the penalties due for sin before God, whether temporal or eternal. A temporal punishment often remains due to sin, even after its guilt has been removed by absolution. Baptism, as the Church defines, leaves no such penalties, and the apostolic origin of this belief is proved by the practice of the early Church, which imposed no penance for the gravest crimes if committed before baptism. The rebellion of the flesh does of course remain after baptism, but this rebellion is not sin, unless the will fully consents to it.[4] (γ) It bestows sanctifying grace and the infused virtues. A difficulty was felt even among Catholic divines with regard to the case of infants. All admitted that children received the forgiveness of sins, but how could they have grace and the infused virtues imparted to them? How, for example, could a child receive faith in baptism, when it plainly remains unable to exercise faith till the age of reason? The answer is that the capacity is one thing, the actual exercise another. A man in sleep may have the capacity for or habit of faith, though he cannot exercise it till he wakes. Moreover, the very fact that baptism gives a title to the possession of heaven proves that it always confers grace, since it is the grace of God, not the mere absence of sin, which enables us to enter there. The Council of Vienne contented itself with pronouncing the opinion that grace is conferred in baptism "more probable." Since then, the Council of Trent defined that all the sacraments of the new law confer grace on those who rightly receive them.[5]

(δ) It imprints a "character" or indelible mark on the soul, whence it cannot be reiterated. [See under CHARACTER.] (ε) It makes the recipient a member of Christ and of the Church, and makes it possible for him to receive the other sacraments.

An infant is unable to put a bar (*obex*) in the way of sacramental grace, and therefore must receive the full effect of baptism rightly administered. With adults it is different. In them positive dispositions are called for. In order to receive baptism validly, an adult is only required to have the intention of doing so. If the intention be there, he receives the character and incurs the responsibilities of a Christian; but in order to obtain the grace of the sacrament, he must come with faith and with contrition perfect or imperfect—*i.e.* he must from a supernatural motive detest his sins, and resolve to begin a new life.[6] Thus a person who comes without at least attrition for all his mortal sins, and the purpose of amendment, would receive neither grace nor forgiveness. If, however, he afterwards supplied the requisite dispositions, the grace of the sacrament would revive, and he would receive remission of Original Sin, and of all actual sins (including the temporal punishment annexed) which he had committed up to the date of his baptism.[7]

III. *The Necessity of Baptism.*—The "passage" (from death to life), says the Council of Trent, "cannot be made since

[1] Iren. ii. 22, 4, *PG.* vii. 784.
[2] *Epist.* lxiv. ed. Hartel, p. 717 sqq.
[3] Acts ii. 38.

[4] *Decret. pro Armen. in Bulla Eugen.* IV. (Denzinger-Bannwart, p. 238). Concil. Trident. sess. vi. cap. 14; sess v. Decret. de Peccat. Orig.
[5] Sess. vii. De Sacram. in. gen.
[6] *Catech. Rom.* ii. cap. 2, 40.
[7] Billuart, *De Baptismo*, iv. 2.

the promulgation of the Gospel except by the laver of regeneration, or by the desire of it, as it is written, 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'" It is interesting to notice that Tertullian makes precisely the same application of this text against the heretics of his day.[1] Accordingly, infants dying unbaptized are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, although, according to the opinion now universally held, they do not undergo suffering of any kind in the next world. [See LIMBO.] Protestant difficulties on this point arise from inadequate ideas on grace and the sovereignty of God. Heaven is a reward which is no way due to human nature, and God can withhold it, as He pleases, without injustice. In adults the baptism of desire or of blood may supply the place of baptism by water. Thus an act of the perfect love of God remits sin, original and actual, and confers sanctifying grace. Our Lord in St. John's Gospel promises that He will love those who love Him, a promise which would not be fulfilled if a man who loved God above all things and for His own sake, were still allowed to remain God's enemy in consequence of unforgiven sin. The baptism of blood—*i.e.* martyrdom—not only forgives sin but remits the temporal penalties of sin also. St. Cyprian says of catechumens who died before being baptized with water, that they had in fact been baptized "with the most glorious and greatest baptism of blood,"[2] and Tertullian witnesses to the belief of the early Church that the Holy Innocents were sanctified by their blood.[3]

IV. *Conditional Baptism* is given when there is some doubt whether a person has been validly baptized. The form prescribed in the Roman Rituale is "If thou hast not been baptized, I baptize thee," &c.[4] In early times the condition was not expressed in words. Fleury could not find any trace of the conditional form before the time of Alexander III., and St. Thomas alleges a decretal of this Pope for its use.[5]

V. *The Ceremonies of Baptism.*—The following is a summary of the ceremonies prescribed by the Roman Rituale, with their signification as given in the Roman Catechism. The sacrament is to be administered, apart from cases of necessity, in the church or baptistery near the church. However, the children of kings and princes may be baptized in their private chapels. Baptismal water is in all cases to be used. The person baptized is to receive a baptismal name, and the Rituale recommends the parents to impose the name of a saint, that the child may profit by his example and patronage. The priest meets the child at the door of the church; drives the devil from him; breathes thrice upon his face, to signify the new spiritual life which is to be breathed into his soul; puts salt into his mouth as a sign that he is to be freed from the corruption of sin; signs him on the forehead and breast with the sign of the cross, and leads him into the temple of God. The recipient then, through his sponsors, professes his faith by reciting the Creed and the Our Father. Then the priest exorcizes the child; anoints his ears and nostrils with spittle—after our Lord's example, who thus cured the deaf and dumb man (Mk. vii. 33)—and asks him in three separate interrogations whether he renounces Satan, all his works, and all his pomps. He next anoints him with the oil of catechumens on the breast and between the shoulders. The ancient athletes were anointed before their contest in the arena, and in the same way the young Christian is prepared for the "good fight" which lies before him.[1] The priest pours water three times on his head, in the form of a cross, at the same time pronouncing the words "I baptize thee," &c. After baptism, chrism is put on the top of his head, to signify his union with Christ, the head of his Church; he receives a white garment, and a burning light in his hands, symbols of innocence and of the light of faith and charity.

These rites are recommended as well by their beautiful symbolism and the majestic words which accompany them as by their venerable antiquity. Tertullian[2] mentions the triple renunciation made in baptism, the unction, the triple immersion. The Sacramentary of Gelasius[3] (died 496) contains almost every ceremony of baptism to be found in the present Rituale. Two differences, however, must be noted. In the West solemn baptism was given as a rule only at Easter and Pentecost; in the East it was also given at the Epiphany.[4] Again, the ceremonies now in use were intended primarily for adults, and instead of being given together were spread over three or four weeks. Thus in the Gelasian Sacramentary, the ceremonies of baptism begin on the third Sunday in Lent, although the baptism itself did not take place till Holy Saturday. (See the dogmatic and moral treatises of the theologians;

[1] Tertull. *De Baptism.* 13, *PL*, i. 1214. Concil. Trid. sess. vi. cap. 4.

[2] *Ep.* lxxiii. ed. Hartel, p. 796.

[3] "Testimonium Christi sanguine libaverunt," *Adv. Valentin.* 2, *PL*, ii. 141.

[4] An order was issued by the Vicars Apostolic at the beginning of the nineteenth century, that all converts from Protestantism born after 1773 should be conditionally baptized. This order was re-enacted by the first provincial synod of Westminster, chap. xvi. In 1878 however, the Holy Office decreed that inquiry should be made in each case. There can be no doubt of the validity of some Protestant baptisms. The water used is to be holy water, not water taken from the font, and all the ceremonies are to be omitted. [See RECEPTION OF CONVERTS.]

[5] Fleury, *Hist.* xciv. 31. St. Thom. 3ª, q. 66, a. 9. The form St. Thomas quotes is fuller than the one in present use.

[1] "Quasi athleta"; Billuart, *De Baptism.* v. 2.

[2] *De Coron.* 3, *PL*, ii. 79, where he also mentions the custom of tasting milk and honey after baptism; *De Baptism.* 7, *PL*, i. 1206.

[3] Fleury, *Hist.* xxx. 62.

[4] Thomassin, *Traité des Festes*, ii. 7.

St. Thom. 3ª, qq. 66-71; Bellamy, Bareille, &c., in DThC; Pincet in DACL; see Chardon, II *sqq.*; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. ix.; Cabrol, "Les Origines Liturgiques," p. 145.)

BAPTISM OF SHIPS. Baptism, or, more correctly, blessing, of ships, a form in the Roman Rituale. Certain prayers are said, in which God is asked to bless the ship and those who travel in it, as He blessed the ark of Noe and helped Peter when he was sinking in the deep. This form is not found in the older "Ordines." The practice of blessing ships seems to have become common during the time of the Crusades.

BAPTISMAL NAME. A name given in baptism, to signify that the baptized person has become a new creature in Christ. The Rituale forbids heathenish names, and advises, though it does not enjoin, the taking of a saint's name.

The custom of taking a new name in baptism was not usual in the early Church—though we find instances of it from the third century onwards. Then, and long after, Christians bore not only the names of saints, but also those (1) of feasts—*e.g.* Epiphanius, Natalis (from Christmas), Paschasius, &c.; (2) of virtues—*e.g.* Faith, Innocent, Pius, &c.; (3) animals—*e.g.* Leo, Columba, Ursula, &c. (Hefele, "Beiträge," 393.)

BAPTISMAL ROBE. [See Chrisom.]

BAPTISMAL WATER. Water blessed in the font on Holy Saturday and the vigil of Pentecost, which must be used at least in solemn baptism. The priest signs the water with the cross, divides it with his hand, pouring it towards the north, south, east and west; breathes into it, and places in it the paschal candle, after which some of it is sprinkled on the people and some removed for private use. The priest then pours oil of catechumens and chrism into the water.

The origin of this custom of blessing the water is lost in immemorial antiquity. A form for blessing the water is found even in the Apostolic Constitutions,[1] in ancient Western and in all the Oriental liturgies.[2] [See Font.]

BAPTISTERY (called also in Greek φωτιστήριον, the place of illumination; cf. Heb. vi. 4). That part of the church in which solemn baptism is administered. Anciently, when Baptism was constantly given to adults and the rite of immersion prevailed, it was inconvenient to baptize in the church itself, and hence after the conversion of Constantine separate buildings for the administration of Baptism were erected and attached to the cathedral church. Eusebius[3] mentions a baptistery of this kind in the basilica at Tyre, and examples of such buildings still exist at Rome, Florence, Ravenna, Pisa, Pistoia, Modena, Padua, &c. It was only gradually that Baptism was administered in any but cathedral churches. The ancient baptistery was sometimes round, sometimes it had four, eight, or twelve sides. St. Cyril of Jerusalem distinguishes the outer part of the baptistery (προαύλιος οἶκος), in which the catechumens renounced Satan, &c., from the inner portion (ἐσώτερος οἶκος), in which they were baptized.

The modern baptistery is merely a portion of the church set apart for baptism. According to the Roman Rituale, it should be railed off, it should have a gate fastened by a lock, and be adorned, if possible, with a picture of Christ's baptism by St. John. It is convenient that it should contain a chest with two compartments, one for the holy oils, the other for the salt, candle, &c., used in Baptism. (See De Montault, "Construction des Eglises," p. 105; Leclercq in DACL, *Baptistère.*)

BAREFOOTED FRIARS. [See Discalced.]

BARLAAM. [See Hesychasts.]

BARNABITES. The proper designation of the religious of this order is that of "Regular Clerks of the Congregation of St. Paul"; they are popularly called Barnabites on account of a church of St. Barnabas at Milan which belonged to them in the sixteenth century. Their principal founder was St. Antonio Maria Zaccaria (died 1539); with him were joined Bartolommeo Ferrari and Giacomo Antonio Morigena. The frequent wars by which the north of Italy had been devastated; the influx of Lutheran soldiers, whose example tended to propagate a spirit of contempt for the sacraments and the clergy; and the frequency of pestilential disorders caused by the famine and misery of the population, had produced about 1530 a state of things which powerfully appealed to the charity and pity of the true pastors of Jesus Christ. It occurred to Zaccaria that a better way of combating these evils could not be found than by organizing a congregation of secular clergy, not going out of the world but living in it and working for it, and bound by a rule—that is, diligently attending to their own sanctification while preaching reformation to others,—"who should regenerate and revive the love of the divine worship and a truly Christian way of life by frequent preaching and the faithful administration of the Sacraments." In 1533 the foundation of such a congregation, under a special rule approved by the Holy See, was sanctioned by Clement VII. The members pronounced their vows before the Archbishop of Milan, and chose Zaccaria for their superior. The order soon spread into France and Germany. In 1579 their constitutions were examined by St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, protector of the congregation,

[1] *Apost. Constit.* vii. 43.
[2] Denzinger, *Ritus Orient.* p. 24.
[3] *H. E.* x. 4, 45.

and being approved by him were finally confirmed. They called, and still call, their establishments colleges. They are governed by a General residing at Rome, elected for three years, and capable of re-election once. Besides the three usual vows they take a fourth, never to seek any office or ecclesiastical dignity, and to accept no post outside of their order without the permission of the Pope. The habit is merely the black soutane worn by secular priests in Lombardy at the time of their foundation. Their principal house is now at Rome; and they have about twenty colleges in all, in various parts of Italy and Austria. There is no house of these religious either in England or in Ireland. Among the eminent men of this order may be mentioned St. Alexander Sauli, called the Apostle of Corsica; Bascapé, the biographer of St. Charles Borromeo; Gavantus, the well-known writer on rubrics and ceremonies; Vercellone, the Biblical scholar; Gerdil, the philosopher, &c. (Hélyot.)

BASILIANS. This order takes its name from the great St. Basil (died 379), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. On his return to his own country after a long journey through Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia—made that he might collect the experience of monks and solitaries living under many different rules—Basil, still thirsting for the perfect life in which self should be subdued and union with Christ attained, withdrew into a desert region of Pontus, where his mother Emelia and his sister Macrina had already established monasteries, and laid the foundation of the great order which bears his name. To those who placed themselves under his direction he gave two rules, the Great and the Little—the former containing fifty-five, the latter three hundred and thirteen articles. This twofold rule became so famous and popular in the East as to supplant all others; and at this day it alone is recognized and followed by the monks of the Greek Church. The order never penetrated into France or England; but in southern Italy there were many Basilian convents in existence, even before the time of St. Benedict, who regarded both the rule and its author with great veneration, and appears to have had it before him when framing his own rule. A famous Basilian monastery still exists at Grotta Ferrata near Rome. In Russia, the first missionaries to which were Greek monks, the Basilian order received an immense development. Nearly all of them have, since the division of the ninth century, adhered to the Photian schism; there are, however, in Austrian Poland and Hungary several communities of Basilian monks which are in communion with Rome; the monks of these call themselves Ruthenians. In Spain there were several Basilian monasteries, reformed and unreformed, up to the date of the suppression in 1835. The habit of the Basilians is scarcely to be distinguished from that of the Benedictines. Nearly all the convents of Basilian nuns, founded by St. Macrina, like those of the monks, have embraced the Eastern schism. (Hélyot; Besse, "Les Moines d'Orient.")[1]

BASILICA (*βασιλική*). This name began to be applied to Christian churches about the beginning of the fourth century. The earlier expressions were "house of prayer" (*οἶκος προσευκτήριος*), "oratory" (*προσευκτήριον*), and "Lord's house" (*κυριακόν*, *dominicum*), besides the loosely-employed term "ecclesia."

It has been commonly held that the ancient Roman basilicas (large halls, like the "Basilica Portia" built by Cato about 180 B.C., used for the purposes of justice or commerce) passed in considerable numbers into Christian hands, after the conversion of Constantine, and were used for Christian worship; that new churches were built after the model of these, and that the name "basilica" was naturally applied to buildings of either class. Closer investigation has furnished grounds for a somewhat different view. Kraus, in the "Real Encyklopädie," gives the following conclusions, as, in the opinion of the writer, solidly established by the evidence. (1) All that the Romans meant by "basilica" was a fine, stately, splendid building; no notion of what was *kingly* or *princely* connected itself in their minds with the term. (2) Christian congregations used buildings or rooms set apart for divine worship, from the first. (3) Before the time of Constantine, these were, at Rome, ordinary chambers in private houses, the triclinia, or other large rooms in the dwellings of the wealthy, and, specially, the private basilicas of Roman palaces. Such a basilica is mentioned in the Clementine "Recognitions" [see CLEMENTINE] as having formed part of the mansion of Theophilus, a wealthy citizen of Antioch, even in the Apostolic age, and been used by the Christians as a church. (4) The form of these private basilicas *probably* bore a considerable resemblance to that of the pre-Augustan forensic basilicas, such as the Portian basilica already noticed; this point, however, is not at present determined with absolute certainty. (5) It is not probable that, apart from the chambers or halls and private basilicas above mentioned, the Christians of the pre-Nicene period possessed, at least in Rome, any churches properly so called within the city. (6) Besides the private basilicas, sepulchral buildings were used for Christian worship in the period referred to—exceptionally, and in times of persecution, those under ground (Catacombs); regularly, the "Memories" and Cells of

[1] There is a Basilian house, the College of St. Mary Immaculate, at Plymouth.

Martyrs built above ground. Both parts of this proposition can be proved by abundant evidence. (7) The Christian basilica of the age of Constantine is not a simple adaptation or imitation of the forensic basilica of the preceding period. For the forensic basilica appears to have had no one determinate shape; sometimes it had an apse, sometimes not, and it was entered either from one end or from the side—whereas the Christian basilica, faithful to the form of the crypt, or "Memory," of the earlier time, had always an apse, and was always entered from the end opposite the apse. At the same time, the forensic basilica, with its constant *internal* feature of a space divided by rows of columns into three aisles—a form very suitable to the needs of a large congregation—was certainly not overlooked by Christian architects. (8) The final conclusion is that the Christian basilica of the age of Constantine arose out of the combination of two factors—one the sepulchral "Cella," terminating in one or three apses; the other, the great three-aisled hall, so familiar to Roman eyes, whether in the forensic or in the private basilicas.

The origin of the Christian basilica having been considered, it remains to show what were its parts, structural features, and arrangements for worship. As a general rule, it was built in an east and west direction, the altar or table being sometimes at one end, sometimes at the other. It was usually surrounded by an outer wall. Through a portico or colonnade, forming a vestibule, admission was obtained into a quadrangle (*atrium*), round which ran an arcade, separated by a low partition from the enclosed space (*area*), which was open to the air. In the middle of the "area" was the "cantharus," or water-basin, where the faithful washed their faces and hands before entering the church. The right-hand arcade was for men; that on the left, for women; here penitents must remain during the service; those, however, whose offences were of a very heinous type were excluded even from these, and had to stand in the open area. On the opposite side of the atrium was an oblong hall, formed by rows of pillars, which was sometimes called the "narthex" or "ferula." Passing through this, the worshipper entered the church by a door which was called the "Beautiful Gate." He found himself in a nave (ναός) with two flanking aisles (from which it was separated by pillars), but without a transept; as he proceeded, he came upon the "ambo" [see that article]; beyond which were the "cancelli,' or rails parting off the choir—which was for the clergy—from the rest of the church. At the end of all was the semicircular vaulted apse [see APSE], with the bishop's chair in the centre, and seats for the clergy on either hand; just in front of the apse was the altar or table. During the divine worship, the men occupied the south, the women the north, aisle; the space between was left free.

At Rome thirteen churches still retain the name of "basilicas"—five larger, and eight smaller. Those of the former class are St. Peter's, St. John Lateran, St. Mary Major, St. Paul without the Walls, and St. Lawrence. Among the smaller basilicas, San Clemente (beneath which an older church was discovered in 1858 by the Irish Dominican, Father Mullooly), Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, Sant' Agnese, Santa Sabina, and San Sebastiano, are of great interest and beauty. (Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; Plattner, "Beschreibung der Stadt Rom," 1829, vol. i. p. 417; Kraus, "Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst," i. 265; Leclercq in DACL; Lanciani, "Pagan and Christian Rome," p. 114; Grisar, "Hist. of Rome and the Popes," §§ 247-262).

BASILIDIANS. [See GNOSTICISM.]

BASLE, COUNCIL OF. The schism in the Papacy, healed with difficulty at the Council of Constance through the election of Martin V., produced in the fifteenth century a prevalent sentiment that the most effectual safeguard against the recurrence of so terrible an evil lay in the frequent assemblage of general councils. It was provided accordingly, by one of the decrees of Constance (1414–1418), that a general council should in future be held every five years. Martin V., in pursuance of the decree, convoked a council for 1423, to meet at Pavia; but various difficulties arose, and it was finally arranged that Basle should be the place of meeting, and the time, July 1431. Martin also named Cardinal Julian Cesarini papal legate and president of the assembly. But before the day of meeting the Pope died; and a doubt as to the intentions of his successor influenced many bishops, so that there was but a slender gathering at the formal opening of the council. Cesarini, however, who had himself been absent on the opening day (having been sent into Bohemia to endeavour to effect a reconciliation with the Hussites), sent out messengers and letters in all directions; and soon a great number of French and German bishops—most of whom sincerely desired to carry out a real reformation, both "in the head and the members" of the Church—was assembled at Basle. The new Pope, Eugenius IV., was deeply impressed with the importance of taking advantage of the humiliation of the Eastern Empire (which, owing to the encroachments of the Ottoman power, was now reduced to a small district round Constantinople) to open negotiations—earnestly desired by the Greeks themselves—for the healing of the Photian schism, and reunion of the East and West. The joint council which would be necessary for this purpose could not, the Pope saw, be held at Basle, because the Greeks would never consent to cross the Alps. Again, the Hussites in Bohemia having recently gained some important military

successes, the Pope considered that bishops could not safely proceed to a city which seemed, in Italian eyes, to be within the reach of the dreaded Procopius. Other special objections were alleged in the bull, which transferred the council to Bologna. The bishops at Basle, headed by Cesarini—who wrote to the Pope, endeavouring to show that the particular reasons alleged for the transfer were founded on mistake, or had little weight—vehemently opposed the removal of the council, and continued their sittings. They came chiefly from France and Germany; Italy, England, and Spain furnished each a very slender contingent. The number present, even at the most important sessions, does not appear to have exceeded fifty. According to the relative importance which good men might attach to the project of reunion with the Greeks or to the reform of ecclesiastical abuses, they might honestly prefer a city south or north of the Alps as the place of meeting for the council. The general opinion, however, seems to have been at this time in favour of Basle. The Pope himself, finding in 1432 that he could not bring over the Emperor Sigismund to his opinion, began to waver, and sent a legate, Christopher, Bishop of Cervia, to Basle with authority to negotiate with the council on the question. By February in the following year, he had come to the conclusion that it was expedient to yield still further; a bull appeared, explaining the reasons why the Pope had hitherto objected to Basle, and the considerations which now induced him to withdraw his opposition and send legates to the council. This he did; but his legates, who were to agree to the discussion only of certain subjects prescribed by the Pope, were ill received at the council. Several other decrees and bulls were issued on one side and on the other in this controversy; at last, in February 1434, a letter from the Pope was read at the council, with the terms of which they declared themselves satisfied, and they admitted the papal legates.[1] But before long a breach occurred, which proved to be irreparable. At its twenty-first session (June 1435) the council adopted a decree for the reform of the Roman Chancery—abolishing first-fruits, cutting down fees, and regulating official charges and perquisites. The Pope might well complain that a measure so important had been adopted without previous consultation with him. He refused his sanction, and the council launched an angry decree against him. Meantime the Eastern emperor, John Palaeologus, had been in negotiation both with the Pope and the council on the subject of the proposed reunion of East and West; one consequence of which, the Emperor fondly hoped, would be the effective armed intervention of Western Europe to roll back the tide of Ottoman invasion. A synod can seldom hold its own with a single ruler in such transactions; moreover, the envoys of the council were empowered to propose to the Emperor and the Greeks no place of meeting more acceptable than Avignon, to which Ferrara, offered by the Pope, would appear to them infinitely preferable. A division hereupon sprang up in the council itself, the minority—among whom was the excellent and able Nicholas of Cusa, a theologian from Coblenz—voting for the removal of the council to Italy, while the majority were in favour of Avignon. In October 1437 Eugenius published a bull in which he formally transferred the council from Basle to Ferrara; and although, at the first session held in the last-named city, in January 1438, the number in attendance was scanty, the Papal influence gradually asserted its ascendency, and defections from the council at Basle began to be of frequent occurrence. In his famous work, written some years before, "Concordantia Catholica," Nicholas of Cusa had said "Where there is no true oecumenical council, the most certain synod is that in which the Pope is found"; and agreeably to this maxim, Nicholas himself now abandoned the cause of the council, and repaired to Ferrara. From the time of the publication of the bull of October 1437, the acts of the Council of Basle are considered as of no authority. Before that date, in the years between 1431 and 1436, their most notable work was the pacification of the Hussites, whom they succeeded to a great extent in reconciling to the Church, by conceding the demand of the more moderate party—the Utraquists—for communion under both species.

The recalcitrants at Basle, headed now by the Cardinal of Arles, exasperated by the desertions from their ranks and the growing influence of the Council of Ferrara, proceeded to extreme measures. They erected into a universal axiom that theory of the subjection of Popes to General Councils which, as enunciated by the Council of Constance, had been a particular proposition, referring only to one Pope and a special complex of circumstances. Next (May 1439), they pretended to depose Eugenius, in whose stead they chose Amadeus of Savoy. This anti-pope took the title of Felix V. But he was feebly supported, and after playing his miserable part for five years, abdicated in April 1445. At the same time, the Council of Basle, which, after lingering on for several years in almost entire obscurity, had transferred its sittings to Lausanne, gave a last sign of life by recognizing the pontificate of Nicholas V. Nothing more is heard of them afterwards. (Hefele, "Hist. of the Councils"; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," i. 280–350; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," ii. bk. iii.)

[1] A consideration of these dates shows how unfounded is the view of Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, ch. lxvi.) that the revolt of the Romans against the Pope, and his consequent flight—an event which happened in *May* 1434—compelled Eugenius to make a humiliating submission to the Council.

BEADS. [See ROSARY.]

BEARD, CLERICAL. In the earliest times the shaving of the hair on the face was considered effeminate (Clem. Al. "Paedagog." iii. 11), and the beard was worn by clergy and laity alike. Early, however, in the middle ages, ecclesiastics in the West shaved off the beard (Bede, "H.E." iv. 14), and this custom furnished Photius, in 867, with the ground for one of the reproaches which he made against the Latins. Pope Gregory VII. required the Archbishop of Cagliari and his clergy to shave, and from the twelfth century onwards, all through the middle ages, synods were constantly enforcing the rule, "Clerici barbam ne nutriant." In the middle of the sixteenth century the clerical beard again came into fashion, and the beard is seen on the portraits of the Popes from Paul III. to Innocent XII. Synods now simply required that the beard should not be too long. At the end of the seventeenth century fashion changed again, under French influence, and when some of the Bavarian priests began to wear the beard, Pius IX., in a brief dated 1863, commissioned the Nuncio at Munich to see that the bishops put a stop to the innovation. This rule, of course, does not apply to an order like that of the Capuchins, with whom the beard is no novelty. (Talhofer, in "Kirchenlexikon"; Leclercq in DACL, *Barbe*.)

BEATIFIC VISION. The sight of God face to face, which constitutes the essential bliss of angels and men. The Council of Florence defines that the "souls of those who after receiving baptism have incurred no stain of sin whatsoever, or who after incurring such stain have been purified, in the body or out of the body, ... are at once received into heaven and clearly see God Himself as He is, in three Persons and one substance, some, however, more perfectly than others, according to the diversity of their merits." [1]

Many passages of Scripture speak of this vision as the reward of the just. "When He shall appear," St. John says, "we shall be like to Him, because we shall see Him as He is." Similarly, St. Paul contrasts the seeing through a glass in an obscure manner with that vision "face to face" which is reserved for the life to come.[2] Petavius adduces a multitude of patristic testimonies on this point, and explains passages from other Fathers who seem to affirm the absolute impossibility of seeing God as He is. At the same time, he confesses frankly that some ancient Catholic writers spoke ambiguously and others erroneously with regard to the vision of God. They had a difficulty in supposing it possible even for the blessed to behold the divine essence.

It is with the eyes of the soul, not with the bodily eyes, that God is seen. This follows from the very fact that God is incorporeal. Nor can any created intellect in its own strength or by the force of its nature enjoy the beatific vision, for there is no proportion between the divine nature and any created intelligence. In order that the blessed may see Him, God infuses a supernatural quality which elevates and perfects the intellect and makes it capable of the beatific vision. Just as the natural eye, in order that it may see, requires first the presence of the object, and then light, in order that the image of the object may be received, so the intellect, in order to see God, requires not only the proximity of the divine essence, but also an interior disposition by which it is elevated to an act above its natural powers.[1] The schoolmen fitly call this quality in the intellect of the blessed the "light of glory," a term which occurs in the Fathers—*e.g.* in St. Augustine, though not in the same definite sense. The Council of Vienne adopted the expression in its condemnation of the error "that the soul does not need the light of glory, which elevates the soul so that it beholds God and enjoys Him in bliss" (Denzinger-Bannwart, p. 208). The word "light" is of course a mere metaphor, for the light of glory is immaterial. Nor is it anything outside the intellect, or again an object which the intellect perceives. It is in the intellect and enables it to see God.

By the ordinary law of God, this vision is not given in the flesh, since no man can see God's face and live, although great authorities maintain that it has been bestowed in exceptional cases even during this life. St. Thomas, for instance, maintains that Moses and St. Paul enjoyed the beatific vision before their death, though the gift was not a permanent one. On the other hand, it was a question long discussed in the Church, whether the saints saw God face to face before the day of judgment. The Council of Florence, quoted above, closed the controversy, and this definition is the true development of patristic teaching. From the first it was held that martyrdom, as the perfect purgation of the soul, admits to the immediate possession of glory, a tenet which logically involves the belief that heaven since Christ's ascension has been opened to all who are fitted by perfect purity for the vision of God. St. Gregory[2] places the difference between the saints of the Old and New Testaments in this very point, that whereas the former had to wait for the vision of God till Christ's descent into limbo, the latter, when "their earthly house of this habitation is dissolved," have a "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. v. 1). The words of the council, with which we began, explain what it is that the beatific vision implies. The

[1] *Decret. unionis* (Denzinger-Bannwart, p. 236).
[2] 1 Jn. iii. 2; 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

[1] St. Thom. 1a, q. 12, a. 5.
[2] Petav. *De Deo*, vii. 13.

saints and angels see God—*i.e.* His essence, His attributes, and the three Persons of the Trinity. Further, seeing God, they see creatures in Him, who is the supreme cause, in whom all things live and move and exist. The saints do not, indeed, know all that God can do, because even to the blessed He remains in a certain sense incomprehensible, and it is one thing to see an object before us, quite another to know that object in the utmost extent to which it can be known. Such perfect comprehension of the divine nature belongs to God Himself, and cannot be communicated to any creature. But the saints see in God all the facts concerning creatures which it is suitable for them to know. They have, for example, a special knowledge of those who are placed under their patronage; they are aware when souls on earth implore their prayers; they are acquainted with the best means of helping their clients. The most plausible objection which is made to the invocation of the saints falls to the ground if this point, which St. Augustine sets forth with great fulness, is well understood. We ask the saints to pray for us, not because we believe them omniscient or omnipresent, but because, seeing God, they see in Him all that He wishes them to see.

Lastly, though all the blessed see God, they do so with different degrees of perfection. The vision of God is the reward of merit, and as God repays every man according to his works, as the crown promised in heaven is a crown of justice, therefore the vision of God cannot be given in precisely the same manner to all. This truth was denied by Jovinian in ancient, by Luther in modern, times, and the anathema of the Council of Trent—sess. vi. cap. 16, can. 32—is directed against the latter. (See Petavius, "De Deo," lib. vii.; BEATITUDE; HEAVEN.)

BEATIFICATION. [See CANONIZATION.]

BEATITUDE, or bliss, is defined by St. Thomas as that perfect good which completely appeases and satisfies the appetite.[1] God alone can constitute man's perfect bliss, for man's will seeks the fulness of all good, and this cannot be found except in God. Had man been left without grace, then he would have found his natural beatitude in knowing God most perfectly as the author of nature, and in adhering to Him by natural love, sweetly and constantly.[2] He would have attained this happiness, after passing successfully through his probation in this mortal life. As it is, man has been raised to a supernatural state, and his bliss consists in God, seen face to face in the heavenly country. [See BEATIFIC VISION.]

So far all the Catholic theologians are at one. All admit that God is man's last end and that he attains this end through the beatific vision. But if we question theologians more closely and wish to know the precise manner in which the blessed reach perfect happiness, various answers are given, of which three may be repeated here. The Thomists, following apparently the clear teaching of their master,[1] place the essential happiness of the blessed (*beatitudo formalis*) in the act of the intellect by which the saints see God as He is. They argue that while the will is an appetite which tends to its object and rests in it, it is by the intellect that an immaterial object actually becomes present to the soul. Thus while the will of the blessed rests in God, it is the intellect which actually apprehends, acquires and possesses Him. The delight which the will takes in good attained does not constitute the possession of this good, but presupposes it. The Thomists allege further that the intellect is the noblest of the faculties, and that the bliss of man must consist in the exercise of this power.[3] Here, we may add, they make a legitimate application of Aristotle's principles. "That which is proper to each by nature," says this philosopher,[3] "is best and sweetest for each; sweetest, then, for man is the intellectual life (ὁ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν βίος), since this [*i.e.* reason] chiefly constitutes man. Such a life, therefore, is most happy." St. Basil, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and St. Augustine (consciously or unconsciously) made a similar application of the Aristotelian principle.[4]

The second opinion is that of Scotus, which places beatitude in the act of the will by which it loves God with the love of friendship; a third, that of several Jesuit theologians, who make it consist in the exercise of intellect and will combined. It is scarcely necessary to say that the Thomists only place the essence or spring of beatitude in the vision of God by the intellect. Hence flow the full satisfaction of the will, the happy necessity of loving God, the knowledge which the saints have that their happiness is eternal. After the resurrection this bliss will overflow into the body, bestowing upon it the four gifts of *impassibility*, *subtlety* (by which it will be able to penetrate other bodies, as the risen Christ penetrated the closed doors), *agility* (which will make it capable of the swiftest motion), *clarity* (through which it will become luminous or transparent). [See BEATIFIC VISION; HEAVEN.]

BEATITUDES, THE EIGHT. The blessings pronounced by our Lord at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 3–10). In the so-called Sermon on the Plain (Lk. vi. 20–22) only four are enumerated. Various reasons are given by the Fathers for this difference (see St. Thomas, 1ª 2æ, q. 69, a. 3).

[1] See 1ª 2æ, q. 2, a. 8.
Billuart, *De Grat.* Diss. ii. 1.

[1] See 1ª 2ae, q. 4, a. 2.
[2] Billuart, *De Ultimo Fine*, Diss, ii. 2.
[3] *Eth. Nicom.* x. 7.
[4] Petav. *De Deo*, vii. 8.

BEDESMAN, BEADSMAN. One who prays for the soul of another; a pensioner charged with this duty. [See ROSARY.]

BÉGUINES and BÉGHARDS. The Béguines of Flanders are an interesting and ancient foundation. An attempt, indeed, was made in the seventeenth century to trace their origin to St. Begga, the mother of Pepin of Heristal, who flourished about A.D. 700; but in the judgment of Hefele the attempt failed. That they can be traced back to the twelfth century, and are consequently older than either the Franciscans or Dominicans, is unquestionable. The scandals caused by the conduct of a dissolute Bishop of Liège, about 1180, aroused the zeal of a holy priest of the diocese, Lambert le Bèghe, who spent his fortune in founding an institution at Liége for widows and single women desirous to consecrate their lives to God, and opened it in 1184. The associates called themselves Béghines, corrupted to Béguines, after their founder, and the name of Béguinage was given to the abode, or rather group of abodes, in which they lived. For the Béguinage, resembling in this respect the ancient *laura*, is not a convent, but a collection of small houses (each inhabited by one or two Béguines, who do their own housekeeping), surrounded by a wall, and with a chapel in the centre. The Béguines do not take perpetual vows, nor do they renounce private property; they can leave the association whenever they desire it, and reclaim the capital which they may have contributed to it. But each Béguine on admission to the habit makes a vow, in the presence of the curé who has the spiritual charge of the community, of obedience and chastity so long as she remains in the Béguinage. They employ themselves, according to the strength or capacity of the several members, in educational work (including large Sunday-schools for girls) and corporal works of mercy of various kinds, besides taking part in the divine office. Some of their communities in the fourteenth century fell into the error of the Fraticelli (*q.v.*), or brethren of the free spirit, and incurred condemnation on that account from the Council of Vienne (1311). At the present day, they are still flourishing in Belgium, their original seat; there are Béguinages at Ghent, Bruges, Antwerp, Mechlin, and other places. In the great Béguinage at Ghent there were in 1857 six hundred professed Béguines, and two hundred *locataires*—that is, ladies living within the enclosure, paying a certain pension, and to some extent participating in the religious life of the sisters. There are Béguinages in Germany, and one was founded at Castelnaudary, in the south of France, by a zealous priest of Carcassonne, M. Soubiran-la-Louvière, which promised to be eminently successful and useful.

The Béghards had no special founder, but were associations of laymen living together in imitation of the Béguines. They first appear in the early part of the thirteenth century. Heresy and antinomianism made great ravages in their ranks in the following age, and the severities of which they were consequently the object caused the greater number to pass into the third orders of the Mendicant fraternities. (Gilliat-Smith, in "Cath. Enc."; Bauer in "Kirchenlex.")

BELLS. Nothing certain is known as to the date of their introduction, which has been attributed sometimes to St. Paulinus of Nola, sometimes to Pope Sabinian. During the heathen persecution it was of course impossible to call the faithful by any signal which would have attracted public notice. After Constantine's time, monastic communities used to signify the hour of prayer by blowing a trumpet, or by rapping with a hammer at the cells of the monks. Walafrid Strabo, in his celebrated book on the divine offices, written about the middle of the ninth century, speaks of the use of bells as not very ancient in his time, and as having been introduced from Italy. However, we learn from the history of St. Lupus of Sens that church-bells were known in France more than two centuries before Strabo's time.[1] They were much in use in the Keltic churches as early as the fifth or sixth century (Gougaud in DACL, *Clochettes Celtiques*). For long the Eastern Church employed, instead of bells, clappers, such as we still use on Good Friday, and bells were not known among the Orientals till the ninth century.[2] Even then their use cannot have become universal among them, for Fleury mentions the ringing of church-bells as one of the customs which the Maronites adopted from the Latins on their reunion with the Catholic Church in 1183.[3] The classical words for bell are κώδων and *tintinnabulum*. *Signum* is the name in the Pontifical, and was the name commonly used in Gaul. From the seventh century onwards, we find the names *campana* (from the Campanian metal of which they were often made), *nola* (from the town where their use is said to have been introduced), and *cloccae*[4] (French *cloche*). Originally church bells were comparatively small. Large ones of cast metal first appear in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; those of the greatest size in the fifteenth. In the tenth century the custom began of giving bells names.[5]

Before the Church sets aside bells for sacred she blesses them with solemn ceremonies. The form prescribed in the Pontifical is headed "the blessing of a bell," though it is popularly called "the baptism of a bell,"[1] a title by which the office is mentioned as

[1] Fleury, *Hist.* xlviii. 42.
[2] Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 172.
[3] lxxiii. 46.
[4] First occurs in Bonifacius, *Ep.* 134; perhaps from the old German *chlachan* = *frangi*. Kraus, p. 288.
[5] Kraus, *loc. cit.*

early as the eleventh century.[1] The bishop washes the bell with blessed water, signs it with the oil of the sick outside, and with chrism inside, and lastly places under it the thurible with burning incense. He prays repeatedly that the sound of the bell may avail to summon the faithful, to excite their devotion, to drive away storms, and to terrify evil spirits. This power of course is due to the blessings and prayers of the Church, not to any efficacy superstitiously attributed to the bell itself. Thus consecrated, bells become spiritual things, and cannot be rung without the consent of the ecclesiastical authorities.

Hitherto, we have been treating of the large church-bell. Small bells are also used during Mass, and are rung by the server at the Sanctus and at the Elevation. The object of this rite is to excite the attention and devotion of the faithful. The practice of ringing the bell at the Elevation was introduced after the custom of elevating the Host [see ELEVATION] had become common in the Church. The Elevation-bell is mentioned by William of Paris. In England it is the custom to ring the bell also as the priest spreads his hands over the Host and chalice before the consecration, and at the *Domine, non sum dignus*, before the priest's communion. This bell is not rung when Mass is said before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, nor again in the private chapel of the Apostolic Palace if the Pope says or hears Mass;[2] nor at *solemn* Masses celebrated in St. Peter's and in the other Patriarchal Basilicas. (Barbier de Montault, "Traité de la Construction et l'Ameublement des Églises," i. 345 *sqq.*; Thurston in "Cath. Enc." and in the "Month," 1907; Leclercq in DACL, *Cloches*.)

BENEDICAMUS DOMINO, *i.e.* "Let us bless the Lord," a form used in the breviary at the end of each hour except matins, and at the end of Mass instead of *Ite, Missa est* on days when the *Gloria in excelsis* is not said. Various reasons are given for the use of *Benedicamus Domino* for the usual *Ite, Missa est*. Cardinal Bona thinks that the *Ite, Missa est* was omitted first of all during penitential seasons, such as Advent and Lent, because then the people did not immediately leave the church, but waited for the recitation of the hours, and that gradually the *Benedicamus Domino* came to be used in ferial Masses generally. In Masses for the dead, *Requiescant in pace* took the place of the *Ite, Missa est*, perhaps because the people often had to remain for the funeral rites. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." 11, 24.)

BENEDICTINES. The patriarch of monks in the West, St. Benedict, having first established his order at Subiaco, removed it to Monte Cassino, on which Apollo was in those days still worshipped, in 529. The rule which he compiled for his monks was regarded as fraught with singular wisdom, and dictated by a marvellous insight into human nature, neither prescribing to all an asceticism only possible to a few, nor erring on the side of laxity. It regulated with great minuteness the mode of celebrating the divine office at the canonical hours; and, eschewing all idleness, ordered that the monks, when not employed in the divine praises, or in taking necessary food and rest, should engage themselves in useful works, either manual labour, or study, or copying books, or teaching. Every monastery was to have a library, and every monk was to possess a pen and tablets. The clothing, of which the prevailing colour was black, was to vary in material and warmth at the discretion of the abbots, according to the exigencies of different climates and circumstances. The abstinence from meat enjoined by the rule (except in the case of the sick) is perpetual; but there is some doubt whether the prohibition was meant to extend to poultry and winged game, as well as the flesh of four-footed animals. A singular clause in the rule, and one which was fruitful in results, was that which ordered that all persons whatever, without distinction of age, rank, or calling, should be admissible to the order of St. Benedict. If parents offered a son to the service of God in a monastery, even if he were but a boy of five years old, the monks were to receive and take full charge of him. Thus our own Bede was given over when only seven years old to the monks at Wearmouth and Jarrow, and the good Orderic, the historian of Normandy, was committed by his father in his tenth year to the kind hands of the monks of St. Evroult, and saw his native land no more. Out of this practice of offering young boys to the monasteries a great system of monastic schools naturally arose.

St. Maur, a disciple of St. Benedict, founded the first Benedictine monastery in France, in his master's lifetime, at Glanfeuil, near Angers. In Spain Benedictine monks were introduced about 633. We in England have special cause to be grateful to the Benedictine order, for it was by it that Christianity was first taught to our Saxon forefathers. The monastery on Monte Cassino was destroyed by the Lombards towards the end of the sixth century, but the monks took refuge at Rome; where Pope Gregory gave them St. Andrew's Church. The Benedictine abbot of St. Andrew's was the person chosen by the Pope to head the mission which he sent to the Court of Ethelbert, and he will be remembered through all time as St. Augustine, the Apostle of England. Benedictine monks from England—St. Willibrord (699) and St. Boniface (750)—introduced Christianity in the Low

[1] Fleury, lix. 20. A capitulary of Charlemagne (789) says: "Ut cloccas non baptizent." (DACL, *Cloche* 1968:)

[2] Benedict XIV. *De Miss.* ii. 11, 19; 15, 31.

Countries and the Rhineland. Volumes might be written on the manifold services which the German Benedictines, going forth from the tomb of St. Boniface at Fulda, and settling themselves down as welcome guests at numberless points in the forests which then covered the Teutonic land, rendered to their half-savage countrymen, accustoming them by degrees to the restraints of religion and law, and training and cultivating both the land and the people. But all human institutions are liable to change, and even this famous order, chiefly through the intrusion of ambitious laymen into the office of abbot, witnessed before the end of the eighth century a great decline of monastic virtue. St. Benedict of Anian then appeared as a reformer and restorer. So, when the fierce Danish and Norman barbarians in the ninth and tenth centuries had destroyed many monasteries in France and England, and murdered great numbers of monks, while those who were spared lived with little regularity, the reformation of Cluny by four saintly abbots, predecessors of St. Peter the Venerable, and that carried on by our own St. Dunstan in England, caused the old life, in its lovely peace and fruitfulness, to flourish again. It is said that, a calculation being made in the first half of the fourteenth century, it was found that up to that time twenty-four Popes, two hundred cardinals, seven thousand archbishops, fifteen thousand bishops, and a still greater number of saints, had been given to the Church by the Benedictine order.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries many relaxations and corruptions crept into the Benedictine monasteries in various parts of Europe. In France the reaction against these led to the foundation of the reformed congregation of St. Vanne, in which the rigid observance of the rule was revived (1550); and out of this proceeded the yet more celebrated congregation of St. Maur (1618) [see MAURISTS], to which a great number of French monasteries adhered. This congregation, by its colossal patristic and historical labours, directed by such men as Mabillon, Martène, Ruinart, Rivet, and D'Achéry, rendered incalculable services to the learned world. Two such works as the "France Littéraire" and the "Recueil des Historiens," if they had accomplished nothing else, would entitle the congregation to the gratitude of all men of letters. At the Revolution the order was entirely suppressed in France. In the nineteenth century it again took root, and began to bear fruit of the old kind; witness the foundation at Solesmes, the residence of the pious and gifted Dom Guéranger; the community at Pierre-qui-Vire (founded by the Père Muard, who died in 1854); and the Benedictine nunneries of Pradines and Flavigny. But once again all have been seized by the government. In Spain and Germany the order was suppressed during the revolutionary troubles; but it has been re-introduced in both countries.

In England, at the dissolution, there were one hundred and eighty-six Benedictine abbeys, priories, and nunneries, the revenues of which appear in the "Valor Ecclesiasticus," and about a hundred other cells and priories of less importance, besides those previously suppressed by Wolsey (twenty-nine, of which the majority were Benedictine) and the "alien" priories—that is, those which were cells of foreign abbeys. All these were suppressed, with what ruinous results to education, art, and learning, all the world knows. Dom Feckenham, the last abbot of Westminster, made a noble speech in the House of Lords against the change of religion in the first year of Elizabeth; it may be read in the Somers Tracts. Feckenham was thrown into prison and kept there for the rest of his life. One of his monks, Dom Sigebert Buckley, after forty years' imprisonment, died at a great age in 1610; before dying he gave the habit to two English Benedictines who had been professed abroad, and was thus the link between the monks of old and those of modern times. For several generations the English Benedictines were obliged on account of persecution to have their houses abroad, whence they sent men to the English mission. (Guilday, "English Catholic Refugees on the Continent," ch. vii.) Mr. Law's "Calendar of English Martyrs" (1876) contains the names of nine or ten Benedictine missioners hanged, drawn, and quartered between 1558 and 1681. The old titles, abbot of Westminster, Glastonbury, &c., are still kept up. By Apostolic Letters (October 31, 1890) the English Benedictine missions are placed under three abbeys, Downside, Ampleforth, and Douai (now Woolhampton), and various changes are made in the constitutions. The abbey at Fort Augustus (in Scotland) is an offshoot from the English province. There is a monastery at Ramsgate belonging to the Cassinese branch of the order. There are also in England houses of the French and German congregations of Solesmes and Beuron. An English colony, Western Australia, furnishes a noble example of the old civilizing and colonizing energy of the order. Two Spanish Benedictines, Dom Serrano and Dom Serra, driven by the Revolution from their own country, emigrated with Bishop Brady to Perth; about sixty years ago they formed a settlement on the Moore river, sixty miles to the north of Perth, where they gathered the natives round them, learned their language, instructed them in the truths of salvation, and taught them how to till the ground and to practise many useful arts. They have changed hundreds of these wild

blacks from barbarous nomads into civilized, God-fearing, home-loving men. By a Papal indult, the head of their abbey is an abbot-bishop, like St. Columba and his successors at Iona. The flourishing Benedictine monasteries in N. America were originally founded by Dom Boniface Wimmer, of the abbey of Metten, in Bavaria.

We are told by St. Gregory the Great that St. Benedict's sister, Scholastica, presided over a community of religious women. It may be presumed that they were under St. Benedict's direction, and that their rule was his rule as far as it could be observed by women. As the Benedictine rule spread abroad, similar communities were eastblished. [See NUNS; ABBESS.]

As noted above, Leo XIII. appointed an honorary head over the whole Order with the title of "Abbot Primate." [See ABBOT.] His position, however, does not interfere with the autonomy of each abbey which has always been a tradition of the Order.

(Hélyot; "Sketch of the Life and Mission of St. Benedict," written by a monk of Downside; Taylor's "Index Monasticus," 1821; Cardinal Newman's "Mission of the Benedictine Order"; Gasquet, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries"; Montalembert, "Monks of the West," new Eng. ed. by Cardinal Gasquet; Gasquet "Life and Mission of St. Benedict"; Taunton, "English Black Monks of St. Benedict." [1])

[1] *List of English Benedictine Houses existing at date of suppression.*

Nunneries and cells are indicated by *n* and *c* respectively.

Abbotsbury (Dorset)
Abingdon (Berks)
St. Alban's (Herts)
St. Alban's de Pratis, *n.*
Alcester (Warw.), *c.* to Evesham
Aldeby (Norf.), *c.* to Norwich
Ambrosbury, or Amesbury (Wilts), *n.*
Ankerwyke, near Wraysbury (Bucks.), *n.*
Arden (York), *n.*
10. Armathwaite (Cumb.), *n.*
Arthington (Yk.), *n.*
Athelney (Som.)
Avecot (Warw.), *c.* to Malvern
Bardney (Linc.)
Barking (Essex), *n.*
Barrow (Essex), *c.* to Colchester
Bath (Somerset)
Battle (Suss.)
St. Bees (Cumb.) *c.* to St. Mary's, York
20. Belvoir (Linc.), *c.* to St. Alban's
St. Benet Hulme (Norf.)
Binham (Norf.), *c.* to St. Alban's
Birkenhead (Chesh.)
Blackborough (Norf.), *n.*
Blyth (Notts)
Boxgrave (Suss.)
Bradewell (Bucks)
Brewood (Staff.), *n.*
Bromfield (Salop)
30. Bungay (Suff.), *n.*
Burnham (York), *n.*
Burton-on-Trent (Staff.)
Bury St. Edmund's (Suff.)
Canterbury, Christchurch
Canterbury, St. Augustine
Canterbury, St. Sepulchre, *n.*
Canyngton (Som.), *n.*
Cardigan, *c.* to Chertsey
Carow (Norf.), *n.*
40. Catesby (Northants), *n.*
Cerne (Dorset)
Chatteris (Cambr.), *n.*
Chertsey (Surr.)
Chester, St. Werburgh
Chester, St. Mary, *n.*
Cheshunt (Herts), *n.*
Colchester (Essex)
Colne, Earl's (Essex)
Coquet Isle (Northumb.), *c.* to Tynemouth
50. Coventry (Warw.)
Cowick (Devon), *c.* to Tavistock
Cranbourne (Dors.), *c.* to Tewkesbury
Croyland (Linc.)
Daunton (Kent), *n.*
Deeping (Linc.), *c.* to Thorney
Dover (Kent)
Dunster (Som.)
Eastbourne (Suss.), *n.*
Evesham (Worc.)
60. Exeter, St. Catherine, *n.*
Exeter, St. Nicholas
Eye (Suff.).
Eynsham (Oxf.)
Farne I. (Northumb.)
Feversham (Kent)
Finchale (Durh.)
Flamstead (Herts), *n.*
Folkestone (Kent)
Fosse (Linc.), *n.*
70. Frieston (Linc.)
Glannach (Angles.)
Glastonbury (Som.)
Gloucester, St. Peter
Godstow (Oxf.), *n.*
Grimsby (Linc.), *n.*
Halliwell (Midd.), *n.*
Hallystone (Northumb.), *n.*
Handale (York), *n.*
Hatfield Peveril (Essex), *c.* to St. Alban's
80. Heanwood (Warw.), *n.*
Hedingham Cas. (Essex), *n.*
Hertford
Hinchinbrook (Hunts)
Horsham (Norf.)
Horton (Dors.), *c.* to Sherborne
Hoxne (Suff.), *c.* to Norwich
Hoyland (Lanc.)
Hunston (Linc.)
Hurley (Berks), *c.* to Westminster
90. Hyde (Hants)
Ickleton (Camb.), *n.*
St. Ives (Hunts)
Jarrow (Durh.), *c.* to Durham
Keeling (York), *n.*
Kidwelly (Caerm.), *c.* to Sherborne
Kilburn (Midd.), *n.*
Kington (Wilts), *n.*
Lambley (Northumb.), *n.*
Langley (Leic.), *n.*
100. Leominster (Herf.), *c.* to Reading
Lincoln, St. Mary Magd., *c.* to St. Mary's, York
Lindisfarne (Northumb.), *c.* to Durham
London, Clerkenwell, *n.*
London, St. Helen's, *n.*
Luffield (Northants)
Lynn (Norf.), *c.* to Norwich
Lytham (Lanc.) *c.* to Durham
Malling (Kent)
Malvern, Great (Worc.), *c.* to Westminster
110. Malvern, Little (Worc.), *c.* to Worcester
Market-Street (Beds), *n.*
Marlow, Little (Bucks), *n.*
Marrick (York), *n.*
Marsh, Little (York), *n.*
Meuresley, or Ivinghoe (Bucks), *n.*
Michelney (Som.)
Middlesburgh (York), *c.* to Whitby
Milton Abbas (Dors.)
Modney, near Hilgay (Norf.), *c.* to Ramsey
120. Molesby (York), *n.*
Monkton Nun (York), *n.*
Monmouth
Morfield (Salop), *c.* to Shrewsbury
St. Neot's (Hunts)
Neashaw (Dur.), *n.*
Newcastle (Northumb.), *n.*
Norwich, Trinity
Norwich, St. Leonard's, *c.* to the last
Oldbury (Warw.), *c.* to Polesworth
130. Oxney (Northants), *c.* to Peterborough
Pembroke, *c.* to St. Alban's
Penwortham (Lanc.)
Pershore (Worc.)
Peterborough (Northants)
Pilton (Devon), *c.* to Malmesbury
Polesworth (Warw.), *n.*
Polleshoo (Devon)
Ramsay (Hunts)
Reading (Berks)
140. Redburn (Herts)
Redlingfield (Suff.)
Rochester (Kent)
Romsey (Hants), *n.*
Rusper (Suss.), *n.*
Sandtoft (Linc.), *n.*, *c.* to St. Mary, York
Selby (York)
Seton (Cumb.), *n.*
Shaftesbury (Dors.) *n.*
Sheppey (Kent), *n.*
150. Shrewsbury
Snellshall (Bucks)
Sopewell (Herts), *n.*
Spalding (Linc.)
Stanford (Linc.), *c.* to Durham
Stanford (Northants), *n.*
Stanley (Glouc.), *c.* to St. Peter's, Glouc.
Stratford le Bow (Midd.), *n.*
Stroguil, or Chepstow (Monm.)
Studley (Oxf.), *n.*
160. Sudbury (Suff.), *c.* to Westminster
Swaffham (Cambr.), *r.*
St. Syriac (Corn.), *c.* to Montacute
Tavistock (Devon)
Tewkesbury (Glouc.)
Thetford (Norf.), *n.*
Thickhed (York), *n.*
Thorney (Cambr.)
Tynemouth (Northumb.), *c.* to St. Alban's
Uske (Monm.), *n.*
170. Walden, Saffron (Essex)
Wallingwells (Notts), *n.*
Wearmouth (Dur.), *c.* to Durham
Wenny (Glam.), *c.* to Glouc.
Wetherell (Cumb.) *c.* to St. Mary's, York
Wherwell (Hants), *n.*
Whitby (York)
Wilberforce (Yk.), *n.*
Wilton (Wilts), *n.*
Winchcombe (Glouc.)
180. Winchester
Winchester, St. Mary, *n.*
Winchester, Newminster
Worcester, St. Mary
Wroxall (Warw.), *n.*
Wymondham (Norf.)
York, St. Mary's
York, Trinity
York, St. Clement's, *n.*

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. A rite which has now become very common in the Catholic Church. The

priest takes the Host from the tabernacle, places it in the monstrance, and then puts the monstrance containing the Host on a throne above the tabernacle. The priest then incenses the Blessed Sacrament, while the choir (at least in England) usually sing the "O Salutaris Hostia." Next the Te Deum, the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, or some other canticle or antiphon, is sung, followed by the "Tantum Ergo," during which the Blessed Sacrament is again incensed, and the prayer "Deus, qui nobis," &c., is recited. Finally, the priest, mantled with the veil, makes the sign of the cross with the monstrance over the people. The Congregation of Rites orders this Benediction to be given in silence; probably to show that it is not the earthly, but the Eternal Priest who in this rite blesses and sanctifies His people. If a bishop gives Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, he makes the sign of the cross over the people three times.

The rite is comparatively modern. Processions and expositions of the Blessed Sacrament date from the early part of the fourteenth century, but at first, apparently, the Host was replaced in the tabernacle, without any benediction being given to the people. "The custom" [of benediction], says the learned Thiers, in a treatise on the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, published in 1673, "appears to me somewhat novel (*assez nouvelle*) for I have found no Ritual or Ceremonial older than about a hundred years which mentions it." The same author tells us, that the custom of singing the "O Salutaris Hostia"[1] at the Elevation in the Mass was introduced by Louis XII. of France, a little before his death, in 1515, at a time when he was harassed by various enemies. Thiers also mentions that the Carthusians still maintained the custom of replacing the Host, after exposition, without giving benediction.[2] "It seems certain that our present Benediction service has resulted from the adoption of the evening singing of canticles before the statue of Our Lady, enhanced as it often came to be in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, which was employed at first only as an adjunct to lend it additional solemnity. The blessing at the close seems to have been added simply because the custom gained ground of making the sign of the cross over the people whenever the Blessed Sacrament was replaced in the tabernacle after a procession." (Thurston, in "Cath. Enc." and in the "Month," 1901, 1905; De Buck, "Précis Historiques," xxi. 59–70.)

BENEDICTIONALE. A collection of forms of blessing, compiled for the convenience of priests, from the Roman Ritual, Pontifical, Missal, &c. Such books may be lawfully published with the approbation of the Ordinary, but they possess no authority in themselves. "Those books only are to be employed, and those Benedictions only to be given which conform to the Roman Ritual." (Decree of S. Congreg. of Rites, April 7, 1832; Schulte, "Benedicenda.")

BENEDICTUS. The canticle of Zachary (Lk. i. 68–79). It is recited daily at Lauds in the Roman and other rites, except the Ambrosian; also in the burial of the dead and on other occasions. Formerly in many churches it was chanted in the Mass instead of the "Gloria in excelsis." (Cabrol in DACL, *Cantiques Evangéliques.*)

BENEFICE. An ecclesiastical benefice is a perpetual right, established by the Church in favour of an ecclesiastical person, of receiving the profits of Church property, on account of the discharge, by such person, of a spiritual office.

The term had its origin in a special use of the Latin word *beneficium* which arose in the dark ages, and was connected with the difference between allodial and feudal property. The allodial estate of a Teuton was his absolute, hereditary, freehold property, which royal favour had not given, and royal rapacity seldom dared to deprive him of. But a king could reward a faithful follower by the grant, usually for life, of lands belonging to the crown; and estates so granted were called *beneficia*, as being pure emanations of the king's grace and favour, though it is true that military service was always an implied condition of the tenure. As the landed possessions of the Church increased, usurpations of them by unscrupulous laymen became frequent. The clergy found that, practically, they had no other defence against this species of rapine but by granting portions of Church property to lay lords, on condition of military service against those who might disturb them in the quiet possession of the rest. The tenure being much the same, Church lands thus came to be called *beneficia*; and this name was gradually transferred to the beneficial enjoyment of all Church property, after the lands above described had been, with the advent of more peaceful times, restored to ecclesiastical hands.

According to the canonists, six things are required in a benefice. First, that it should be established by episcopal authority. Secondly, that it should have some spiritual work annexed to it—thus the function of an organist, or a verger, being merely temporal, is incompatible with the possession of a benefice. Thirdly, that it should be conferred by an ecclesiastical person. (Lay patrons are not properly said to *confer*, but to *present to*, a benefice.) Fourthly, that it should be conferred on a clerk who has at least received the tonsure. Fifthly, that it should be for life. Sixthly, that whoever has the right of conferring it should not keep it

[1] *Traité de l'exposition du Saint Sacrement de l'autel*, iii. ch. 5.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 7.

for himself, but give it to another. (Ferraris, *Beneficium*; Taunton.)

BENEFIT OF CLERGY. By this was originally meant the privilege enjoyed by persons in holy orders of claiming, if charged with any felony (unless it were high treason, or arson), to be tried in the bishop's instead of the king's court. The ancient usage was, says Blackstone, "for the bishop, or ordinary, to demand his clerks to be remitted out of the king's courts as soon as they were indicted." Henry II. endeavoured to do away with the exemption, and to subject clerks charged with felony to the jurisdiction of his own court; but the reaction in popular feeling which followed the murder of St. Thomas à Becket prevented the realization of his intention. After much conflict between the secular and ecclesiastical courts, it was settled, in the time of Henry VI., that a clerk charged with felony should first be arraigned in the king's court, after which he might either plead his benefit of clergy at once, declining the jurisdiction, or, after conviction, by way of arresting judgment. Originally, only persons who had the clerical dress and tonsure were entitled to the privilege; but a laxer test was gradually accepted, until it came to be a settled thing that every prisoner who could read should be allowed the benefit of clergy, even though neither ordained nor tonsured. It was found that too many laymen were thus let in, and by a statute of 1487 it was enacted that a layman might not claim the privilege more than once, and, when allowed it, he was to be burnt with a hot iron "on the brawn of the left thumb"—an effectual, if barbarous, mode of identification—so that he should not illegally claim it a second time.

After benefit of clergy had been claimed and allowed, the culprit was remitted to the bishop's court, and there tried. An elaborate procedure was followed, of which the ordinary result is said to have been an acquittal. If, however, the temporal courts surrendered the accused to the ordinary *absque purgatione facienda*, he had to be imprisoned for life.

The later history of benefit of clergy turns upon a statute of 1576. The government of Elizabeth were resolved to take away all criminal jurisdiction from the bishops, but the principle of immunity to the educated classes as compared with the uneducated was inwoven by so long a usage into judicial practice, and was so convenient for the former, that it is easy to understand why it should not readily be relinquished. By the statute above mentioned, it was forbidden to surrender any prisoner to the Ordinary; but when benefit of clergy had been allowed, and burning inflicted in the usual way, the prisoner was to undergo no further punishment—except that the judge might, at his discretion, order him to be kept in gaol for any period within a year. Acts were afterwards passed, allowing Peers, even though they could not read, to claim benefit of clergy, and extending the statute to female defendants on their being burnt and imprisoned for less than a year. But "those men who could not read, if under the degree of peerage, were hanged." It should be understood that not all felonies were within benefit of clergy. High treason and arson, as already mentioned, were always excluded from it; and other crimes, such as murder, burglary, unnatural crime, &c., were expressly withdrawn from it by different statutes.

As more and more criminals were found able to read, the state of the law was thought to tend too much to laxity. Acts of 1718 and 1720 provided that any person convicted who was entitled to benefit of clergy, with consequent burning and short imprisonment, might be, in substitution for such burning, &c., sentenced to transportation to America for seven years. Benefit of clergy was finally abolished in 1827. (Blackstone's "Commentaries," book iv.; Stephen, "Hist. of the Criminal Law," I. xiii.)

BERENGARIUS. A writer of the eleventh century, celebrated for having anticipated the Sacramentarians of a later age in assailing the mystery of the Eucharist. He was born, probably at Tours, about A.D. 1000, and was about forty years of age when he was made Archdeacon of Angers. At this period of his life he gave vent to the crude and novel theory on the sacrament of the altar which an inquisitive intellect, joined to a vain and unstable character, suggested to him. His former friends, Ademann of Liège, and Hugh, bishop of Langres, wrote to him letters of earnest remonstrance; but being at this time supported by the king of France, Bruno, bishop of Angers, and other persons of influence, he disregarded their admonitions. The French king, Henry I., seeing that a line of German Popes was apparently firmly fixed in the chair of Peter, and apprehensive lest the Papal influence should be used to further imperial designs against France, is said [1] to have meditated the formation of a Gallican schism, and in pursuance of this design to have encouraged Berengarius to resist the authority of Rome. The treatise in which he set forth his peculiar teaching has been recently discovered and printed. In the judgment even of those who would be most inclined to take a favourable view,[2] it is described as "hard, harsh, and obscure." It is certain that he denied any real or objective change, any transubstantiation of the bread and wine; with Erigena he held that the presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament was only real in so far as it was spiritually conceived, and rejected the opposite tenet of Paschasius

[1] By Gfrörer, on no authority. See art. "Berengar" in *Kirchenlex.*

[2] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 390.

Radbert. A letter of his to Lanfranc, then Prior of Bec, referring to these views, found its way to Rome; the matter was immediately taken up, and in a council held at Rome in 1050, the ancient faith of the Church was emphatically reasserted, and the tenets of Berengarius and Erigena condemned. Again, in the Synod of Vercelli (Sept. 1050), and shortly afterwards at Paris, Berengarius was condemned. For some time, so long as he was able to avoid attendance at any of these synods, he treated their decisions with contempt. But the King of France, who had now learned to form a truer estimate of the great character and apostolic aims of Leo IX., withdrew his support of Berengarius, who was consequently compelled to appear at a synod held at Tours in 1054, over which the legate Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII.) presided. Berengarius made and signed the recantation required of him, but not long afterwards he reasserted the condemned error. This happened several times over, Berengarius subscribing whatever orthodox formulary might be set before him, and then, in some fresh publication, giving an inadmissible turn to the subscription which he had made. The last of his retractations—from which he does not seem to have subsequently receded—was pronounced at the Council of Bordeaux, in 1080. Malmesbury[1] declares that he changed his views before his death (in 1088), and lamented that he could not effect the like change in all who had espoused his opinions. The same writer—the passage has been often quoted—professes to give us his dying words. It should be mentioned that he died on the feast of the Epiphany. "To-day, being the day of his manifestation, my Lord Jesus Christ will appear to me, either, as I hope, to raise me to glory for my repentance, or, as I fear, to punish me for the heresy which I have been instrumental in spreading."

It should be added that William of Malmesbury quotes a long passage from a Latin poem by Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, a former pupil of Berengarius, in which he warmly eulogises the temperance, charity, and self-denial of his departed master, and that Malmesbury himself writes of him in the same strain, though, whether he is merely echoing the encomiums of Hildebert, or speaking from some independent source of information, there are no means of ascertaining. (See CONSUBSTANTIATION; Vernet, in DThC, *Bérenger de Tours* (good bibliography).)

BERRETTA. [See BIRETTA.]

BETHLEHEMITES. 1. Matthew Paris speaks of some "fratres Bethleemitae" to whom a house was granted at Cambridge, on the way leading to Trumpington, in 1257; their habit, he says, was like that of the Friars Preachers, with the addition of a red and blue star on the breast. Of this foundation nothing further is known.

2. An order bearing the same name was founded by a noble Spanish gentleman of Teneriffe, Peter of Bétancourt, at Guatemala, in Central America, about the year 1600. He founded a hospital, convent, and school under the patronage of Our Lady of Bethlehem, with an order of monks to attend the sick and teach in the school. The Bethlehemites were rapidly propagated through every part of Spanish America. In 1687 Innocent XI. placed them under the rule of St. Augustine. They are said to possess some forty houses even now, the chief establishment being at Guatemala. There were convents of nuns of the same order, founded in 1688. (Hélyot; Besse in "Cath. Enc.")

BETROTHAL. [See ESPOUSAL.]

BIBLE (from *βιβλίον*, a letter or paper, and that from *βίβλος*, the inner bark of papyrus.) A name given to the sacred books of the Jews and the Christians. In itself "Bible" might mean a book of whatever kind, just as its synonym "Scriptures" (*γραφαί*) means originally writings of any sort. Gradually the Jews who spoke Greek employed the word "Bible" as a convenient name for their sacred books. Thus the Greek translator of Ecclesiasticus, writing soon after 132 A.C., mentions the law and the prophets and the rest of the Bible (*τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων*); and a similar instance might be quoted from first Machabees.[1] Our Lord and His disciples received the Jewish collection of the sacred books with the same reverence as the Jews themselves, and gave it the title usual at the time—viz. "the Scriptures." But after an interval there came a change. The Apostles and their disciples wrote books professing sacred authority. These writings appeared in the latter half of the first century, and were quoted within the Church with the same formulas—"it is written," &c.—which had been used before to introduce citations from the law and the prophets. These books of Christian authorship were called, first of all, "the books" or "scriptures of the new covenant," and from the beginning of the third century the shorter expression "new covenant" came into vogue. In Chrysostom and succeeding writers we find "bible" (*βιβλία*) as the familiar term for the whole collection contained in either "covenant," or, as we should now say, in the Old and New Testaments.[2]

Under the article CANON OF THE SCRIPTURE the reader will find some account of

[1] Malm. *Gest. Reg.* lib. iii.

[1] Ecclus. Praef.; 1 Mach. xii. 9. In Dan. ix. 2, we find *ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις*, a translation of בַּסְּפָרִים.

[2] "The scriptures of the new covenant," Euseb. iii 25; "the books of the new covenant," by implication in Melito of Sardis, about 170 A.D. (apud Euseb. iv. 26). The "new document" and Testament, Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 1 ("novum instrumentum"), *PL*, ii. 361. We have translated *διαθήκη* "covenant." It never means "testament" in the Christian Scriptures except in Heb. ix. 15-17.

the way in which and the authority by which the list of sacred books has been made, while the nature of their inspiration is also treated in a separate article. Here we take for granted that the Bible consists of a number of inspired books, contained in the Vulgate translation and enumerated by the Council of Trent; and we proceed to treat of its authority, its interpretation, and of its use among the faithful.

1. The Church holds that the sacred Scripture is the written word of God. The Council of Trent, "following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives with piety and reverence all the books of the Old and New Testament, since one God is the Author of each" (sess. iv.). These words of the council, which are an almost verbal repetition of many early definitions, separate the Bible utterly from all other books. Of no human composition, however excellent, can it be said that God is its author. And the divine origin of Scripture implies its perfect truth. We know for certain, St. Irenaeus argues, that the Scriptures are perfect, since they are spoken by the Word of God and by the Spirit.[1] Some few Catholic theologians have, indeed, maintained that the Scriptures may err *in minimis* —*i.e.* in small matters of historical detail which in no way affect faith or morals, though such an opinion has never obtained any currency in the Church.[2] But of course the modern Protestant theories which reduce the historical account of the Bible to mere myths, or again which, while they allow that the Scripture contains the word of God, deny that it is the written word of God, are in sharp and obvious contradiction to the decrees of the Church. [See INSPIRATION.]

2. The Church, then, affirms that all Scripture is the word of God, but at the same time it maintains that there is an unwritten word of God over and above Scripture. Just as Catholics are bound to defend the authority of the Bible against the new school of Protestants who have come to treat it as an ordinary book, so they are compelled to withstand that Protestant exaggeration, on the other side, according to which the word of God is contained in Scripture and in Scripture alone. The word of God (so the Council of Trent teaches) is contained both in the Bible and in Apostolical tradition, and it is the duty of a Christian to receive the one and the other with equal veneration and respect. The whole history and the whole structure of the New Testament witness to the truth and reasonableness of the Catholic view. If our Lord had meant His Church to be guided by a book and by a book alone, He would have taken care that Christians should be at once provided with sacred books. As a matter of fact He did nothing of the kind. He wrote nothing, and He gave no command to write. He refers those who were to embrace His doctrine, not to a book, but to the living voice of His apostles and of his Church. "He who heareth you," He said to the apostles, "heareth me." For twenty years after our Lord's ascension, not a single book of the New Testament was written, and all that time no Christian could appeal, as many Protestants do now, to the Bible and the Bible only; for the simple reason that the New Testament did not exist, and the faithful were evidently called upon to believe many truths for which no strict and cogent proofs could be brought from the pages of the Jewish Scriptures. Further, when the writings of the New Testament were issued, they appeared one by one, in order to meet special exigencies, nor is the least hint given that the Apostles or their disciples provided that their writings should contain the whole sum of Christian truth. St. Paul wrote to various churches in order to give them instruction on particular points, and in order to preserve them from moral or doctrinal errors to which they were exposed at the moment. Far from professing to communicate the whole circle of doctrine in a written form, he exhorts his converts in one of his earliest epistles, to "hold the traditions which" they "had learned, whether by word or by" his "epistle"; a few years later he praises the Corinthians for keeping the traditions (παραδόσεις) as he delivered them, and towards the close of his life, he warns St. Timothy to keep the "deposit" (παραθήκην) of the faith without a syllable to imply that this deposit had been committed to writing.[1] So, with regard to the Gospel records, St. John expressly declares that they were from the necessity of the case an incomplete account of Christ's life.[2] The Christians who lived nearest to Apostolic times believed, as the Apostles themselves had done, that Scripture is a source, but by no means the only source, of Christian doctrine. Tertullian constantly appeals to the tradition of the Apostolic Churches, and lays down the principle on which all his arguments against heresy turn—viz. that the Apostles taught both by word and by letter.[3] A little before Tertullian's time, St. Irenaeus actually put the imaginary case that the Apostles had left no Scripture at all. In this case, he says, we should still be able to follow the order of tradition, which [the Apostles] handed down to those into whose hands they committed the Churches.[4]

3. There is a controversy no less vital between Catholics and Protestants as to the interpretation of Scripture. A popular Protestant theory makes it the right and the duty of each individual to interpret the Bible

[1] Iren. ii. 28, 2, *PG*, vii. 805.
[2] "Nefas omnino fuerit concedere sacrum ipsum auctorem errasse" (Leo XIII. *Provid. Deus*).

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 20.
[2] Jn. xxi. 25; and see Acts xx. 35.
[3] *Praescript.* 21, *PL*, ii. 33.
[4] Iren. iii. 4, 1, *PG*, vii. 855.

for himself and to frame his own religion accordingly; the Catholic, on the contrary, maintains that it belongs to the Church, and to the Church alone, to determine the true sense of the Scripture, and that we cannot interpret contrary to the Church's decision, or to "the unanimous consent of the Fathers," without making shipwreck of the faith. The Catholic is fully justified in believing with perfect confidence that the Church cannot teach any doctrine contrary to the Scripture, for our Lord has promised that the gates of hell will not prevail against His Church. On the other hand, Christ has made no promise of infallibility to those who expound Scripture by the light of private judgment. St. Peter tells us distinctly that some parts of the New Testament are hard to understand (2 Pet iii. 16). Moreover, the experience of centuries has abundantly confirmed the Catholic and disproved the Protestant rule of interpretation. Unity is the test of truth. If each man received the Holy Ghost, enabling him to ascertain the sense of the Bible, then pious Protestants would be at one as to its meaning and the doctrines which it contains, whereas it is notorious that they have differed from the first on every point of doctrine. The principle of private judgment has been from the time it was first applied a principle of division and of confusion, and has led only to the multiplication of heresies and sects, agreed in nothing except in their common disagreement with the Church. Nor does the authority of the Church in any way interfere with the scientific exposition of Scripture. A Catholic commentator is in no way limited to a servile repetition of the interpretation already given by the Fathers. He is not, indeed, permitted to give to any passage in Scripture a meaning which is at variance with the faith, as attested by the decision of the Church or the unanimous consent of the Fathers. But he may differ as to the meaning of passages in Scripture, even from the greatest of the Fathers; he is not bound to consider that these passages necessarily bear the meaning given them by general councils in the preambles to their decrees; he may even advance interpretations entirely new and unknown before. When, for example, God is said to have hardened Pharao's heart, a Catholic commentator cannot infer from this that the book of Exodus makes God the author of sin, but he may, if he sees cause, give an explanation of the words which differs from that of St. Augustine or St. Thomas, or, indeed, from that of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church taken together.[1]

4. We now come to the use of the Bible, and the Catholic principles on this head follow from what has been already said. It is not necessary for all Christians to read the Bible. Many nations, St. Irenaeus tells us, were converted and received the faith without being able to read.[1] Without knowledge of letters without a Bible in their own tongue, they received from the Church teaching which was quite sufficient for the salvation of their souls. Indeed, if the study of the Bible had been an indispensable requisite, a great part of the human race would have been left without the means of grace till the invention of printing. More than this, parts of the Bible are evidently unsuited to the very young or to the ignorant, and hence Clement XI. condemned the proposition that "the reading of Scripture is for all." These principles are fixed and invariable, but the discipline of the Church with regard to the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue has varied with varying circumstances. In early times, the Bible was read freely by the lay people, and the Fathers constantly encourage them to do so, although they also insist on the obscurity of the sacred text. No prohibitions were issued against the popular reading of the Bible. New dangers came in during the Middle Ages. When the heresy of the Albigenses arose there was a danger from corrupt translations, and also from the fact that the heretics tried to make the faithful judge the Church by their own interpretation of the Bible. To meet these evils, the Councils of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible. Pius IV. required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of Scripture unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such reading was likely to prove beneficial. The Popes have warned Catholics against Protestant Bible Societies, which distribute versions (mostly corrupt versions) of the Bible with the avowed purpose of perverting simple Catholics. It is only surprising that any rational being could have thought it possible for the Holy See to assume any other attitude towards such proceedings. Nevertheless the Church displays the greatest anxiety that her children should read the Scriptures, if they possess the necessary dispositions. "You judge exceedingly well," says Pius VI., in his letter to Martini, the author of a translation of the Bible into Italian, "that the faithful should be excited to the reading of holy Scriptures: for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to everyone, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine. This you have seasonably effected . . . by publishing the sacred Scriptures in the language of your country, . . . especially when you show that you have added explanatory notes, which being extracted from the holy Fathers preclude every possible danger of abuse." Leo XIII. granted indulgences to those who devoutly read the Scriptures (1898),

[1] Pallavicini, *Hist. Concil. Trident.* in Möhler's *Symbolism*, ii. p. 68.

[1] Iren. iii. 4, 2, *PG*, vii. 855.

and Benedict XV. commends the diligence of those who "spread far and wide copies of the Holy Gospels as well as of the other books of the Holy Scriptures, and in multiplying them so as to reach all men of goodwill" (Letter to Catholic Truth Society, March 2, 1915). (See CANON OF SCRIPTURE; INSPIRATION; the dogmatic theologians in their treatises "De Scriptura," *e.g.* Franzelin; Barry, "The Tradition of Scripture"; Gigot, "General Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures"; Cornely, "Introductio Generalis.")

BIBLIA PAUPERUM (the Bible of the poor.) A representation in between forty and fifty pictures of events in the Old and New Testaments, with short explanations and Scriptural texts appended in Latin or German. The redemption by Christ is the central idea of the collection, so that the Old Testament subjects are chosen for their typical significance. The paintings were often copied from the MSS. and represented in sculpture, or on walls, glass, the antipendia of altars &c. At Vienna there is an antipendium thus adorned which dates from the twelfth century. The Court library of the same city contains two copies of the "Biblia Pauperum," both of the year 1430. They are block books. Copies printed on movable types soon followed, but owing to the popularity of the book, copies were soon worn out, and are now very rare. (See Streber in "Kirchenlex.")

BIGAMY. [See IRREGULARITY; MARRIAGE; IRREGULARITY, *ex defectu Sacramenti*.]

BILOCATION. The fact or power of being in two places at once. Our Lord's glorified Body is in heaven and on countless altars on earth. [See EUCHARIST: *the mode of Christ's presence*.] That an ordinary material body can be in two places at once is physically impossible. But whether in an unglorified body bilocation involves an intrinsic contradiction, so that not even Omnipotence could bring it about, is a question into which we cannot now enter. Apparent instances in the lives of the Saints may be accounted for in other ways. (St. Thom., 3ª, q. 26, a. 5; Dalgairns, "Holy Communion," part I.)

BINATION. Saying a second Mass on the same day. The term for this in England is usually "duplication."[1] [See MASS, p. 566.]

BIRETTA, BERRETTA. A square cap with three or sometimes four prominences or projecting corners rising from its crown. There is usually a tassel or tuft in the middle where the corners meet. It is worn by a priest as he approaches the altar to say Mass, by ecclesiastics in choir, &c. The biretta worn by a cardinal is red. Leo XIII. granted to bishops the privilege of wearing a purple biretta (Feb. 3rd, 1888). Other clerics wear a black one. A four-cornered biretta belongs to Doctors of Divinity,[1] but this shape is worn by the clergy generally in France, Germany, and Spain.

The word is derived from *birrus*, a mantle with a hood, and that again from πυρρός, flame-coloured. "At Rome," says Benedict XIV., "and in most churches, the biretta was unknown as late as the ninth century. Its ecclesiastical use began when priests gave up the ancient custom of covering their heads with the amice till the actual beginning of the Mass."

The Pope does not wear a biretta, but a head-covering called the *camauro* (*q.v.*). (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." i. 9; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 510, 514; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

BISHOP. I. *Meaning of the Name and Divine Institution of the Office.*—The word bishop is derived from the Greek ἐπίσκοπος, which latter occurs in writers of the earliest age in the general sense of "overseer," and was specially applied in later Greek to the officers whom the Athenians sent to subject states. In the LXX[1] ἐπίσκοπος is used for an officer or prefect of any kind. The Christians adopted the word as the title of an ecclesiastical dignitary who has received the highest of the sacred orders and is invested with authority to rule a diocese as its chief pastor.

A bishop, therefore, is superior to simple priests, and the Council of Trent defines that this superiority is of divine institution. "If anyone deny," says the council, "that there is in the Church a hierarchy instituted by divine ordinance, which consists of bishops, presbyters, and ministers, let him be anathema"; and again, "if anyone affirm that bishops are not superior to presbyters, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, or that the power which they have is common to presbyters also, let him be anathema."[2]

The Anglican Church, as is well known, did not, at least formally, cast off belief in the divine institution of episcopacy, and learned Anglican divines, among whom Pearson is the most celebrated, have strenuously vindicated the episcopal authority. With most of the Protestant bodies it has been otherwise. They do not pretend to have bishops, or if they have superintendents whom they call by that name, they attribute to them no authority except such as has been bestowed upon them by the Church. They deny, in other words, that the episcopate is of divine institution, and directly impugn the definitions of Trent on this subject. They admit, of course, that bishops (ἐπίσκοποι) are frequently mentioned in the New Testament, but they urge that in the Acts and the Epistles bishop and presbyter are two names for the same office. They suppose that originally there were three grades in the hierarchy—

[1] Who, however, are forbidden to use this peculiar biretta in sacred functions. S.R.C. 7 Dec. 1844. But there is some doubt as to the precise force of this decree.

[1] *E.g.* Num. xxxi. 14; 2 Par. xxxiv. 12

[2] Sess. xxiii. can. 6, 7.

viz. the Apostles, whose office ended with their life-time, and who left no successors; the bishops or presbyters, corresponding to the ministers or clergymen of the present day; and deacons. They defend their position chiefly on the following grounds:—

We first find the word ἐπίσκοπος in the Acts of the Apostles, xx. 28. "Take heed," St. Paul says, to the clergy of Ephesus, "take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, in which the Holy Ghost made you bishops." It is plain, however, (so it is urged) that these "bishops" were mere presbyters, so that "bishop" and presbyter in New Testament language are synonymous, for St. Luke tells us at the beginning of the same chapter that the Apostle was addressing "the presbyters of the Church" whom he had summoned to Miletus. Towards the close of the Apostle's life the Church was still without bishops in the modern sense, for St. Paul addressed an epistle to the faithful at Philippi "with the bishops and the deacons." Here the plural number and the fact that no allusion is made to presbyters as distinct from the "bishops" are said to prove that in that age ἐπίσκοπος or "bishop" meant presbyter. Later still, St. Paul writes to Titus that he had left him in Crete to "appoint *presbyters* in every city," and continues—"for *the bishop* must be irreproachable," &c. Presbyterian writers also allege certain confirmatory evidence from antiquity—some words of St. Jerome (who, however, anxious as he was to exalt the priestly dignity, expressly mentions the power of conferring orders as marking the distinction between bishop and priest), and the supposed tradition of the Alexandrian Church. The reader who is curious on this latter point will find a full discussion of it in Pearson's "Vindiciae Ignatianae." But Presbyterian arguments from antiquity need not detain us here. Even on their own showing, Presbyterians can but produce one or two doubtful testimonies, and they have against them a cloud of witnesses dating from the sub-Apostolic age. One additional remark, however, must be made before we end our statement of the Presbyterian case. We have seen that there are plausible reasons for holding that the words presbyter and bishop are synonymous in the New Testament. It is right to add that Clement of Rome, writing towards the end of the first century, does not seem to recognize any distinction in meaning between the two words.[1]

In spite of the objections just stated, the arguments for the divine institution of episcopacy are clear and cogent. We need not deny that the same persons were at first called indifferently bishops and presbyters. It is possible, as some ancient writers suppose, that at Philippi and other places a number of persons received episcopal consecration; that they were occupied for a time in administering the sacraments and preaching at the place of their consecration, and ready, as convenience required, to be removed to such other Churches as the Apostles should empower them to govern with proper episcopal jurisdiction. Or again, we may suppose, with other great authorities, that the Apostles did not at once provide the newly-founded Churches with bishops, but left them for a season under clergy of the second order, who at that time were called indifferently "bishops" and presbyters.[1] Whatever theory we adopt as to the early use of the word "bishop," it is certain that there are clear traces of the episcopal office, as we now understand it, within the lifetime of the Apostles, and with the sanction of their authority.

For, first, St. James the Less was beyond reasonable doubt bishop of Jerusalem. Thus, in the year 44, when St. Peter was released from prison he desired information to be given to James and the brethren. At the Apostolic Council James adds his judgment to Peter's decision (Acts xv. 13 *sqq.*). St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians describes Judaisers from Jerusalem as "certain who came from James," thus naming the Church by its bishop; in Acts xxi. 18, St. Paul is said to have made a formal visit to St. James and to his presbyters. Moreover, in the middle of the second century all parties were agreed in regarding St. James as bishop of Jerusalem.[2] This is clearly proved by Bishop Lightfoot, who rightly describes St. James as "the precedent and pattern of the later episcopate." We refer to Dr. Lightfoot for this admission, not only because of his great learning and high ability, but also because he is perhaps the very ablest writer who has ever written against the Apostolic origin of episcopacy.

Next, St. Paul gave Titus power to ordain presbyters; he gives St. Timothy directions for the way in which he is to receive accusations against presbyters. Clearly then both Timothy and Titus were ecclesiastical officers superior to the clergy of the second order.

Thirdly, the Angels of the Churches in the Apocalypse cannot possibly be angels in the ordinary sense, for some of them are charged with serious faults. Nor can the Angels be identified with the Churches, since both Angels and Churches are represented by distinct symbols. "The seven stars," St. John says, "are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches." What, then, were the Angels of

[1] Clem. 1 *Ep.* 42, *PG*, i. 292. He thrice mentions ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι together, as in Phil. i. 1, which is striking, because the object of his epistle is to defend the authority of the presbyters. See Lightfoot, *in loc.*

[1] Petavius, *De Eccles. Hierarch.* lib. iv. *ad init.*, gives both theories as probable, quoting Fathers of the Church for each. The latter seems much the more attractive on intrinsic grounds. The former is recommended by the language of the Council of Trent, where Acts xx. 28 is interpreted of bishops in the proper sense.

[2] Lightfoot, Ep. to Philippians, "Essay on the Christian Ministry." Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. p. 228.

the Churches? Each of them represents the Church of a city, and is responsible for the purity of its doctrine and its morals. They answer to the idea of diocesan bishops and to nothing else.[1]

This inference from Scripture rises to demonstration if considered in connection with the earliest tradition. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, writes as a bishop and distinguishes himself from his presbyters. The Ignatian epistles notoriously exalt the episcopal office as the centre of unity, and insist on the necessity laid both on presbyters and laymen of submission to the bishop. St. Ignatius wrote only a few years after St. John's death, and his letters prove that episcopacy was established in his time, not only at Antioch, where he himself was bishop, but at each of the six Churches in Asia Minor to which he writes, nor does he hint that there was any Church with other than an episcopal organisation. True, the authenticity of these letters has been disputed, but this on most inadequate grounds. Indeed, many eminent German scholars, prejudiced as they are against the Ignatian teaching on episcopacy, have been compelled by the weight of evidence to admit the authenticity of these epistles. The Clementine homilies supply another important contribution to the evidence. [See CLEMENTINE LITERATURE.] Their witness is all the more valuable because they are deeply marked with heresy. Still the author of these homilies, differing as he does from Catholics on other points, agrees with them in affirming the Apostolic origin of the episcopal office.[2] These homilies come from early times: they cannot be placed later than the end, and should perhaps be placed at the beginning, of the second century. Now, if we allow the Apostolic institution, this ancient evidence presents no difficulty. It does but confirm the conclusion we had already reached from an examination of the New Testament records. If, on the other hand, it is maintained that bishops in the modern sense began to be after the death of the Apostles, or at least without their sanction, it is impossible to understand how in so brief a space Churches all over the world exchanged presbyterian for episcopal government. Nor is this all. We must suppose that in a very short time—within a century at the most—all recollection of the original state of things had perished. St. Irenaeus cannot even understand that the name of "bishop"[3] had ever been given to mere presbyters. We say nothing of later Fathers, for in the Church of the fourth century it is admitted to have been a settled maxim that bishops only could ordain, and Epiphanius describes the doctrine of Aerius, the first presbyterian, as frantic.

II. *Nature of the Episcopal Office.*—We may now dismiss the controversial part of the subject, and proceed to explain the *duties*, *rights* and *position* of a bishop in the Church. A bishop is, according to the Council of Trent, the successor of the Apostles. He has received the sacrament of Order in all its fulness. He can, like the Apostles, confirm; he can ordain priests and consecrate other bishops. The Pope himself, so far as Order goes, is simply a bishop. Moreover, the bishop is the member of a hierarchy which is divinely constituted, and which collectively represents the college of the Apostles. The Holy Ghost has appointed bishops "to rule the Church of God," and although the Pope can suppress sees or change their boundaries, he cannot do away, throughout the Church, with bishops governing their sees with ordinary jurisdiction, because this would involve a change in the divine constitution of the Church, which is inalterable. Again, even an individual bishop has certain duties to the whole Church. It is his duty to bear witness to the faith and tradition of his predecessors and of his flock, and he sits as a judge in general councils. Of course all these rights are held and duties exercised in union with and in submission to the see of Peter.

1. In his own diocese it is a bishop's duty (*a*) to *teach*. He himself is required by the Council of Trent to preach the word of God, unless he be lawfully hindered, nor can anyone, secular or regular, preach in the diocese without his leave. He must watch over purity of doctrine, especially in all schools public and private, and appoint professors in the seminary and clerical colleges. No book treating on religion (*de rebus sacris*) can be published till it has been examined by the bishop's orders and received his imprimatur.[1]

(*b*) To guard the morals of his flock, and especially to maintain discipline among his clergy; to take measures for the due performance of divine worship; to see that the people are provided with the sacraments, &c. He himself (or another bishop, with his leave) must confirm, ordain priests, consecrate the holy oils, churches, altars, chalices, &c. He must also approve priests, and give them their faculties to hear confessions, to administer the other sacraments, &c., &c.

(*c*) To reside.[2] (*d*) To make a visitation of all the churches in his diocese at least every two years.[3]

2. In order that he may perform these duties, a bishop possesses certain rights:—

(*a*) He may make laws for his diocese: not, however, such as are contrary to the law of the Church.

[1] See the authorities for this interpretation in Petav. *op. cit.* lib. i. 2. It was adopted by Grotius, one of the most celebrated of Protestant commentators, and himself member of a Presbyterian sect.

[2] See, *e.g.*, the Epistle of Clement to James.

[3] iii. 14, 2, *PG*, vii. 914. The passage is very instructive. St. Irenaeus says St. Paul at Miletus "convoked the bishops *and* the presbyters." He is evidently unable to understand the interchange of names.

[1] Concil. Trident. sess. v. cap. 2, De Reform.; sess. xxiv. cap. 4, De Reform.; sess. iv. De Edit. et Usu SS. lib.

[2] *Ibid.* sess. xxiii. cap. 1, De Reform.

[3] Concil. Trid. sess. xxiv. cap. 3.

(*b*) He decides in the first instance all ecclesiastical causes.

(*c*) He can inflict penalties, suspension, excommunication, and the like.

(*d*) He may dispense from the observance of his own laws, and although, generally speaking, a bishop cannot dispense in laws made by those who have power superior to his own, still the general law of the Church enables him to dispense in certain cases of irregularity, in the proclamation of banns, in oaths (unless the dispensation tends to the injury of a third party), and in simple vows, except vows of chastity and vows to enter religion, or to make pilgrimages to Rome, the Holy Land, or St. James of Compostella, &c., &c. Some bishops have additional power to dispense by virtue of lawful custom or by delegation from the Pope.

(*e*) Certain other rights of bishops are summed up under the general head of "administration." A bishop may erect or suppress churches or benefices, provided he observes the canonical regulation respecting such matters. He collates to all benefices, parish churches, prebends in his diocese, except such as are reserved to the Pope. He assigns their duties to his clergy, and determines the persons among his subjects who are to be admitted to the ecclesiastical state or to higher orders. He watches over the management of temporal goods pertaining to the Church or to pious places. As Apostolic Delegate, he becomes in certain cases mentioned by the law the executor to carry out the intentions of those who have given or left money for pious uses.[1]

III. *Titles, Insignia, &c., of Bishops.*—All priests saying Mass in the diocese pray for the bishop by name in the Canon. He is received by the priests and people at the door of the church when he comes on official visits. He receives certain titles of honour. In the first ages he was called Most Holy, Most Blessed, Lord (*dominus*), "Your Holiness" (*sanctitas tua*), "Your Beatitude," &c., &c., some of which titles are now reserved to the Pope. Desiderius of Cahors, about 650, calls himself *servus servorum*.[2] At present a bishop is called "most illustrious and most reverend Lord"; the Pope addresses him as "venerable brother," "your fraternity," &c., while the bishop speaks of himself as "N., by the grace of God and of the Apostolic See, Bishop of N." The insignia of his office are the pastoral staff (*pedum, baculus*), the ring, pectoral cross, episcopal throne, the mitre, pontifical vestments, gloves and sandals. In many countries the bishop has special rights and titles of honour accorded to him by the laws of the State.

IV. *Election, &c., of Bishops.*—Bishops were first of all chosen by the Apostles. St. Paul, for instance, left St. Titus at Crete, with authority to ordain priests, &c.

In the third century bishops were chosen, as Cyprian says, "by the suffrage of the clergy and the people" of the province[1]—*i.e.* the people chose a bishop, but the bishops of the province could put a veto on this choice: nay, the bishops could in extreme cases actually choose the bishop. The fourth canon of Nicaea recommends (*προσήκει*) that a bishop be appointed (*καθίστασθαι*) by the bishops of the province. If this is impossible, three bishops are to consecrate him with the consent of the rest. The confirmation of the whole matter (*τὸ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων*) is to rest with the Metropolitan. Two interpretations of this canon were current in the Church. The Greek canonists, following the lead of the Seventh General Council, understood the Nicene canon as reserving the choice of a new bishop to the bishops of the province, and so annulling the old form of election by clergy and people. In the West, the canon was interpreted as merely requiring the presence of the bishops of the province at the consecration. Hence in the Latin Church popular election continued, at least in form, till the eleventh century. After that, the bishop was elected by the clergy of the cathedral church, the confirmation resting, as before, with the Metropolitan.[2] Gradually, from the eleventh century onwards, the right of confirmation passed from the Metropolitan to the Pope.[3] Later on, from the time of Clement V., the Popes reserved the whole appointment of bishops in certain cases, and at last in all cases, to themselves. This last state of things, however, did not continue. The Popes restored in some countries the right of electing bishops to the chapters,[4] and the right is still continued in Germany (except Bavaria and part of Austria) and in Switzerland. In other countries the Pope has given to Catholic sovereigns the right of nominating to vacant bishoprics. Such rights have been conceded to the Kings of France, Portugal, Spain, Naples and Sicily, Sardinia, to the Emperor of Austria with certain exceptions, and by the Concordat of 1817 to the King of Bavaria. Even Protestant Governments in Germany are permitted to inspect a list of names proposed provisionally by the chapters and to exclude such names as are displeasing to them. In England the choice of bishops belongs simply and exclusively to the Pope. At the same time certain privileges have been granted in this respect to the English Church by Pius IX. A week after the see is vacant the canons are required to elect a vicar capitular. A month later, under the presidency of the metropolitan, or, failing him, of

[1] Concil. Trid. sess. xxii. cap. 8, De Reform. Chiefly from Card. Soglia, *Institut. Juris Eccl.*
[2] Kraus, "*Real-Encyklop.*" Art. "Bischof."

[1] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxviii., ed. Hartel, 745.
[2] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 539.
[3] Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 326.
[4] Soglia, *Institut. Juris Privat.* v. 38.

the senior bishop, they by their separate votes recommend three persons for the vacant see. Each of these persons must have obtained an absolute majority of the votes of the chapter. The names are given or sent in alphabetical order to the Metropolitan. The bishops of the province examine the names, annex their judgment upon each of them, and transmit them to the Consistorial Congregation. It need scarcely be said that this recommendation is wholly different from true and canonical election.[1] The person thus elected, nominated or recommended must be thirty years of age, in holy orders, of Catholic parentage, of good fame, able to produce the public testimony of some university or academy to his learning.[2] In the case of a true election, the person elected must within a fixed time ask for the Papal confirmation, by which he is approved and made bishop of the see. This confirmation is given by the Pope in a consistory of Cardinals, and in virtue of it the bishop designate contracts spiritual marriage with his see and receives full jurisdiction within it. He cannot, of course, previous to his consecration, confirm, ordain, &c., but he can delegate power for the performance of these and other acts of episcopal order to another bishop.

It is evident from what has been said that the discipline of the Church with regard to the appointment of bishops has varied from age to age, and that the Holy See now exercises a more immediate control over the matter than was usual in the primitive or even the mediaeval Church. From the first, however, the Pope possessed the full power of governing the whole Church, No one is, and no one ever could be, a Catholic bishop, unless either expressly or tacitly recognized as such by the Pope. Varying circumstances made it prudent for the Pope to exercise his control in a less or in a greater degree, but the principle of government has remained the same. The Pope, by the law of Christ, is the head of the Church. On the other hand, Patriarchs and Metropolitans are of ecclesiastical institution; they could therefore possess no inherent right to confirm bishops, and they suffered no wrong when the Pope withdrew it from them.

V. *Consecration of Bishops.*—The consecration of bishops used to be performed by the Metropolitan and two other bishops. According to the present discipline, the consecration of bishops is reserved to the Pope, or to a bishop specially commissioned by him. The consecrator is assisted by two other bishops, for which latter the Pope sometimes permits mitred abbots, or even simple priests, to be substituted. The consecration should take place within three months of confirmation, and on a Sunday, or feast of an Apostle. The bishop-elect, who must already have been ordained priest, takes an oath before the bishop who is to consecrate him, that he will be faithful to the Holy See, that he will promote its authority, and that he will, at stated intervals prescribed by law, and different for different countries, visit the city of Rome, and give an account to the Pope of his whole pastoral office. Afterwards, the elect is consecrated bishop by imposition of hands, with prayer, the tradition of staff and ring, the unction with the chrism, the imposition of the book of the Gospels on his shoulders, and other rites prescribed in the Pontifical. Thus the fulness of the priesthood is received, and the person consecrated acquires episcopal order in addition to episcopal jurisdiction, which he already held. [See also ORDER, HOLY.]

VI. *Translation, Resignation, Deposition of Bishops.*—So sacred is the connection between a bishop and his see, that, as Innocent III. declares, the power to sever it belongs, "not so much by canonical legislation, as by divine institution, to the Roman Pontiff, and to him alone." This follows from principles already stated.

Translation from one see to another was absolutely forbidden by the Nicene Council (Can. 15), and by the Council of Antioch, which met in 341. This prohibition was, however, modified by the 14th of the Apostolic Canons, which permits translation if the reasons are very urgent and approved by the judgment of "many bishops."[1] At first, such translation was effected by provincial councils. In the ninth century, Hincmar of Rheims says a bishop might be translated "by the ordinance of a synod, or by the consent of the Apostolic See"; but by the law which has prevailed from the twelfth century the consent of the Pope is always required. The Pope's leave is also required for resignation. Finally, the "grave causes" against bishops such as deserve deposition or privation can only be examined and terminated by the definitive sentence of the Pope.[2] Less serious charges may be examined and decided in a provincial council (See the treatises of the theologians and canonists, "De Ordine"; Taunton, 79-123; Vives y Tuto, "De Dignitate et Officiis Episcoporum"; Ferraris, *Episcopus*; Petavius, "De Episcopis et eorum Jurisdictione et Auctoritate"; Bouix, "De Episcopo.")

BISHOP AUXILIARY. When a bishop is unable, for various reasons, to perform all the functions required by his office, it is usual to assign to him a titular bishop to assist him. This auxiliary bishop, as such, has no jurisdiction; he only performs those things which belong to the episcopal office and order. He may, however, be nominated by the

[1] See *Synod. Provinc. Westmonast.* decret. xii. and the Instruction of Propaganda in the Appendix.
[2] Concil. Trid. sess. xxii. cap. 2, De Reform

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 718, 720, 760; Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii. p. 233.
[2] Concil. Trid. sess. xxiv. cap. 5, De Reform.

bishop as vicar general; in which case he has the right to exercise jurisdiction. Another less usual name for an auxiliary is Bishop Suffragan [*q.v.*].

BISHOP, COADJUTOR. [See COADJUTOR.]

BISHOP IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM. A bishop consecrated to a see which formerly existed, but which has been, chiefly through the devastations of the followers of Mahomet, lost to Christendom. Such a bishop may also be described as a "Titular" bishop. (See below.)

The creation of such titular bishops dates only from the pontificate of Leo X., but they existed *de facto* from the time when the first Christian see was widowed by the attacks of a foreign enemy or the action of a hostile government. Gregory the Great provided for several Illyrian bishops, whom an inroad of the Avars had driven from their sees, by appointing them to vacant sees in Italy, till they should be able to return home. The Moorish conquest of Spain widowed a great number of sees, the prelates of which fled to the parts still unconquered, chiefly settling at Oviedo, which thence had the name of "the City of Bishops." But it was the progress of Mahometan arms in the East, devastating numberless Churches in Asia Minor, Syria, and Africa, which, till then, had been flourishing bishoprics, that caused a great and sudden rise in the number of titular bishops, attached to no special sphere of duty, but wandering from place to place, some hoping one day to return, others seeking for suitable work wherever it might be offered. This state of things led to great abuses; for a bishop whose see was *in partibus* would often enter some remote portion of the diocese of a more fortunate brother further west, and there exercise in various ways, without the permission of the bishop of the diocese, his episcopal office. Clerks whom their own bishop would not have promoted to priest's orders often received through the agency of these wandering bishops the ordination which they desired. This abuse was condemned by a decree of the Council of Trent,[1] which expressly forbids these wandering bishops—"clero carentes et populo Christiano"—to promote candidates for ordination to any orders whatever, without the consent of the bishop of the diocese.

With the increasing complication of political affairs in Europe, circumstances could not but arise which should induce the Popes, while providing for Catholic populations more or less at the mercy of Protestant Governments pastors armed with full episcopal powers, to prefer investing them with the titles of ancient sees, now extinct, to asserting their claim to local titles and thus arousing the hostility or suspicion of unfriendly Governments. Considerations of this nature were the cause why Catholic affairs in our own country were committed to the administration of bishops *in partibus*, from the appointment of the first Vicar Apostolic (1623) to the creation of a new hierarchy in 1850. Besides the Vicars Apostolic in a non-Catholic country, the Vicars of Cardinal-bishops, auxiliary bishops in countries where it is usual to appoint them, and Papal Nuncios, usually have their sees *in partibus infidelium*.

Bishops *in partibus* can attend general councils. They are considered as truly wedded to the Churches of which they bear the titles, so that they cannot be appointed to other sees except upon the conditions common to all episcopal translations. They are not obliged, like other bishops, to make periodical visits *ad limina apostolorum*, because they have no dioceses to report of. They are, however, expected to inform themselves, so far as they may have opportunity, of the condition of affairs in their titular dioceses, and work actively for their restoration to Christendom, if any favourable opening should present itself.

The political condition of the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean has for some time been such as to allow of the existence of flourishing Christian communities in many places where formerly Mussulman bigotry would have rendered it impossible. These countries are no longer "partes infidelium," in the full sense of the words. Leo XIII. therefore substituted the phrase "Titular Bishop" for "Bishop in Partibus Infidelium."

BISHOP, SUFFRAGAN (Lat. *suffragari*, to support). This name is given to a bishop in an ecclesiastical province, relatively to the Metropolitan [*q.v.*] in whose province he is. Also to a titular bishop or bishop *in partibus* who is exercising the pontifical functions and ordinations for the ordinary bishop whom he has been invited to assist.

BISHOP, TITULAR. [See BISHOP IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM.]

BLACK FRIARS. [See DOMINICANS.]

BLACK MONKS. [See BENEDICTINES.]

BLASPHEMY (Gr. *βλασφημία*). Originally, injurious and opprobrious words generally; afterwards it was restricted to language dishonouring to God—*contumeliosa in Deum locutio*—but yet so that the offence committed against those known to be God's servants was held to be committed against God Himself; as when Stephen was charged by the Pharisees with speaking "blasphemous words against Moses" (Acts vi. 11); finally, and in modern use, the employment of such language against, or concerning, God only. In Mt. xii. 31, we read that, while every other sin and blasphemy are pardonable, "the blasphemy of the Spirit" shall not be forgiven. Various explanations of this passage have been given by theologians. There is a

[1] Sess. xiv. De Ref. ii.

chapter on "Blasphemy" in the body of the Canon Law, which prescribes the penalties to be awarded to the various persons who may be guilty of it. In England the statute 10 William III. ch. 32, modified by 52 George III. ch. 160, contains the law in respect of blasphemy. The code of Würtemberg punishes outrageous and offensive words or acts against the customs, rites, &c., of any recognized religion; but the pain inflicted on the feelings of men, not the dishonour to God, seems to be the motive of such legislation. Similarly the French code, while not punishing blasphemy, as such, restrains it indirectly by severe regulations repressive of anything like what we should consider "brawling" in church.

Protestant divines have often stigmatized the rapturous language in which Catholics indulge in praise of the Blessed Virgin as "blasphemous," on the ground that God is indirectly dishonoured when His creature is thus exalted. But this seems to involve a misuse of the term "blasphemy" which implies a conscious and intentional use of language which the speaker knows to be injurious to the Being of whom it is uttered. No excess of "profane swearing," culpable as it may be, can amount to blasphemy, because the intentional contempt of God is not there. In the same way, to speak of Mary as "negotiating our peace," not only is not "blasphemous," but conveys an important truth; while to deny that her Son "negotiated our peace" in a higher sense would, of course, be blasphemous in the highest degree. (St. Thom. $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, qq. 13–14; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. 366; Oblet, in DThC.)

BLESSED (title). [See CANONIZATION, p. 115.]

BLESSING, in its most general sense, a form of prayer begging the favour of God for the persons blessed. God is the source of all His blessing, but certain persons have special authority to bless in His name, so that this blessing is more than a mere prayer; it actually conveys God's blessing to those who are fit to receive it. Thus in the old law God said of the sons of Aaron, "They shall invoke my name on the children of Israel, and I will bless them";[1] and Christ said to his disciples, "Into whatsoever house you enter, first say: Peace be to this house: and, if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him."[2] Accordingly, the Church provides for the solemn blessing of her children by the hands of her ministers. Such blessings are given,

(1) By priests. "It is the part of a priest to bless," the Pontifical says, in the office for their ordination. This blessing may be given privately, at discretion. It is given by a form tolerated in England to the penitent before confession; to those who have received communion out of Mass; on many other occasions, some of which are determined by custom, but above all at the end of all Masses except those for the dead. The priest raises his right hand and makes the sign of the cross once over the people. This custom of priests blessing at Mass is not very ancient. The older writers on ritual make no mention of it, and although it was known to the author of the "Micrologus," a contemporary of Gregory VII., the custom does not seem to have been universally received even then. At one time priests used to make the sign of the cross three times over the people. Pius V. restricted them to a blessing with a single sign of the cross, except in solemn Masses; Clement VIII. made the rule, which forbids a priest to bless with the triple sign of the cross, absolute.

(2) By bishops. A bishop immediately after his consecration is conducted round the church, blessing the people; and afterwards, returning to the altar, blesses them solemnly, making the triple sign of the cross. He uses the same rite of blessing whenever he says Mass. An abbot, according to the decrees of Alexander VII., can give the blessing with the triple sign of the cross only when he celebrates Mass pontifically. (See Benedict XIV. "De Miss." ii. 24.)

(3) By the Pope. The Pope blesses the people solemnly at Easter, on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, and also on other special occasions. To this papal blessing (*Benedictio Pontificia seu Apostolica*) a plenary indulgence is attached, to be gained by the faithful on certain conditions. Bishops in virtue of a special indult sometimes receive the privilege of bestowing the Papal blessing at stated times. The bishop gives it after Mass, first causing the Apostolic letters, which confer the plenary indulgence, to be read. The power of bestowing it is also sometimes communicated to simple priests—*e.g.* to regulars, at the conclusion of a mission, &c.

Hitherto we have been occupied with blessings bestowed upon the faithful in general. But there are also blessings reserved for special persons or for special objects. Gavantus and other writers on ritual divide blessings of this kind[1] into two classes—viz. into *benedictiones invocativae*, or blessings which merely invoke the blessing of God upon persons or things; and *benedictiones constitutivae*, or blessings which set apart a person or thing for the service of God. To the former class belongs the blessing of houses, fields, ships, candles, food, &c., &c.; to the latter the blessing of sacerdotal vestments, corporals, altar-cloths, &c. It is impossible to distinguish accurately between the use of the word consecration and blessing when it is

[1] Num. vi. 2. [2] Lk. x. 5.

[1] This division really includes all blessings, for such as are given to the faithful generally fall under the head of *Benedictiones invocativae*.

used in the sense of *benedictio constitutiva*; but consecration denotes a more solemn form of blessing, so that we speak of blessing an abbot or a bell, but of consecrating a bishop or an altar. [See CONSECRATION.] Of these blessings some (such as that of the *Agnus Dei*, and the rose sent to sovereigns) are reserved to the Pope; others (*e.g.* the blessing of a king or queen at their coronation, of bells, vestments, &c.) are proper to bishops; others (such as the blessing of houses, fields, medals, crosses, &c.) may be given by simple priests, though, of course, for many blessings special faculties are required.

With regard to the rite employed, the more ordinary blessings are given by the priest in surplice and stole, with prayer, accompanied by the sign of the cross and very often by the use of holy water. In other more solemn blessings other rites are added, such as exorcisms, incensation and anointing with the holy oils. The principles on which these special blessings rest are very simple. God made all things good, but although matter still remains good, it has been marred, and is constantly abused by the spirits of evil. Hence the Church, in the power and name of Christ, rescues persons and things from the power of the devil. Further, she prays that the things which she blesses may avail to the spiritual and bodily health of her children. It may be asked, how water, or medals, or candles, can possibly help us on the way to heaven. In themselves plainly they have no such power. But they tend to excite good dispositions in those who use them aright, not only because they remind us of holy things, but also because they have been blessed for our use by the prayers of the Church. There is surely no superstition in believing that if the Church prays that the sight or use of pious objects may excite good desires in her children, God will listen to these prayers and touch in a special way the hearts of those who use them aright. ("Pontificale Romanum"; "Rituale Romanum"; Schulte, "Benedicenda.")

BLOOD. [See BAPTISM, § III. See also PRECIOUS BLOOD.]

BOAT. The vessel that holds the incense before it is put into the censer. It is so called from its shape. [See THURIBLE.]

BOHEMIAN BRETHREN. The gentleness with which the Council of Basle dealt with the Hussites, and the evident desire of the majority of the prelates to go to the verge of lawful concession in order to restore them to the unity of the Church, deprived the schism of much of its *raison d'être*. The moderate party (Calixtines) were disposed to be satisfied with the concession as to communion under both species, joined to a promise that clerical abuses should be reformed; while the violent section (Taborites), after a long succession of victories over their German foes, were signally defeated at Laban (1434), and after that found it necessary to abate their pretensions. Some years passed; a Taborite remnant which had found shelter at Lititz, on the frontiers of Moravia and Silesia, throve unmolested; its leaders plunged anew into the dreamy mysticism which has such charms for the Slavonian mind; they fraternized with some scattered Calixtine pastors, who were discontented with what they regarded as the undue pliability of the mass of their party, and the "Union of the Bohemian Brothers" (1457) was the result. Three of their leading men, Kunwald, Prelautsch, and Krenov, were ordained (1467) by a Vaudois bishop. Under the Bohemian prince George Podiebrad (died 1471) they were subjected to much persecution. Vladislav, his successor, left them undisturbed, and in his long reign they grew greatly in numbers and solidity; about 1500, they possessed two hundred churches in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Reformation came, the brethren, after vainly endeavouring to extract an approval of the "Apology" for their system which they had drawn up from the wary Erasmus, made overtures to Luther. These were well received; but the brethren were scandalized at the lack of discipline which prevailed among Luther's followers, and for a long time there was a coolness; ultimately, however, something like a cordial understanding was established. The toleration which the brethren had long enjoyed was withdrawn, about the middle of the sixteenth century, by Ferdinand, brother to Charles V.; and many of them emigrated in consequence to Prussia and Poland. The Emperors Maximilian and Rodolph (1564–1612) were favourable to them; the latter gave them permission to found an Academy and a Consistory, to hold churches and found new ones on the estates of their adherents. With prosperity, says their historian, Comenius, came the relaxation of their peculiar discipline. They joined the general rising of the Bohemian Protestants against Ferdinand II., and after the battle of the White Hill (1620) were implicated in the consequences of their defeat. Many thousands of them abandoned their native soil; and of those who remained, hoping against hope that the old state of things would one day be restored, the greater number, at last renouncing that hope, quitted Bohemia in 1721 and found a refuge on the estate of Count Zinzendorf, in Lusatia. Under the name *Herrn-huters* or *Moravians*, the new organization which these refugees, aided by their patron Zinzendorf (who to a mystical and imaginative turn united much quiet power and practical sagacity), succeeded in forming, has gained a world-wide notoriety. John Wisby's connexion with them is well known. The Brethren who still lingered on in Bohemia adhered under Joseph II. (1780–1790) to the Helvetic Confession, because that Emperor would tolerate in his dominions

no other Protestant doctrine but either that or the Confession of Augsburg

With regard to their doctrine and discipline, it is unnecessary to say that they admitted neither the authority of the chair of Peter nor the unity of the visible Church. After the Reformation period they adopted Luther's opinions on most other points, but would not follow him in embracing the tenet of consubstantiation: they would only allow of a mystical union of the Body and Blood of Christ with the elements, and denied anything like a real presence. Their organization was the most remarkable thing about them. They divided themselves into three classes, the Beginners, the Proficients, and the Perfect (*incipientes, proficientes, perfecti*). From the ranks of the Perfect were chosen the ministers, who were also of three kinds, acolytes or deacons, pastors or priests, and bishops or presidents. They had four fast days of obligation in the year. In relation to sin, the laity (if their offences were of an open nature—for such only, in the absence of confession, could the system reach) were subjected to three degrees of discipline: warning, public reproof, and excommunication. At the present day the Moravians number about 40,000, more than half being in the United States, and about 7,000 in Great Britain. They have small missions among the heathens in each of the great continents. (See Borowy, *Brüder, Boehmische*, in "Kirchenlex."; Wilhelm in "Cath. Enc."; "Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society"; Bareille, *Bohèmes, les Frères* in DThC.)

BOLLANDISTS. A name given to the Jesuit editors of the great "Acta Sanctorum," or Lives of the Saints. The first plan of the work came from the Flemish Jesuit Rosweyde, who calculated the size of the whole work at eighteen volumes. He, however, died in 1629, without actually beginning the work. His papers were entrusted to another Jesuit, John Bolland (Bollandus, born in the Netherlands, 1596—died 1665), who settled at Antwerp and opened a correspondence with learned men over Europe, in order to procure the documents useful for his purpose. The plan grew in the hands of Bolland, and in 1635 his brother-Jesuit Godfrey Henschen (born 1601—died 1681) was appointed to help him. In 1634, two large folios appeared containing the lives of the Saints who are commemorated in January; they were followed in 1658 by three more folios, containing the Saints for February. Two years later a new labourer was secured, the Jesuit Daniel Papenbroeck (Papebroch) (born 1628—died 1714), and, at the wish of Pope Alexander VII., Henschen and Papebroch travelled through France, Germany, and Italy, where they found many precious MSS. A little later Bolland died, but the number of those who laboured at the work was continually recruited from the society; indeed, even after the suppression of the Jesuits, the Bollandist Lives were still continued by ex-Jesuits, until in 1794 the French Revolutionary troops entered the Netherlands, and put an end for the time to this great undertaking. At that date the Lives had reached the 53rd volume, which was printed at Tongerloo in the very year the French troops entered, and contained Lives of the Saints from the 12th to the 15th October. The papers of the Jesuit fathers were scattered, some perishing entirely, others being preserved in the Royal Library at the Hague, and in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. Napoleon desired in vain to procure a continuation of the work. At last, in 1837, the Belgian Government entrusted the prosecution of the work to the Society of Jesus, and a prospectus was published, "De Prosecutione Operis Bollandiani." The first volume of the new series was published in 1845. Additional volumes have since appeared, the latest being vol. lxvi. The "Analecta Bollandiana" contain materials bearing on the "Acta." (De Smedt in "Cath. Enc."; Van den Gheyn, *Acta Sanctorum* in DThC.)

BOLSENA, MASS OR MIRACLE OF. A portent which is said to have happened at Bolsena (the ancient Volsinium) in the reign of Urban IV. This Pope was still in doubt whether he should cause the feast of Corpus Christi to be kept throughout the Church. While he held his court at Orvieto in the year 1264, a priest in the neighbouring city of Bolsena spilt a drop of the Precious Blood from the chalice with which he was saying Mass, and tried to conceal the accident by covering the spot where the consecrated wine had fallen, with the corporal. Suddenly the corporal was covered with red spots in the shape of a host. This miracle led the Pope to delay the institution of the feast no longer. The corporal is still preserved at Orvieto, and the event is commemorated in a famous picture of Raphael's in the Vatican. (See Hefele in "Kirchenlex." and Benedict XIV. "De Festis," *De Festo Corporis Christi*, where another account is also given, according to which the miracle happened to remove the priest's doubts in transubstantiation.) The story is not supported by strong historical evidence. Urban makes no mention of it in his bull. The phenomenon of red spots on the corporal is capable of a natural explanation.

BONA MORS. (Happy death.) A confraternity whose object is to prepare its members by a well-regulated life to die in peace with God. It was founded in Rome by Fr. Vincent Caraffa, S.J., in 1648, and has been approved by several of the Popes.

BON SECOURS. (1) This institute of religious sisters was founded in 1822 by Mgr. de Quélen, archbishop of Paris, for the care of the sick in their own homes and also of

orphans. It was approved by the Holy See in 1875, and has houses in England, Ireland, and the United States.

(2) Bon Secours (of Troyes). A similar institute founded in 1840 by Canon Millet of Troyes. It was approved in 1899, and has many houses in various countries.

BONI HOMINES. Several monastic brotherhoods have borne this name. (1) The order founded in the eleventh century by St. Stephen Grandmont was once so called. A house of theirs at Vincennes having been transferred by Henry III. in 1584 to the Minims, these (2) came to be called in France *Bons hommes*. (3) A Portuguese order of Canons, founded in the fifteenth century by John Vicenza, Bishop of Lamego, had the same appellation. After a time they had fourteen houses in Portugal, and we read of their sending missionaries to the Indies and to Ethiopia. (4) Matthew Paris describes the arrival in England in 1257 of some friars of an order previously unknown, whom he calls *fratres saccati*. Comparing this with a passage in Polydore Vergil referring to the same year, we find that these unknown religious professed the rule of St. Austin, and were called in England "Boni Homines."

Roger de Hoveden, under the year 1165, gives an abstract of the proceedings of a council held at Lombez, near Toulouse, which examined and condemned some heretics calling themselves Boni Homines, whose tenets seem to have closely resembled those of the Cathari and Paulicians. [ALBIGENSES.]

BOWING. [See GENUFLEXION.]

BRASSES. Engraved sepulchral memorials on brass are so called, which began to a large extent to supersede stone tombs and effigies in the course of the thirteenth century. One great advantage of their use was that they could be let into the pavement: they took up no room in the church. Once introduced, the fashion spread rapidly; improvements and developments appeared; and during three centuries brasses may be said to have been in general use. The material employed was hard *latten* or sheet brass. The Reformation brought in a period of plunder and destruction, from which (especially the former, because of the intrinsic value of the metal) our brasses suffered enormously. Their number must have been very great, if it be true that four thousand are still preserved in various parts of England. They were once equally common in France, Germany, and Holland; in France, however, all that escaped the Huguenots were purloined by the revolutionists. There are fine brasses at Meissen and Freiberg in Saxony, at Werden and Paderborn in Westphalia, and at Bruges in Flanders. The greater number of those preserved in England are in the eastern counties; the churches of Ipswich, Norwich, Lynn, and Lincoln, are exceptionally rich in them. The chapel of Merton College, Oxford, once possessed a large number; but many have disappeared, and of those that remain some have been sadly mutilated. The earliest English brass now in existence is said to be that of Sir Roger de Trumpington, at Trumpington, near Cambridge; its date is 1289. That of Sir John d'Abernon, at Stoke d'Abernon in Surrey (1327), is exceedingly fine; the effigy is the size of life. In Acton Burnell church there is a well-known one of a Lord Burnell, dating from the same century. In the fifteenth century this art, in respect both of design and of execution, reached its acme. In the cathedral of Constance there is a fine brass of English workmanship commemorating a bishop of Salisbury, Robert Hallam, who died during the council held at that city (1414–17). In the sixteenth century the figures become portraits. "The incised lines were filled up with some black resinous substance, and the armorial decorations and back-ground with mastic, or coarse enamel of various colours." (Parker's "Gloss. of Arch."; the subject of English brasses is exhaustively treated in the work of Cotman.)

BREAD. For the bread used in the Mass see EUCHARIST, p. 328, and ALTAR BREAD. The "Eulogiae" [*q.v.*] were the remains of the bread blessed at the offertory but not consecrated. The "pain bénit" is no part of the offertory, but common bread blessed with one of the forms in the Rituale. (See Rock, i. p. 110.)

BREVIARY. The word Breviary is of mediaeval origin and Fleury could find no example of its use before 1099. It signifies a compendium or abridged collection and is a volume containing the extracts needed from the Holy Scriptures, the Lectionaries, Antiphonaries, Collections of Liturgical Prayers, &c., to enable a cleric to recite in its entirety the Hours or daily Divine Office. But the recitation of the Breviary is the continuation of a practice which was in use from the infancy of the Church, nay, which the Church herself received from the Synagogue. We may divide the history of the Breviary prayer into four periods: the first from the beginning of Church history down to Pope Damasus in the fourth century; the second extending to the reign of Gregory VII. in the eleventh; the third to that of Pius V. in the sixteenth; while the fourth period stretches from Pius V. to our own day. In these periods we propose to trace the history of the hours of prayer, the origin, the completion, and the final revisions of the Breviary. We shall treat in conclusion of its component parts, of the obligation of reciting it, and of the authority which belongs to its teaching.

I. *The Hours of Prayer in the first Four Centuries.*—Even in the Acts of the Apostles we find the third, sixth, and ninth hours specially mentioned. From Clement of Alex-

andria, Tertullian, Cyprian,[1] and others, we learn that the observance of these hours was general among Christians, and that mystic significations were attached to them. In the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions [2] morning and evening prayer are mentioned in addition to the three hours already named, and all five hours are regarded as times of public prayer. To these five hours we must add the nocturnal prayers on the vigils of feasts. This last became more prominent when the times of persecution passed away, and the coenobitical or monastic life grew and flourished. Cassian tells us that the monks divided the nocturnal office into three nocturns. Thus, counting the nocturnal office as one, we get six hours, corresponding to matins with lauds, prime, tierce, sext, none and vespers, in the present Breviary. We may mention here, for the sake of convenience, though the fact belongs to our second period, that St. Benedict, in the sixth century, added compline to the hours, and so completed the number seven, answering to the praises "seven times a day" of which the psalmist speaks.[3] The service at these hours consisted of psalms, lections, and prayers. As early at least as the time of Athanasius,[4] it was the custom in the East to have the alternate verses of the psalm intoned by different choirs, and this practice was introduced at Milan under St. Ambrose.[5] The lections were usually from Scripture, but on the feasts of the Martyrs their Acts were also read. Much was left to free choice in the selection of the Scriptural lessons.[6] The prayers were recited after each psalm, and the office concluded with the blessing of the celebrant.[7]

II. *Origin of the Breviary. Damasus to Gregory VII.*—Great changes occurred during this second period. According to a tradition which is not well attested, but which is most likely correct in substance, St. Jerome, at the request of Pope Damasus, arranged the psalms for the different hours and put the lections together in books called Lectionaries, and these Lectionaries were provided with indices marking the beginning and end of the lections. Later on, in the Middle Ages, we find the word Breviary used for a collection of rubrics, pointing out the way in which the office was to be said on each day, and sometimes these rubrics were united with the office itself so as to form one book, which was called Plenarium, and answers to our present Breviary.[1] Further, hymns were added to the office as early as the sixth century,[2] although particular churches varied in this respect, and the Roman Church did not adopt them till our third period.[3] At the same time lections were introduced from the writings of the Fathers, and these as well as the psalms and responsories were adapted to the different feasts. Lastly, the influence of the Roman Church introduced uniformity throughout the West. We find an English council in the year 747 (Cloveshoe) passing a decree that the feasts should be kept "in all things pertaining to them . . . in celebration of Masses, in mode of singing, according to the written copy which we have from the Roman Church." [4] Charlemagne introduced the Roman office throughout most of his vast empire, and at last, in 1048, the Council of Burgos ordered its use in Spain.[5]

III. *The Completion of the Breviary. Gregory VII. to Pius V.*—Hitherto we have traced the origin of the Breviary offices; we now find the word "Breviary" in its modern sense. "A certain shortening of the office," says Meratus, "was made by Gregory VII., and the office so shortened was called Breviary." Under Innocent III. the office was abbreviated still further. Next, changes were made in its arrangements by the Franciscan General Haymo, and Nicholas III. prescribed the use of the Breviary thus modified in the churches of Rome. Cardinal Quignon (Quiñonez) made additional and radical alterations. In his Breviary the whole Psalter was recited every week; nearly the whole of the New Testament and a great part of the Old were read in the course of the year; the chapters, responsories, and versicles were excluded. The use of this Breviary was permitted from the time of Paul III. to that of Pius V.—viz. for about forty years.[6]

IV. *Revision of the Breviary by St. Pius V.*—The Council of Trent, finding that the commission which it had appointed to revise the Breviary had not time to complete their work, left the matter in the Pope's hands.[7] Pius V., with the assistance of the Barnabite Fathers, effected the desired revision, and imposed the new Breviary on the whole Latin Church, permitting, however, churches to retain a special Breviary of their own, if they could allege a prescription of 200 years on its behalf. (See Bäumer-Biron, *ib.* ii. 168 *sqq.*; Batiffol, 239 *sqq.*) Additional improvements were effected by a commission under Clement VIII. Bellarmine and Baronius were members of it,

[1] Tertull. *De Orat. D.* 25, *PL*, i. 1192; Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. 7, *PG*, ix. 456; Cyprian, *De Dom. Orat.* 34, 35, ed. Hartel, p. 292.
[2] *Ap. Const.* viii. 33. Prayer at "cock-crow" is also mentioned.
[3] Ps. cxviii. 164. Some liturgical writers make seven hours, counting matins and lauds as one. Bona counts seven day hours, and makes matins correspond to the "midnight praise" spoken of in the Psalms (Ps. cxviii. 62).
[4] Theodoret. *Hist.* ii. 29.
[5] August. *Confess.* ix. 7, *PL*, xxxii. 770.
[6] Probst, *Brevier und Brevier-gebet*, p. 28. The permission, however, Meratus says, was not universal.
[7] The Council of Laodicea, canon 17, orders a lection after each psalm.

[1] Probst, p. 32.
[2] Concil. Agath, can. 30.
[3] Probst, p. 34.
[4] Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 907.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 35 *sqq.*
[6] Bäumer-Biron, *Hist. du Bréviaire*, i. 126 *sqq.*; Batiffol, *Hist. du Bréviaire Romain*, 220 *sqq.*; Probst, p. 46. There is an ed. by Wickham Legg, Cambridge, 1888.
[7] Sess. xxv. *contin.*

and to them we owe great ameliorations in the lections of the second nocturn which contain the history of the Saints. The finishing touches were added by Urban VIII.; once more the lections were revised, and with the help of three learned Jesuits many barbarisms and false quantities, and also many rugged beauties were removed from the hymns. (Bäumer-Biron, ii. 285; Batiffol, 260 *sqq.*) The Breviary remained unaltered, until the changes made by Pius X., except that of course offices for saints canonised since that time, and for new feasts, were added by the authority of different Popes. It is true that new Breviaries were constructed in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; but the bishops who brought them into use had no power to do so lawfully, and these new Breviaries are now entirely or almost entirely abandoned. These modern Gallican Breviaries must not be confused with the ancient Gallican office, current in France before Charlemagne's time.

V. *Reform of Pius X.*—Pius X. by his Bull *Divino afflatu* (Nov. 1, 1911) announced and initiated a radical revision of the Roman Breviary. What so far has been effected is an entirely new distribution of the Psalter, made in order to ensure as far as practicable its weekly recitation as a whole, the shortening of the prolix Sunday office, the diminishing of the number of Saints' Offices entitled to oust that of the Sunday, and in general the insisting upon the precedence to be given to the Breviary lections styled the Common of the Season or Psalter and Proper of the Season, over those entitled Proper and Common of Saints. A revision of the lections, more particularly of those summarizing Saints' lives and of the Calendar or Distribution of Festivals through the months of the year, will, it is believed, follow at once. The abandonment by local churches of particular festivals neither of universal observance nor specially connected with their own traditions has already been decreed. [Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter and its Use.")

VI. *The Arrangement of the Breviary.*—The Breviary is divided into four parts: viz. a winter, spring, summer, and autumn quarter. Each part contains (α) the psalter—*i.e.* the psalms arranged for each day of the week. (β) The proper of the season—*i.e.* hymns, antiphons, chapters, and lessons, with responsories and versicles, for each day of the Church year, including the movable feasts. (γ) The proper of the saints—*i.e.* prayers, lessons, responsories, &c., for the immovable feasts. (δ) The common of the saints—*i.e.* psalms, with antiphons, lections, &c., for feasts of a particular class, *e.g.* of the Blessed Virgin, of a Martyr, &c. To this division the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, the office of the dead, the penitential and gradual psalms are added. The last two, however, do not occur in the latest Breviaries. (ε) A supplement containing offices which do not bind the whole Church, but are recited only in particular countries, &c. Besides this, a diocese, province or county, &c., or, again, an order or congregation, may have a special supplement with offices approved for use in that district. This second supplement forms no part of the Breviary. It is printed separately for the persons who are to use it, and then, usually, for the sake of convenience bound into the Breviary. Every day the office is composed of matins and lauds, prime, tierce, sext, none, vespers and compline; but the rules which determine the mode of their recitation are too elaborate to be given here.

VII. *Breviaries other than the Roman.*—Besides the Roman Breviary in use throughout the Western Church several others are approved: (1) the Ambrosian at Milan (differing essentially in content and arrangement from the Roman); (2) that of St. Peter's at Rome (of which the distinctive feature is its holding to the old and otherwise almost obsolete version of the Psalter, known as the Psalterium Romanum); (3) the Monastic Breviary (differing from the Roman in its distribution of Psalms, Lections, Responsories and the like, but Roman in its liturgical formulas); (4) the Dominican, and (5) the Carmelite (the one and the other mediaeval forms of the Roman, akin to that of Sarum); (6) the Carthusian (a variant of the Monastic or Benedictine); (7) the Bridgettine (a fourteenth-century elaboration of the Breviary, embodying a daily Office of our Blessed Lady with recitation of the entire Psalter), and some others.

It may be observed in fine that Breviaries other than the Roman retain for the Hymns the older text, and do not admit the corrections introduced by Pope Urban VIII.

VIII. *The Obligation of Reciting Office.*—At first all the faithful were accustomed to assist at the canonical hours. "The piety of the lay-people," says Thomassin, "cooled: the clergy did not relax their primitive fervour." From the sixth century downwards, many councils speak of this obligation on the part of clerics, but they do not so much enforce it as take for granted a law already enforced by the custom of the Church. The present discipline of the Church imposes the obligation (α) on all clerics, even if not in Holy Orders, who hold a benefice. By omitting their duty they forfeit the fruits of their benefice and must make restitution (so the Fifth Lateran Council, session ix.); (β) on all persons in Holy Orders, *i.e.* on subdeacons, deacons, priests; (γ) on religious men and women, professed for the duties of the choir. In the last two cases Billuart considers that the obligation cannot be proved by any positive law, but is founded on custom

which has the force of precept.[1] All these persons are required under pain of mortal sin to recite the office at least in private.

IX. *The Authority of Statements in the Breviary.*—As the Church herself imposes the recitation of the Breviary, it cannot contain anything contrary to faith or morals; otherwise the Church herself would be leading her children into error. But no Catholic is obliged to believe historical statements merely because they are found in the Breviary, and as a matter of fact many of them have been questioned and denied by Catholic critics and historians.

The principal books on the Breviary are:—in the Middle Ages, Amalarius of Metz, who wrote four books "De Ecclesiastico Officio," in the year 820; the author of a work called "Micrologus de Ecclesiasticis Observationibus," written in the time of Gregory VII.; John Beleth, a Paris theologian, who wrote, about the middle of the twelfth century, "De Divinis Officiis"; the abbot Rupert, "De Divinis Officiis libri xii." (died 1135); and Durandus, "Rationale Divinorum Officiorum" (about 1286). In modern times the principal authors are:—Grancolas, "Commentarius historicus in Romanum Breviarium"; Bona, "De Divina Psalmodia"; but above all Gavantus, who published "Commentaria in Rubricas Missalis et Breviarii," in 1628, and Meratus, who edited the work of Gavantus with elaborate notes. (From Gavantus, with Meratus's notes, and from Probst, "Brevier und Breviergebet"; Bäumer-Biron, "Hist. du Bréviaire"; Batiffol, "Hist. du Bréviaire Romain"; Baudot, "The Roman Breviary," Eng. tr.; Bacuez, "Le Saint Office.")

BRIDAL RING. [See MARRIAGE, p. 556.]

BRIDAL WREATH. [See MARRIAGE.]

BRIEF (BREVE). A papal Brief is a letter issuing from the Court of Rome, written on fine parchment in modern characters, subscribed by the Pope's Secretary of Briefs, dated in the modern style (*e.g.* die nona Septembris, MCMXIV.), and sealed with the Pope's signet-ring, the seal of the Fisherman. [See BULL.]

BRIGID, ST., SISTERS OF. Founded in Dublin to take charge of poor schools for girls and little boys whose faith is in danger from the attacks of the so-called "Irish Church Missionary Society."

BRIGITTINES. This order was founded about 1344 by St. Brigit of Sweden, author of the "Revelations" so well known and so greatly esteemed by persons aspiring to perfection. Each monastery was double, for nuns and for monks; but the foundation of the nunneries, which were to contain on the average sixty inmates, was the principal object of the founder; the related houses of monks were to have thirteen inmates each, priests, besides four deacons. The constitutions of the order, which took the name of the Order of the Saviour, were said to have been communicated to St. Brigit by divine revelation; the rule was that of St. Austin. The first monastery was built on the saint's estate of Wastein, in the diocese of Lincopen. The order spread through all the northern countries of Europe, and was of notable service to the Church. The convent of Wastein, partly through the extraordinary constancy of the nuns, partly from their finding friends where they could have least expected them, survived the change of religion in Sweden for many years, and was only suppressed in 1595. In England there was one great and wealthy Brigittine house, Sion Convent, near Brentford. This was one of the few monasteries restored by Queen Mary; but being again suppressed under Elizabeth, the nuns, that they might be free to observe their rule, took refuge at Lisbon. They have had a perpetual succession in Portugal down to our own day; and in 1861 some of them came to England and founded the Brigittine convent of Sion House, Spettisbury, in Dorsetshire, afterwards (1887) removed to Chudleigh, Devon. A monastery for men has recently been established at Cobham, Surrey. (See Hélyot; Guilday, "English Cath. Refugees on the Continent," ch. iii.)

BRITISH CHURCH, ANCIENT. "In the year 156 from our Lord's Incarnation, whilst Eleutherius, a holy man, was vested with the pontificate of the Roman Church, Lucius, king of Britain, sent him a letter praying to be made a Christian by an act of his authority—the object of which pious request he soon after obtained—and the Britons having received the faith kept it whole and undefiled, and in peace and quiet till the days of the Emperor Diocletian" (Bede, "Eccl. Hist." i. 4).[1] During the persecution St. Alban and many others suffered martyrdom in Britain. After the elevation of Constantine to the purple (which took place at York, where his father Constantius died, in the year 306) we find the British Church in communion of faith and discipline with the rest of Christendom. Contemporary documents tell us of British bishops sitting in the Councils of Arles (314), Sardica (347), and Rimini (359). The Pelagian heresy found favour in Britain—indeed, it is said to have had a British origin (see PELAGIANISM). It was expelled by St. Germanus of Auxerre, assisted by Lupus of Troyes, and Severus of Treves. From the moment that the Romans withdrew from Britain we are left in darkness as to the fate of the British Church, until, about 559, we meet with the writings of the Briton Gildas. From these we gather the

[1] Billuart, *De Relig.* ii. 8, 3, where he says that the canons speak "either of priests only, or of beneficed clerks, or of the public office," &c. See also St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.* v. § 140.

[1] This story, taken from the *Liber Pontificalis*, is rejected by recent critics. (See Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* p. cii.)

following information as to the worship and doctrine of the Britons: 1. They believed in one God in three Persons; in the Divine and human natures of Christ, in the redemption of mankind through His death, and in the eternity of heaven and hell. 2. Their hierarchy consisted of bishops, priests, and other ministers; a particular service was employed at their ordination; the hands of the bishops and priests were anointed and blessed; these were looked upon as successors of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles and bearer of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; they sate in his seat, and inherited his power of binding and loosing; it was their duty to teach the people, and to offer sacrifice. 3. The Britons had monasteries of monks, presided over by abbots; the monks made the usual vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity; and widows often bound themselves by vows to a life of continence. 4. They built churches in honour of the martyrs; there were several altars, the seats of the heavenly sacrifice, in the same church; the service was chanted by the clergy in the churches; oaths of mutual forgiveness and peace were taken by adverse parties on the altar. 5. Their liturgical language was Latin; their translation of the Bible the Vetus Itala[1]; they sang the Psalms from a translation of the Septuagint, the same as that used in the Latin Church; they quoted the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as of equal authority with the other canonical books. Gildas rebukes both clergy and laity alike for their unchristian lives. Murder, rapine, gross immorality, simony, ambition, are some of the crimes to which he attributes the downfall of Britain. The deplorable state of the British Church as described by Gildas was probably the motive which, 40 years later, induced Pope Gregory to place the British bishops under the superintendence of St. Augustine. "Your brotherhood," says the Papal mandate, "will moreover have subject to you . . . all the bishops of Britain, by authority of God and our Lord Jesus Christ; that from your instruction they may learn to believe correctly and from your example to live religiously, and thus, by the discharge of their duty, obtain the reward of the heavenly kingdom" (Bede, i. 29). In the course of time Augustine had a meeting with the Britons. He requested them to join in fellowship with him, to help him in the conversion of the idolaters, and to conform to the usages of the universal Church, especially in the celebration of Easter (see EASTER] and in completing baptism after the Roman manner, viz. by adding Confirmation to it. These demands clearly show that there was no difference of doctrine between the British and the Roman Church, nor respecting the authority claimed and exercised by the Bishop of Rome. Had the Britons differed from Augustine on these points he would never have invited them to become his fellow-missionaries. The meetings and conferences, however, led to no practical results, on account, we may safely assume, of the hatred of the Britons for the Saxon invaders. The British Church naturally met with the same fate as the British race. The Saxon conquest was one of ruthless extermination. Some of the unfortunate natives escaped into the western portions of the island, and there the British Church long survived, until it was ultimately absorbed into the English Church. Attempts have lately been made to trace the origin of the Anglican Protestant Church to the ancient British Church. But, as we have already seen, the British Christians agreed with the Roman Augustine on every substantial point, and held doctrines now repudiated by Anglicans. "Those who study the learned work of the late Mr. Haddan and Bishop Stubbs ('Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents,' &c., vol. i.) will find in the materials collected (from which alone it is possible to obtain any knowledge of the ancient Welsh Church) nothing to justify the statement that the disappearance of differences or the establishment of practical unity between the Church of England and that of the Principality was the result of Norman wars or conquests, or of the interference of Norman kings, barons, or bishops. *The differences were of a trivial kind, quite unworthy to divide Churches; they disappeared (as much under native Welsh as under Saxon influence) during the Anglo-Saxon period,*[2] about the end of the eighth century. Full intercommunion, and close ecclesiastical relations between the Churches followed. During the reign of Edward the Confessor, the English diocese of Hereford was administered by one of the Welsh bishops" ("A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment," by the Earl of Selbourne, 4th ed. p. 335). Besides, if anything is certain in English history it is that the great bulk of our institutions, and especially the Church, had a Saxon and not a British origin. The philological argument which proves so convincingly the extermination of the Britons tells strongly in our favour. No Anglican prelate can style himself a "bishop," or speak of West- "minster," or exhort his flock to give "alms," or "preach," or "ordain" without admitting the Roman origin of the English Church. "The introduction of Christianity about the end of the sixth century brought England into connection with Rome, and during the four following centuries a large number of Latin words became familiar to educated Englishmen. The words introduced into the language were for the most part connected with the Church, its services and observances" (Morris'

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, however, contend for an independent version.

[2] Italics ours.

"Historical English Grammar," p. 11). (See ENGLISH CHURCH, Anglo-Saxon period; Bede, "Hist. Eccles."; Gildas, "De Excidio Britanniae," ed. Stevenson, Lond. 1838; "Monumenta Historica Britannica," vol. i.; Lingard, "Anglo-Saxon Church"; Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland"; Rock, "The Church of our Fathers.")

BROTHERS. Generally speaking those members of a religious community who are not priests are called "brothers." Some may be studying for the priesthood, and others may be engaged in various occupations without any intention of taking orders. The latter are usually called "lay brothers" (*q.v.*) There are, however, certain religious communities whose members do not aspire to the priesthood, *e.g.* Christian Brothers. At the present day there are many of these communities, an account of which will be found under the headings CHRISTIAN BROTHERS, ALEXIAN BROTHERS, XAVERIAN BROTHERS, &c.; see also CONGREGATIONS (RELIGIOUS), ORDERS (RELIGIOUS).

BULGARIANS. This was another name for the Paulician heretics (*q.v.*) owing to their long sojourn in Bulgaria. Constantine Copronymus, about A.D. 750, transplanted great numbers of Paulicians from the banks of the upper Euphrates to Constantinople and Thrace; whence their preachers passed into Bulgaria and obtained many followers. Another powerful colony of these sectaries was brought to the valleys of the Balkans in 970, by John Zimisces, with the view of detaching them from the Moslem alliance, and employing them as a barrier against the barbarians of Scythia. They occupied Philippopolis, and soon gained great influence in Bulgaria. About 1200 their Primate lived at or near that city, and governed by his vicars affiliated bodies in France and Italy. By three channels they obtained access to Western countries—the trade of Venice, the military service of the Byzantine emperors, and the pilgrim track to Jerusalem along the valley of the Danube. Mingled with the Cathari and other heretics, they were found in considerable numbers in the south of France at the time of the Albigensian Crusade. [ALBIGENSES.] (Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," ch. liv.)

BULL. A Papal Bull is so named from the *bulla* (or round leaden seal, having on one side a representation of SS. Peter and Paul, and on the other the name of the reigning Pope), which is attached to the document (by a silken cord, if it be a "Bull of Grace," and by one of hemp if a "Bull of Justice") and gives authenticity to it. Bulls are engrossed on strong rough parchment, and begin "[Benedictus] Episcopus servus servorum Dei ad perpetuam rei memoriam." [1] A Bull is dated in the ancient style by Kalends, Nones, and Ides, "a die Incarnationis" (in modern times the ordinary year) and signed by the functionaries of the Papal Chancery. It is a document of a more formal and weighty character than a Brief, and many memorable Papal decisions and condemnations have been given in this form, such as the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VII., the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI., the bull *Apostolicae Curae*, &c. &c.

[1] Or "ad futuram rei memoriam"; or, if the bull relates to doctrine, the words "ad . . . memoriam" are omitted, and the style usually is, "universis Christi fidelibus salutem et apostolicam benedictionem."

BULL IN COENA DOMINI. This was a Papal sentence of excommunication formerly published against heretics every Maundy Thursday. The latest form which it assumed was given to it by Urban VIII. in 1627. It excommunicates all heretics, mentioning the chief modern sects and heresiarchs by name, as well as those who aid and abet them, or read their works; all those who appeal from the Pope [APPEAL] to a future general council; pirates and wreckers; Christians who ally themselves with the Turks; those who maltreat Papal officials or falsify Papal bulls, and many others. By degrees a spirit of marked opposition to the publication of the bull in their dominions displayed itself on the part of many Catholic sovereigns; Pope Clement XIV. yielded to their wishes, and after 1773 the periodical publication of the bull was discontinued.

BULLARIUM. A collection of Papal bulls is so called. The name seems to have been invented by Cherubini who in 1586 published a folio volume entitled "Bullarium, sive Collectio diversarum Constitutionum multorum Pontificum." The best edition of the Bullarium is that of Mainardi (1733–1762). (See Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Ortolan in DThC.)

BURIAL. [See FUNERAL.]

BURSE (BURSA, also PERA). A square case into which the priest puts the corporal which is to be used in Mass. It was introduced in the fourteenth century. It should be of the same colour as the vestments of the day. Usually it has a cross in the middle. The priest places it above the chalice, with the open side towards his own breast. When he reaches the altar, he extracts the corporal and places the burse on the Gospel side. Pius V. allowed the Spanish priests to carry the corporal without a burse. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." i. 5.)

BUSKINS. [See SANDALS.]

BY THE GRACE OF GOD AND FAVOUR OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE. Bishops and archbishops now use this formula ("Dei et Apostolicae Sedis Gratia") at the beginning of their pastorals and instructions. Something resembling it came in very early; thus St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, called himself the *Servus apostolicae sedis*, and an archbishop of Cologne in the eleventh century took the appellation of *Christi et Clavigeri ejus servus*. But there was for a long time no uniformity; in Hoveden's "Chronicle" may

be read a brief of Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, in which there is no reference whatever to the Holy See, while not many pages further on is a series of decrees of Archbishop Hubert, each of which ends with the words "Salvo in omnibus sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae honore et privilegio." In some European countries, the sovereigns evincing a desire to appropriate for use in their own proclamations the phrase *Dei Gratia*, the bishops have used instead the formula *divina gratia*. In 1209, Otho IV., one of the candidates for the Imperial crown, adopted the style of "Roman Emperor by the grace of God and favour of the Holy Apostolic See."

BYZANTINE RITE. The order of the celebrating of Mass, of the administering of the Sacraments and of other Liturgical functions followed in the Patriarchate of Constantinopole and by the Greek Church in general (Uniate and Schismatic). Admitting the division of liturgical families into three parent rites, those of Antioch, Alexandria and Rome, the Byzantine is a development of the first-named. Adopted by the Orthodox (non-Catholic) Russian Church, it is more widely diffused than any other except the Roman. In its present form the details of the Byzantine Rite were in the main fixed by St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, whose names the two Greek Mass books bear respectively. The arrangement prescribed in the latter, which is the shorter and the more generally used, we here summarize.

1. The celebrant and ministers being vested begin by preparing at the prothesis or credence table with many accompanying prayers the bread and wine to be used in the Sacrifice and which later will be brought processionally to the Altar.

2. Two Litanies are chanted at the Altar with Anthems and Prayers.

3. A reader sings the Epistle or Lesson, and with a chant corresponding to our Gradual the Book of the Gospels is brought in (the "Little Entrance") from which the deacon chants the Gospel.

4. The form of blessing and dismissing the Catechumens is gone through.

5. After another Litany, the Offerings prepared at the prothesis are brought in with elaborate ceremonial (the "Great Entrance").

6. The Kiss of Peace and the recital of the Nicene Creed follow.

7. The Anaphora or Canon begins with *Sursum corda*, Preface and *Sanctus*, substantially as in the Roman Missal.

8. With a very brief introductory prayer the text describing the institution and the words of consecration are recited, followed by the *Anamnesis* (commemoration of the Mysteries of the Life and Death of Our Lord) and the *Epiklesis*, invocation of the Holy Ghost. On the latter, as essential to the consecration rite, the Greeks lay great and undue stress.

9. The reading of the Diptychs or lists of persons to be prayed for with corresponding Litany and Collects represent the Roman Memento for the Living and Memento for the Dead, both, it will be noticed (together with the Commemoration of Our Lady and of the Saints), being made after the Consecration.

10. The Lord's Prayer is chanted by priest and people together.

11. The priest having broken the Host (which he had previously raised or elevated with the exclamation "Holy Things to the Holy") puts a particle in the Chalice, together with a little warm water (a practice peculiar to the Byzantine Rite).

12. The Communion of priest and people then takes place, the laity communicating under both kinds.

13. Prayers of Thanksgiving and the Blessing and dismissal follow.

The Byzantine Eucharistic rite differs from the Roman in that its Collects and kindred formulas are identical in all Masses. In regard, however, to chants (*troparia*, odes) and to lessons from Scripture there is a varying from festival to festival at least as great as that obtaining in the Latin Church.

In the Byzantine Rite the canonical hours are seven in number, corresponding to those of the Roman Breviary. The Psalter is recited once a week as in the latter, but twice a week in Lent. To the Psalms many chants are added, so that the singing of the whole office for one day is said to take about eight hours (Fortescue). Hence Greek priests are not obliged to private recitation when not taking part in its public recitation.

The Greeks always baptize by immersion and administer Confirmation immediately after Baptism. The Eucharist for the Sick is reserved under both kinds, that is, in the form of particles that have been dipped in the consecrated species of wine. The Absolution after Confession is given in the form of a prayer. Holy Orders are conferred by the laying on of hands (with prayer) only as the essential rite. Properly to administer Extreme Unction the Greeks require seven priests for seven anointings; but the oil used is not necessarily blessed by a bishop. An impressive feature in the Byzantine marriage ceremony is the crowning of the spouses.

Byzantine churches abound in icons or sacred pictures, but statuary is not allowed, nor are musical instruments of any kind. In fine the scrupulous screening off of the Sanctuary should be noted. Only at stated intervals in the ceremonies are doors opened enabling the faithful to catch a glimpse of what is passing round about the altar.

(See LITURGIES; Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church" and "The Mass"; Brightman, "Liturgies Eastern and Western"; Renaudot, "Liturgiae Orientales"; the Greek "Horologion" and other service books.)

C

CAEREMONIALE EPISCOPORUM. A book containing the ceremonies to be observed by bishops and other ecclesiastics, in the performance of episcopal acts. An edition "emended and reformed" was published by authority of Clement VIII. In the bull *Cum novissime* the Pope strictly requires all whom it concerns to follow the prescriptions of this Caeremoniale, and several of the subsequent Popes have renewed and confirmed the same law. ("Manuale Decret. SS. Rit. Congr." n. 94 *sqq.*)

CAEREMONIARIUS. A name given to the ecclesiastic who superintends the ceremonies in solemn offices. In cathedral churches one such master of ceremonies should be chosen by the bishop, another, with the approval of the bishop, by the chapter. In episcopal functions he may wear a violet cassock and hold a ferule in his hand. The dignitaries even of the chapter are bound to obey him during the functions, for he is their director, not their servant. Besides the income which may belong to him as canon, &c., he has a right to the offerings made by clergy and people on Good Friday after the adoration of the Cross. ("Manuale Decret. SS. Rit. Congr.")

CAESARIANS. The adherents of a pious German friar of the order of St Francis, Caesar of Spires, were so called. Caesar was one of those who, when Elias of Cortona, the general of the order after St. Francis, attempted to introduce relaxations of the rule, resisted him; in consequence of which Elias, having deceived the Pope, threw Caesar into prison. After having been in confinement more than two years, the poor friar, finding one day the door of his dungeon open, went out to warm himself in the sun's rays. His gaoler, a rough unfeeling lay brother, coming in and thinking that Caesar meditated escape, struck him on the head with a bludgeon with such violence that he died of the effects of the blow. This was in 1239. Under the generals Crescenzio and John of Parma, who in various ways incurred the disapproval of the stricter Franciscans, the party of Caesar lingered on; but after the glorious St. Bonaventure became general (1256) and the rule and spirit of St. Francis were restored in their first purity, the name of Caesarians was soon forgotten. (Fleury, "Hist. Eccl." xxxi.)

CAGOTS. The name given to a race of Christian Pariahs who first came into notice in the South of France about the tenth century. The term has been thought to be derived from *caas-Goth*, dog of a Goth, as if they were a remnant of the Visigoths who occupied Aquitaine till they were expelled by the Franks; but this derivation is quite uncertain. The Cagots were not allowed to live in towns or villages, but in groups of dwellings set apart for them, called *cagoteries*. Like the Swiss *crétins*, they were looked down upon as an inferior race; yet this inferiority was not apparent: in physical development and intelligence they seem to have been on a par with their neighbours; their skin, however, was said to emit a peculiar odour, by which they could always be recognised. They were required to go into church by a separate door, to use a special *bénitier*, and to sit only on benches set apart for them. No trades but those of butcher and carpenter were open to them. They are said still to be numerous in the valleys of the western Pyrenees. (See De Rochas, "Les Parias de France et d'Espagne.")

CALATRAVA, ORDER OF. One of the three great military orders of Spain; the other two were the knights of Santiago and those of Alcantara. The Templars in Spain had had immense estates conferred upon them, and corresponding services in the unremitting war against the Moors were expected from them. Calatrava, a town on the upper Guadiana, on the borders of Andalusia and Castile, was a post of great military importance to the sovereigns of the latter country, whether for offensive or defensive purposes. In the twelfth century it was entrusted to the guardianship of the Templars; but these, finding the charge embarrassing, abandoned the place after eight years. Sancho III., King of Castile, desired to find a body of knights who would undertake its defence; and his wishes were soon fully met by the energy and ability of a Spanish Cistercian monk, Velasquez by name, who with the concurrence of his order founded, in 1258, a chivalrous institute, the knights of which were to live under a strict rule and devote themselves to the protection and extension of the Christian Kingdom to which they belonged. A knight of Calatrava bound himself to perpetual chastity, and this obligation was only relaxed in the sixteenth century, when permission was granted to the knights to marry once. He was enjoined to have his sword ready to his hand while he slept and also while he prayed. Silence was prescribed at meals; the fare was plain, meat not being allowed more than thrice a week. The chaplains of the order were at first allowed to take the field in expeditions against the Moors; but this was afterwards forbidden. In 1197 Calatrava was taken by the Moslems, and the knights retired to Salvatierra, in the north of Spain, and took

the name of that city till their former home was recovered. The order soon became very rich, and the extensive influence and patronage which its wealth placed in the hands of the grand-masters caused the office to be eagerly sought by ambitious men. Such violent quarrels and animosities arose from this cause (which was similarly operative in the case of the other military orders) that Ferdinand and Isabella in the fifteenth century wisely procured the Papal sanction to the annexation of the grand-mastership of all three orders to the crown of Castile. In the general suppression of the monastic orders which the nineteenth century witnessed in Spain, the knights of Calatrava lost all their property, but as a source of honorary distinction the order still survives. (Hélyot; Prescott's "Ferdinand and Isabella.")

CALENDAR, ECCLESIASTICAL. An arrangement, founded on the Julian-Gregorian determinations of the civil year, marking the days set apart for particular religious celebration.

The Diocletian persecution made havoc among Christian records and writings of every kind, and for this reason but few calendars of great antiquity have been preserved. One of the earliest, dated about 350, is little more than a list of holy days; it places Christmas Day on December 25, and the Feast of St. Peter's Chair on February 22. In a calendar prefixed to the "Responsoriale" of Gregory the Great, there is no mention of the Circumcision, nor of Ash Wednesday, but in other respects it closely resembles the present Roman Calendar. The various scientific and historical questions involved in the determination of Easter attracted the earnest attention of the Church from an early period. The Venerable Bede wrote an elaborate work "De Computo"; he is also thought by many to have been the real author of the essay on the true calculation of Easter, given in the form of a letter of the Abbot Ceolfrid to Naiton, King of the Picts, which he has inserted in the fifth book of his "Ecclesiastical History." A treatise "De Computo" is also among the works of Rabanus Maurus, the great Archbishop of Mayence, in the early part of the ninth century. It was ordered by the Council of Orleans (541) that bishops should every year announce the date of Easter on the festival of the Epiphany.

Since Easter varies every year, the liturgical arrangements of the Church, which depend on Easter, must vary in like manner; and the calendar, which notifies those arrangements, can only be good for the year to which it refers. From the first Sunday after Epiphany to Advent Sunday—that is, from about the middle of January to the end of November—there is not a single Sunday of which the ritual observance is not liable to variation from year to year, according to the varying date of Easter. The calendar which announces the actual course of the liturgy for every day of the year, may be called the *liturgical* calendar. It takes into account the relative importance of the celebrations which come into competition on the same day, in accordance with canon law and the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and shows which celebration is to prevail and be had in use. A glance at this calendar will show that many saints are *transferred* in it, as to the celebration of their festivals, and that Masses in their honour cannot be said on their own proper days; but a little further search will generally show that the festival has only been transferred a few days later—that is, to the first vacant day. Owing to the different dignity of feasts (see DOUBLE, SEMI-DOUBLE, FEASTS), their *priority*, and the extent to which they may be transferred are often difficult matters to decide. Translation of feasts has been restricted by decrees of Leo XIII. and Pius X. (*Divino Afflatu*). In general outline this liturgical calendar is the same for the whole Church; the feasts of our Lord and of his Blessed Mother are observed by all Catholics on the same days; so also are the principal feasts of the Apostles, and the martyrs and saints kept by the universal church. But special circumstances, arising out of the history of each Christian nation, affect its liturgical calendar to a certain extent. Many other modifications more or less important might be mentioned, in virtue of which not only each Christian nation, but every religious order, every ecclesiastical province, every diocese—one might almost say every city, at least in a Catholic land, for the "fête patronale" of Cambrai is not that of Rheims, and each causes a slight disturbance of the general *Ordo* in its own favour—may be said to have a liturgical calendar of its own.

As we write (1916), various changes are being made in the calendars of the different dioceses.

Still more general is that description of ecclesiastical calendar in which the "Proprium de Tempore" is omitted, and only the fixed festivals retained. This, if we exclude from it the festivals of our Lord and the Blessed Virgin, is little more than a calendar of saints' days, and would tend to pass into a Martyrology. The "Acta Sanctorum" of the Bollandists [*q.v.*] may be regarded as a colossal calendar of saints, arranged according to the successive occurrence of their festivals in the civil year, and enriched with biographies and collateral information. A Greek Menology is something between a calendar and a Martyrology. (DIRECTORY; ORDO; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

CALENDAR, JULIAN-GREGORIAN, THE. Julius Caesar, in the year 708 of the city, caused the civil calendar, which had fallen into confusion, to be reformed by dividing the year into twelve months, each

with the same number of days as at present, and providing that an additional day should be given to February in every fourth year, in order that the natural year, which was believed to be 365 days 6 hours in length, might keep even pace with the legal year. But as the real excess of the time taken in the solar revolution over 365 days does not amount to six hours, but only to five hours and forty-nine minutes (nearly), it was an inevitable consequence of the disregard of this fact that the addition of nearly forty-four minutes too much every leap-year should again in course of time make the natural and civil years disagree. The accumulated error caused the difference of a day in about 134 years; thus the vernal equinox, which in the year of the Council of Nicaea (325) fell, as it ought to fall, on March 21, in 1582 occurred ten days earlier. But since Easter ought to be kept on the Sunday after the first full-moon following the vernal equinox, it is obvious that, with so serious a difference between the real equinox and the equinox of the Calendar, Easter might easily be kept a month too late; the Paschal full-moon might have occurred on some day between March 11 (the date of the *real* equinox) and March 21, but be disregarded in favour of the *next* full-moon, which fell after the equinox of the calendar. Gregory XIII., consulting with men of science, effectually remedied the evil, and provided against its recurrence. He ordered that the days between October 4 and October 15 in the current year (1582) should be suppressed, and that, beginning with 1700, three out of every four centesimal leap-years—1700, 1800, 1900, but not 2000—should be omitted, so that those years should have only 365, not 366 days. This change, having originated at Rome, was long resisted in Protestant countries. In England it was only adopted in 1751, by which time the accumulated error amounted to eleven days; these days were suppressed between September 2 and 14, 1752. In Russia the Julian Calendar is still adhered to, with the result that their computation of time is now *thirteen* days in arrear of the rest of Europe. (Gerard in "Cath. Enc.")

CALIXTINES. A section of the followers of John Huss, who were so called because they demanded the cup or chalice (*calix*)—that is, Holy Communion under the form of wine as well as under the form of bread. They were also called Utraquists (*sub utraque specie*). [See HUSSITES; COMMUNION (6); BOHEMIAN BRETHREN.]

CALUMNY. A false charge or imputation against another's reputation. This is much more serious than mere detraction, which consists in depriving another of his good name by publishing without just cause something which is true. (St. Thom. $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, qq. 68, 69, 72, 73; Slater, "Mor. Theol." I, 458.)

CALVARIANS. (1) An institute of priests founded in 1635 by H. Carpentier to honour the Passion of Christ and defend the faith in Béarn where Protestantism was making progress. It would appear that this institute did not survive the Revolution.

(2) A congregation of Benedictine nuns, founded at Poitiers by Père Joseph, the Capuchin friend of Card. Richelieu.

(3) There is also a congregation of Calvarian Sisters, established by Virginia Bracelli at Genoa in 1619 for the purpose of educating destitute girls, which has received many favours from succeeding Popes. (Hélyot; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Congregationen.")

CALVIN AND CALVINISM. Calvin was born in 1509 at Noyon in Picardy. His father (Chauvin), who was an episcopal fiscal-procurator, secured a good education for his son in the noble family of Montmor. Young Calvin was provided with a benefice, though he never received more than the tonsure, and went to study theology at Paris. There, however, the influence of Olivetan and Farel won him over to the heresy of the Reformers; he gave up all idea of the priesthood, and went to study law at Bourges. The change which had begun at Paris was made complete. The Lutheran Wolmar persuaded him to give up the law and to devote himself entirely to theology. Later, when it was no longer safe for him to remain in France, he fled to Basle, went afterwards to Ferrara, and finally settled at Geneva in 1536, as professor of theology and preacher. However, in 1538 he was driven from the town, and remained for three years at Strasburg, where he married and formed intimate connections with the German Reformers. In 1541 he was recalled to Geneva, and here he organised his Consistory, through which till his death, in 1564, he exercised an absolute power in temporal as well as in spiritual matters. Calvin brooked no contradiction. Castellio had to leave Geneva for attacking the doctrine of predestination, and the Spaniard Michael Servetus (Servede), who attacked the doctrine of the Trinity, was burnt alive, an *auto-da-fé* which was approved by Melanchthon and Bucer.

As to Calvin's extraordinary talents, there can be no doubt. Both in Latin and French, his writings are a model of clear, concise, nervous language; he had great stores of varied learning at his command; his commentaries on Scripture still hold a very high place in the esteem of Protestant scholars, and his subtlety and power of reasoning fitted him to become the great theologian of the Reformed sects. With a vast section of Protestants in Switzerland, Holland, England, Scotland, &c., his Institutes (*Institutio Religionis Christianae*) possessed almost unlimited authority, and were esteemed as the greatest work which had appeared since the

days of the Apostles. It is this book which contains the methodical exposition of his doctrinal system. It affords abundant proof, not only of Calvin's exalted talents, but also of the gulf which separated him from the tradition of the Church. Its peculiar doctrines have long since lost their hold on Protestants of the better sort, and his system outrages the principles of natural as well as of revealed religion. It is important, however, to remember what the system was which so many found purer and more attractive than that of the Church.

According to Calvin, God ordains some to everlasting life, others to everlasting punishment. God does not choose the elect for any good He sees in them, or which He sees they will do; nor does He select some for eternal reprobation because of their evil deeds foreseen by Him. Indeed, as the whole nature of fallen man, in Calvin's view, is "utterly devoid of goodness; is a seed-bed of sin," which "cannot but be odious and abominable to God"; as man has no free-will, and as God's grace is absolutely irresistible; it follows that there can be no question of merits foreseen, on account of which God chooses the elect, or of demerits, because of which the reprobate are rejected. Calvin's words are explicit on this point. "If," he writes, "we cannot assign any reason for His [God's] bestowing mercy on His people, but just that it pleases Him, neither can He have any reason for reprobating others but His will."[1] Here of course Calvinist heresy is in sharp antagonism to Catholic doctrine, according to which God by His eternal decree condemns none, except for their sins foreseen by Him and of course freely committed.

As to the means by which the elect actually enter into a state of salvation Calvin was at one with the rest of the Reformers. He taught that justification is effected by faith and by faith alone. Calvin's doctrine on the sacraments—of which he recognized only Baptism and the Eucharist—stands midway between that of Luther and Zwingli. He considered the doctrine of the latter (which made the sacraments mere signs of Christian profession, tokens by which a man is known as such among his fellow-Christians) to be erroneous and even profane. He speaks of the sacraments as mystical signs instituted by God, Who through them not only reminds men of past benefits but also renews these benefits, seals His promises, strengthens and increases the faith of the recipient by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Thus to Calvin the sacraments were not bare signs, but real channels of grace. But it was to the elect only that they conveyed this grace. To others they were bare and inoperative symbols.[2]

The Calvinistic worship was much more bare and simple than the Lutheran, and the constitution of the Calvinistic sects was rigidly Presbyterian. But Calvin had higher notions of Church freedom and independence than Luther. He maintained that the Church was altogether independent of the State, and the government which he established at Geneva was theocratic in its character. The influence, however, of Calvin's doctrine was not confined to sects with Presbyterian constitution. His *Institutio* represented the dominant theology in the Anglican Church down to the time of Laud. (See PREDESTINATION; W. Barry in "Cath. Enc."; Moehler, "Symbolism," Eng. tr.; Baudrillart in DThC.)

CAMALDOLI. The austere order of Camaldoli was founded by St. Romuald in 1012 on a small plain among the Apennines bearing that name, about thirty miles east of Florence. He had previously been abbot of several Benedictine monasteries, the monks of which, unable to bear the rigorous penitential life which he wished them to practise, had all after a time expelled him. The foundation of 1012 has always been known as the Hermitage of Camaldoli. Romuald built separate cells for his disciples, most of whom had to repair to the chapel at the canonical hours, but there was a class among them called recluses who were exempted from this obligation. He gave a white habit to his hermits, whom he obliged to fast during two Lents in the year, and to abstain perpetually from meat; moreover, during the rest of the year they had to fast on bread and water on three days in the week. After some time a monastery was built at the foot of the mountains, at a place called Fontebuono, and peopled by monks under a prior; these, however, wore the same habit as the hermits, and were bound to the same rule of life. Alban Butler, who seems to have visited Camaldoli about the middle of the eighteenth century, thus writes of it.[1] "The hermitage is two short miles distant from the monastery [Fontebuono]. It is a mountain quite overshaded by a dark wood of fir-trees. In it are seven clear springs of water. The very sight of this solitude in the midst of the forest helps to fill the mind with compunction, and a love of heavenly contemplation. On entering it we meet with a chapel of St. Antony for travellers to pray in before they advance any further. Next are the cells and lodgings for the porters. Somewhat further is the church, which is large, well built, and richly adorned. Over the door is a clock which strikes so loud that it may be heard all over the desert. On the left side of the church is the cell in which St. Romuald lived, when he first established these hermits. . . . The whole hermitage is now enclosed with a wall; none are allowed to go out of it; but they may walk in the woods and alleys within the inclosure at dis-

[1] *Instit.* lib. iii. 22.
[2] Moehler, *Symbolism*, bk. i. ch. 4.

[1] *Lives of the Saints*, Feb. 7.

cretion. Everything is sent them from the monastery in the valley; their food is every day brought to each cell, and all are supplied with wood and necessaries, that they may have no dissipation or hindrance in their contemplation. . . . No rain or snow stops anyone from meeting in the church to assist at the divine office. They are obliged to strict silence in all public common places, and everywhere during their Lents, also on Sundays, holy days, Fridays, and other days of abstinence, and always from compline till prime the next day."

The order became very wealthy, and many of its hermitages were after a time changed into monasteries. It was agreed that the general of the order, who was also *ex officio* prior of Camaldoli, should be taken from among the hermits and the monks. Rudolph, the fourth general, drew up, in 1102, the first written constitutions of the order, in which he slightly mitigated the severity of the original rule. In process of time the order was separated into five provinces or congregations: that of Camaldoli, or the Holy Hermitage; that of St. Michael at Murano, near Venice; that of the hermits of Monte Corona near Perugia, a reformation founded by Paul Giustiniani early in the sixteenth century; that of Turin; and that of France.

Pope Gregory XVI. (Mauro Cappellari) belonged to this order. (Hélyot.)

CAMAURO. A cap of red velvet with white fur, worn by some of the Popes on extra-liturgical occasions. After the time of Clement XIV. (d. 1775) it was discontinued, but was resumed for a time by Pius IX. and Leo XIII. (See Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 497, *note*.)

CAMERA. [See CURIA ROMANA.]

CAMERLENGO (CAMERARIUS). The "Chamberlain of the Holy Roman Church" is the highest fiscal official of the Holy See. He had formerly, in addition to the fiscal administration, an extensive civil and penal jurisdiction, and, in the event of a vacancy of the Holy See, he assumes the supreme control of the administration of the Church. It is his duty to certify the death of the Pope and to take steps for the assembling of the Conclave. He is always a Cardinal. The office passes at fixed periods from one to another of the Cardinals resident in Rome.

The Cardinals have also their Camerlengo, who administers the revenues of the Sacred College. In like manner, there is a Camerlengo of the Roman clergy elected by the canons and parish priests of Rome. (See Hilling, "Procedure at the Roman Curia," 137; Grissel, "Sede Vacante"; Humphrey, "Urbis et Orbis.")

CANCELLI. [See CHANCEL.]

CANDLEMAS. [See PURIFICATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.]

CANDLES and LIGHTS. St. Luke, in Acts xx. 7, mentions the "great number of lamps" which burnt in "the upper chamber," while St. Paul "continued his speech until midnight." The fact that Christian assemblies during the times of persecution were held before dawn made a similar employment of lights necessary, but we may well believe that the Christians, familiar as they were with the symbolical meaning of the candle-stick in the tabernacle and temple, also attached a symbolical significance to the lights which they burned during the holy mysteries. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that the Church of the fourth century still continued the religious use of lights when they were no longer needed to dispel the darkness. "Throughout the churches of the East," says Jerome, writing against Vigilantius, "lights are kindled when the Gospel is to be read, although the sun is shining: not, indeed, to drive away the darkness but as a sign of spiritual joy" ("Adv. Vigil." n. 7, PL, xxiii. 346). So Paulinus of Nola speaks of "altars crowned with a forest of lights," and similar language might be quoted from Prudentius. The use of lights at Mass is mentioned in all the Oriental liturgies.

With regard to the West, a very ancient African canon makes mention of the candle handed to the acolyte at his ordination[1]; while the mediaeval author of the "Micrologus" says: "According to the Roman order we never celebrate Mass without lights . . . using them as a type of that light . . . without which even in mid-day we grope as in the night." Nor was the use of lights confined to Mass. St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of the lights borne by the neophytes at baptism, "emblems," he says, "of those lamps of faith with which radiant souls shall hasten forth to meet the bridegroom"; and our custom of carrying lights at funerals can be traced back to the fourth century.

The present custom of the Church requires that candles should be lighted on the altar from the beginning to the end of Mass, nor can lighted candles be dispensed with on any consideration. A parish priest, for instance, must not say Mass for his flock, even on a Sunday, unless candles can be procured. The candles must be of pure wax and of white colour, except in Masses for the dead, when the S. Cong. Rit. prescribes candles "de communi cera"—*i.e.* of yellow wax. Two, and not more than two, may be lighted at a priest's low Mass, unless the Mass be said for the parish, or for a convent, or on one of the greater solemnities, when four candles may be used.[2] Six candles are lighted at High Mass, seven at the Mass of a Bishop. Twelve Candles at least should be lighted at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, or six if Benediction is given with the pyx.[3] Candles must

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 112.
[2] "Plus quam duo," according to a decree of the S. Cong.; *Manuale*, n. 377.
[3] See the note in *Manuale Decret.* to n. 2755.

also be lighted when Communion is given, whether in the church or in private houses; a lighted candle is handed to the newly baptized, and one is required in the administration of Extreme Unction. (See Rock, "Hierurgia," II., *On the Use of Lights*; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Van der Stappen, "Sacra Liturgia," III. 74–85.)

CANON. This is a term of many meanings in ecclesiastical literature. The Greek word (κανών) originally meant a rod for measuring or rectifying what is crooked. Hence it came to mean a *norma* or rule of belief or conduct, especially when decreed by the Church. It occurs in Gal. vi. 16 and 2 Cor. x. 13–16, where it bears the general sense (1) of a rule by which Christians should walk; (2) a measure of attainments assigned or permitted to an individual. The various meanings of the word will be indicated in the following articles.

CANON (member of a chapter). The clergy of every large church in ancient times were termed *canonici*, as being entered on the *list* (for this is one of the meanings of κανών) of ecclesiastics serving the church. A more definite meaning was attached to the word in consequence of the labours of Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, in the eighth century, to revive a stricter discipline among his clergy, and give scope for the exhibition among them of shining examples of virtuous living. He formed the clergy of his cathedral into a community, bound by a rule (κανών in the common sense), under which they lived in common, on the proceeds of an undivided property, and recited the divine office in choir with the same regularity as monks. Many other cathedrals and large churches, thence named collegiate, organized themselves in the same way. In the course of ages, the obligation of living in common was abandoned, and the common property was divided into portions or prebends [PREBEND], one for each canon; yet still the clergy of each cathedral formed a united body [see CHAPTER] which the Council of Trent calls an "ecclesiastical senate,"[1] declaring that those who were called to fill places in it ought—inasmuch as cathedral dignities were originally instituted in order to preserve and increase discipline, supply society with examples of pious life, and assist the bishops—to be chosen with extreme care and circumspection. In some cathedrals the community life instituted by Chrodegang was retained, and other separate institutions similarly ordered arose [see AUGUSTINIAN CANONS; PREMONSTRATENSIANS]. The secular canons, with whom we are at present concerned, having the administration of large properties, and holding in cathedrals, relatively to bishops, a position which might be one of willing subordination, yet might easily become one of antagonism, form the subject of numerous chapters of the canon law. A canonry is defined as a spiritual right—arising out of election or reception into the chapter—first, to a stall in choir and a voice in chapter; next, to a prebend or competent portion of the chapter revenues, on the earliest possible opportunity. Till the acquisition of a prebend, the holder of a canonry is a minor canon (*canonicus minor*); after it, a major or full canon. The Council of Trent (*loc. cit.*) ordered that no one should be appointed to a canonry with cure of souls attached, under twenty-four years of age. When there is no cure of souls, a person may receive a canonry in a collegiate church at as low an age as fourteen; in a cathedral where the prebends are distributed among canons with different orders, the recipient of a subdiaconal canonry must be twenty-one; of a diaconal, twenty-two; of a sacerdotal, twenty-four years of age. In a cathedral where the canonries are not distributed, he must be at least twenty-two. The Council ordered that all cathedral canons should possess a grade of orders not lower than the subdiaconate, and recommended that at least half of them should be in priest's orders; it also obliged them to reside not less than nine months in the year. With regard to their duties, it says:—"Let all be bound to attend the divine offices in person and not by substitutes, and to assist and serve the bishop when celebrating Mass, or pontificating in any other manner, and to praise the name of God reverently, distinctly, and devoutly in hymns and canticles in the choir appointed for psalmody."

Chapters were established in England at the restoration of the Hierarchy (1850); but, as there are no revenues attached to them, the canons are exempt from residence and attendance at the divine offices in the cathedral. They are bound, however, to be present once a month. Canons when present in choir should wear the canonical dress. Generally speaking this consists of a black cassock, rochet, and mozzetta. By Papal indult additional articles of dress and variations of colour have been granted to different chapters. The status (rights and duties) of canons vary in different countries. (Ferraris; Taunton, *Chapter*; Rock, ii. p. 64; De Herdt, "Praxis Capitularis.")

CANON LAW. From the earliest times the determinations of the Church received the name of *Canons*—that is, rules directory in matters of faith and conduct. Thus we read of the Apostolic Canons, the Canons of the Council of Nicaea, or of Chalcedon, &c. A tendency afterwards appeared to restrict the term Canon to matters of discipline, and to give the name of *dogma* to decisions bearing on faith. But the Council of Trent confirmed the ancient use of the word, calling its determinations "canons," whether they bore on points of belief or were directed to the reformation of discipline.

[1] Sess. xxiv. De Reform. c. 12.

Canon Law is the assemblage of rules or laws relating to faith, morals, and discipline, prescribed or propounded to Christians by ecclesiastical authority. The words "or laws" are added to the definition, lest it be thought that these rules are only matters of publication and persuasion, and not binding laws, liable to be enforced by penalties. The definition shows that the *object* of canon law is "faith, morals, and discipline"; and nothing but these is its object. "To Christians"—that is, baptized persons are the *subjects* of canon law; and that without reference to the question whether they are or are not obedient to the Church and within her pale. For theologians teach that the *character* imprinted by baptism on the soul is ineffaceable; and in virtue of this character the baptized are Christ's soldiers, and subject of right to those whom He appointed to rule in His fold. The unbaptized (Turks, Pagans, &c.), speaking generally, are not the subjects of canon law. Yet it must not be supposed that the Church has no rights and no duties in regard to such persons; by the commission of Christ she has the right of visiting, teaching, and then baptizing them ("euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizando," &c.). "Propounded"—for some of these rules belong to the natural or to the divine law, and as such are not originally imposed by the Church, but proposed and explained by her. "By ecclesiastical authority"—hence canon law is distinguished from systems of law imposed by the civil authority of States, as being prescribed by the power with which Jesus Christ endowed the Church which He founded ("qui vos audit, me audit; pasce oves meas," &c.).

Before we proceed to give a brief sketch of the history of canon law, to notice its parts, ascertain its sources, and describe its principal collections, a preliminary objection, striking at the root of its authority, and almost at its existence, must be examined. It is, that the consent of the civil power in any country is necessary to give validity to the determinations of the canon law in that country. This is the doctrine of the "placitum regium" or "royal assent"; it implies, whatever may be the form of the government, that State authorization is necessary before it can become the duty of a Christian to obey the ecclesiastical authority. On this Cardinal Soglia writes as follows:—"If we inquire into the origin of the 'placitum,' we shall find it in the terrible and prolonged schism which lasted from the election of Urban VI. to the Council of Constance. For Urban, lest the schism should give occasion to an improper use of Papal authority, granted to certain prelates that there should be no execution of any apostolic letters in their cities and dioceses, unless such letters were first shown to and approved by those prelates, or their officials. The rulers of European States also began carefully to examine all bulls and constitutions, in order that their subjects might not be deceived by pseudo-pontiffs. But these measures, it is evident, were of a precautionary and temporary character. However, when the cause ceased, the effect did not also cease; on the extinction of the schism, the Placitum did not disappear, but was retained by the civil power in many countries, and gradually extended. At first, says Oliva, the Placitum was applied to Papal rescripts of grace and justice given to individuals; afterwards it was extended to decrees of discipline, and in the end even to dogmatic bulls." The Cardinal explains in what sense the celebrated canonist Van Espen, who was prone unduly to magnify the civil power, understood the application of the Placitum to dogmatic rescripts, and proceeds:—"It is evident that this theory" (of possible danger or inconvenience to the State if Papal bulls were published without restraint) "arose out of the suggestions of statesmen and politicians, who, as Zallwein says, out of a wish to flatter and please the princes whom they serve, and to enlarge their own and their masters' jurisdiction, as well as out of the hatred of the ecclesiastical power by which they are often animated, invent all kinds of dangers, harms, and losses, by which they pretend the public welfare is threatened, and artfully bring these views under the notice of their masters. . . . 'If,' proceeds the same Zallwein, 'the ecclesiastical sovereigns whom Christ hath set to rule over the Church of God were to urge their "placitum" also, whenever political edicts are issued which, as often happens, are prejudicial to the ecclesiastical state, hostile to ecclesiastical liberties, opposed to the jurisdiction of the Pontiff and bishops, and aggressive against the very holy of holies, what would the civil rulers say?' Following up the argument, Govart says 'If a prince could not be said to have full power and jurisdiction in temporals, were his edicts to depend on the "placitum" of the Pope and bishops, and could their publication be hindered by others; so neither would the Pope have full power in spirituals, if his constitutions depended on the "placitum" of princes, and could be suppressed by them. Wherefore, if, in the former case, whoever should maintain the affirmative might justly be said to impugn the authority of the prince, so and *a fortiori* in the second case must the supporter of such an opinion be said to undermine with sinister intention the Papal authority, or rather to destroy it altogether.' The sum of the argument is, that 'by the "placitum regium" the liberty of the ecclesiastical "magisterium" and government divinely entrusted to the Church is seriously impaired, the independence of the divinely appointed primacy destroyed, and the mutual intercourse between the head and the members intercepted. Therefore, if the

Church, to guard against still greater evils, endures and puts up with the "placitum," she never consents to or approves of it.'"

From the point of view of the interest of the laity, and the Christian people generally, it is obvious that the lovers of true liberty must disapprove of the "placitum." It is impossible that the Church, or the Roman Pontiff as the mouth-piece of the Church, should issue any decree or have any interest inimical to the welfare of the general Christian population in any State. Any obstacles, therefore, which governments may interpose to the free publication and execution of ecclesiastical rescripts cannot arise from solicitude for the public welfare. Whence, then, do they arise, or have they arisen? Evidently from the arbitrary temper of kings, the jealousies of nobles, and the desire of bureaucrats to extend their power. These two latter classes, at least all but the noblest individuals among them, are usually predisposed to hamper the action of the Church and the clergy, lest their own social influence should be diminished relatively to that of the latter. This is no interest which deserves to engage popular sympathies, but rather the contrary.

Historical.—Jurisdiction is implied in the terms of the commission of binding and loosing which Christ gave to the Apostles, and especially to Peter. While Christians were few and apostles and others who had "seen the Lord" were still alive, the apostolic authority could be exercised with little help from written documents or rigid rules. As these early conditions passed away, the necessity of a system of law, in order to ensure uniformity, equity, and perspicuity in the exercise of the Church's jurisdiction, could not but become increasingly manifest. After the Apostles had passed away, having devolved upon the bishops all of their authority which was not limited to them in their apostolic character, each bishop became a centre of jurisdiction. In deciding any cases that might be brought before him, he had three things to guide him—Scripture, tradition, and the "holy canons"—that is, the disciplinary rules which Church synods, beginning with the Council of Jerusalem, had established. Many of these primitive canons are still preserved for us in the collection known as the Apostolical Canons [see that article], although, taken as a whole, they are of no authority. Till Christianity conquered the imperial throne, questions of jurisdiction and law did not come into prominence; after Constantine the case was very different. The Council of Nicaea, besides its dogmatic utterances, framed a number of canons for the regulation of Church discipline, which, along with those of Sardica, were soon translated into Latin, and widely circulated in the West. An important step towards codification and uniformity of procedure was taken at the end of the fifth or early in the sixth century, when Dionysius Exiguus, under the direction of Popes Anastasius and Symmachus, made a large compilation of canons for the use of the Latin Church. In this he included fifty of the Apostolic canons, translated from the Greek, considering the rest to be of doubtful authority; the canons of Chalcedon, with those of which that council had made use; the canons of Sardica, and a large number promulgated by African councils; lastly, the decretal letters of the Popes from Siricius to Anastasius II. The next collection is that supposed to have been made by St. Isidore of Seville, early in the seventh century. About A.D. 850, a collection of canons and decretals appeared, seemingly at Mayence, which were ostensibly the compilation of Isidore of Seville. In an age of great ignorance, when criticism was neither in favour nor provided with means, it is not wonderful that this collection, which invested with the spurious authority of recorded decisions a system of things existing traditionally, indeed, but liable to constant opposition, passed speedily into general recognition and acceptance. Six centuries passed before it was discovered that these pseudo-Isidorian or False Decretals, as they are now called, were to a great extent a forgery. [FALSE DECRETALS.] Nevertheless, as Cardinal Soglia remarks, the collection contains in it nothing contrary to faith or sound morals; otherwise its long reception would have been impossible; nor does the discipline which it enjoins depend for its authority upon this collection but either upon constitutions of earlier and later date, or upon custom, "quae in rebus disciplinaribus multum valet."

Many collections of canons were made and used in national churches between the date of Dionysius Exiguus and that of the author of the "Decretum." In Africa there was the Codex Africanus (547) and the "Concordantia Canonum" of Bishop Cresconius (697); in Spain the chapters of Martin, bishop of Braga (572), besides the work of Isidore of Seville already mentioned; in France, a Codex Canonum, besides the capitularies of the Merovingian and Carlovingian kings. [CAPITULARY.] Passing over these, we come to the celebrated compilation by Gratian, a Benedictine monk (1151), which the compiler, whose main purpose was to reconcile the inconsistencies among canons of different age and authorship bearing on the same subject, entitled "Concordantia discordantium Canonum," but which is generally known as the "Decretum Gratiani." Having brought our historical sketch to the point where ecclesiastical law, no longer perplexed by the multiplicity of canons of various date and place and more or less limited application, begins to provide herself with a general code—a "corpus juris"—applicable to the whole Catholic world, we drop the historical method

and turn to the remaining heads of the inquiry.

Canon law consists of precepts of different kinds. Hence it is divided into four *parts*—precepts of the natural law, positive divine precepts, directions left by the Apostles, and ecclesiastical constitutions. Upon each of these Cardinal Soglia discourses solidly and lucidly in the second chapter of his Prolegomena.

With regard to the *sources* whence these precepts flow, they might, strictly speaking, be reduced to three—God, who impresses the natural law upon the conscience, and reveals the truths which men are to believe; the Apostles; and the Supreme Pontiffs, either alone or in conjunction with the bishops in general councils. Canonists, however, find it more convenient to define the sources of canon law in the following manner: 1. Holy Scripture; 2. Ecclesiastical tradition; 3. The decrees of councils; 4. Papal constitutions and rescripts; 5. The writings of the Fathers; 6. The civil law. On this last head Soglia remarks that "many things relating to the external polity of the Church have been borrowed from the imperial enactments of Rome, and incorporated in the canon law."

The *Collections* of canon law, considering it as a system in present force and obligation, commence with the "Decretum Gratiani" already mentioned. This great work is divided into three parts. The first part, in 101 "Distinctions," treats of ecclesiastical law, its origin, principles, and authority, and then of the different ranks and duties of the clergy. The second part, in thirty-six "Causes," treats of ecclesiastical courts, and their forms of procedure. The third part, usually called "De Consecratione," treats of things and rites employed in the service of religion. From its first appearance the Decretum obtained a wide popularity, but it was soon discovered that it contained numerous errors, which were corrected under the directions of successive Popes down to Gregory XIII. Nor, although every subsequent generation has resorted to its pages, is the Decretum an *authority* to this day—that is, whatever canons or maxims of law are found in it possess only that degree of legality which they would possess if they existed separately; their being in the Decretum gives them no binding force. In the century after Gratian several supplementary collections of Decretals appeared. These, with many of his own, were collected by the orders of Gregory IX.—who employed in the work the extraordinary learning and acumen of St. Raymond of Pennafort—into five books, known as the *Decretals* of Gregory IX. These are in the fullest sense authoritative, having been deliberately ratified and published by that Pope (1234). The *Sext*, or sixth book of the Decretals, was added by Boniface VIII. (1298). The *Clementines* are named after Clement V., who compiled them out of the canons of the Council of Vienne (1316) and some of his own constitutions. The *Extravagantes* of John XXII., who succeeded Clement V., and the *Extravagantes Communes*, containing the Decretals of twenty-five Popes ending with Sixtus IV. (1484), complete the list. Of these five collections—namely, the Decretals, the Sext, the Clementines, the Extravagants of John XXII., and the Extravagants Common—the "Corpus Juris Ecclesiastici" is made up.

To these a very important addition has to be made in "Jus novissimum"—modern law. Under this head are comprised the canons of general councils since that of Vienne, contained in great compilations such as those of Labbe and Harduin, and the Decretal Letters of Popes, published in the form of *Bullaria*, and coming down (in the case of the great Turin *Bullarium* of 1857) to the pontificate of Pius IX. The decisions of Roman congregations and of the tribunal of the Rota [ROTA] also form part of this modern law. The rules of the Roman Chancery, first formulated by John XXII. and now numbering seventy-two, are everywhere of authority, provided that they do not conflict with a contrary law, a clause in a Concordat, or a legitimate custom. Lastly, the *Concordats*, or treaties entered into by the Holy See with various countries for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, constitute special systems of law for those countries. [CONCORDAT.]

In England, as in other European countries, the canon and civil law were studied together before the Reformation, and formed a code, applicable not only to spiritual suits but to the large class of mixed cases, which was enforced in the Church courts. Provincial constitutions were passed from time to time by different archbishops of Canterbury, but from their increasing number and the want of a methodical arrangement, many of them were gradually forgotten or neglected. A great service, therefore, was rendered to the English Church of his day by William Lyndewode, chaplain to Archbishop Chicheley and official of the Court of Arches, who collected and arranged (about 1425), under the title of "Provinciale," the constitutions of fourteen archbishops of Canterbury, from Stephen Langton to Chicheley, classifying them according to their subjects in five books, in imitation of the Decretals of Gregory IX. To this collection the constitutions of the legates Otho (1237) and Othobon (1262) were subsequently appended. These English constitutions, and canon law generally (except so far as modified by the statutes and canons which consummated the Anglican schism, and raised the reigning sovereign—being an Anglican Protestant, 1702—to the headship of the national church), are still recognised as authoritative in Anglican ecclesiastical courts. (See the important work of F. W. Maitland,

"Roman Canon Law in the Church of England.")

The canon law is at present (1916) in course of codification, and the work is well advanced.

Treatises on canon law, as a rule, are either cast into the form of a Commentary on the Decretals of Gregory IX. or are divided into four sections: *De rebus, De personis, De judiciis, De delictis et poenis*, dealing respectively with sacraments, sacred buildings, church property, &c., with bishops, priests, and the lower ranks of the clergy, with ecclesiastical procedure, and with infringements of canon law and the penalties incurred thereby.

In the enormous literature on the subject of canon law works useful to consult are the "Corpus Juris Canonici" (Leipzig, 1879), the modern treatises of Gasparri, Wernz, De Angelis and Santi-Leitner, and the Manuals of Craisson, Zitelli and Taunton.

CANON OF THE MASS. That part of the Mass which begins after the "Sanctus" with the prayer "Te igitur," and ends, according to some, just before the "Pater noster," according to others, with the consumption of the Sacred Species.[1] The name Canon is given to this part of the Mass because it contains the fixed rule according to which the Sacrifice of the New Testament is to be offered. Other names are given to it by early writers. Thus St. Gregory calls it "the prayer"; Vigilius, "the text of the canonical prayer"; Walafrid and others, "the action" (*q.v.*), the last of these names being still used in the Missal, as well as the word Canon. The Canon consists, according to the Council of Trent, "of our Lord's very words, and of prayers received from apostolical tradition or piously ordained by holy Pontiffs."[2] That the Canon of the Roman Mass comes in its substance from very ancient times is clearly shown, (1) by the fact that Pope Vigilius, in the sixth century, attributes it to the tradition of the Apostles; (2) because the words of consecration, with those which immediately precede them, do not exactly correspond to the Scriptural narrative, and seem to represent an independent apostolical tradition; (3) because the list of saints mentioned consists merely of Apostles and martyrs, a mark that the Canon is earlier than the fourth century, coming from an age before the cultus of confessors had been introduced in addition to the earlier cultus of martyrs.

The words "a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim," were added by St. Leo the Great. Pope St. Gregory the Great added the words "and dispose our days in thy peace, and bid us be saved from eternal damnation, and to be numbered in the flock of thy elect." Since Gregory's time no change has been made in the Canon. Of late years especially there has been much controversy as to whether or not the prayers that make up the Canon still stand in their primitive order; and more particularly whether the mementos of the Living and the Dead were not originally in immediate sequence, possibly even preceding the chant of the Preface. The almost unexplainable occurrence of certain particles, "*Te igitur*," "*Hanc igitur*," "*Memento etiam*," are much dwelt upon in this connexion. Here it will suffice to draw attention to the divergent views on the subject. (See LITURGIES; Benedict XIV. "De Miss." 11, 12; Bona, "De Sacrificio Missae"; Fortescue, in "Cath. Enc." and "The Mass," ch. viii. On recent controversy about the Canon see Cabrol in DACL and "Les Origines Liturgiques," 317; Moureau in DThC, and Lucas, "Holy Mass," vol. ii.)

CANON OF THE SCRIPTURE. As applied to Scripture, the original sense of the word Canon is hard to determine. We first find the *derivatives* of Canon used with regard to the Bible. Thus Origen speaks of "canonical scriptures," "canonized books." The actual word canon, according to Credner,[1] first occurs after the middle of the fourth century.[2] It may, as Credner thinks, have been given to the list of Scriptural books because they were a rule for the faith, or, again, as Westcott argues with great show of reason, it may mean that these books were "admitted by the rule" of the Church. In other words, the canon of Scripture may have an active or a passive sense.

The object of this article is to sketch the history of the canon or list of sacred books, among Jews and Christians, and then to explain Catholic as contrasted with heretical principles on this matter.

I. *The Canon of the Old Testament.*—For the sake of clearness we begin with the list of Old Testament books as given by the Council of Trent, "lest any doubt might arise concerning those that are approved of" as inspired Scripture. They are the following:—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings (the first two being also known as 1 and 2 Samuel), 1 and 2 Paralipomenon (or Chronicles), 1 and 2 Esdras (the second being otherwise called Nehemias), *Tobias*, *Judith*, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, Isaias, Jeremias with *Baruch*, Ezechiel, Daniel, the twelve minor prophets, 1 and 2 *Machabees*. The books marked in italics are generally known among Catholic critics as

[1] "Though the title 'Canon Missae' now stands after the 'Sanctus,' it is important to remember that the Preface is really part of the Canon. Originally it was counted as such. . . . The Canon is one long prayer, the Eucharistic prayer (Prayer of Consecration)." (Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 315.)

[2] Sess. xxii. cap. 4, De Sacrific. Miss.

[1] *Geschichte des N. T. Kanon*, Volkmar's ed. 1863, p. 103.

[2] It occurs, indeed, in Origen, but only in the Latin version.

deutero-canonical,[1] not because their authority is at all inferior to that of the other Scriptures, but because their place in the canon was established after that of the other books. We shall call them henceforth, then, by this name. Their inspiration is denied by the Protestant churches, and the charge of having added apocryphal books to the Bible is often brought against the Church. [See APOCRYPHA.] Hence special attention must be paid to the history of their reception among Jews and Christians. We may now proceed to consider the history of the canon of the Old Testament.

(*a*) *Among the Jews.*

This part of the subject is wrapped in great obscurity. At present, indeed, the Jews accept only such books as actually exist in Hebrew and Chaldee, and are bound up in the modern Hebrew Bibles, to the exclusion of all the deutero-canonical books. It has often been asserted that this canon, as at present recognised by them, was fixed probably by Esdras, and in any case long before our Lord's time; that it was recognized by Him and by His apostles, so that Catholics in maintaining the authority of the deutero-canonical books are guilty of innovation. We shall see that each one of these statements is contrary to fact.

The Jewish collection seems to have begun with the five books of Moses. They were placed "in the side of the ark of the covenant."[2] A collection of Solomon's proverbs copied out by the men of Ezechias is mentioned in Proverbs xxv. 1. Daniel ix. 2 mentions "the books" (ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις LXX., not "books," without the article, as in the Douay and Authorized Anglican versions) in which he observed the seventy years of desolation prophesied by Jeremias. Daniel may refer here to some collection of prophetic writings already made; and Zacharias vii. 12 puts the "former prophets" in juxtaposition with the law. With regard to the popular opinion that Esdras collected the sacred books and closed the Jewish canon, it is to be observed that this supposed fact rests upon the authority of a chapter in the Mishna (viz. Pirke Avoth), and that the tradition is admitted by all modern scholars to contain fabulous details. It may contain this element of truth, that Esdras did collect the Scriptural books written up to his day, but as to closing the Scriptural canon, nothing like historical proof can be adduced for it, and it is itself utterly improbable. "We do not even know," writes a learned Protestant, "whether Esdras died before or after the last prophet. But how could he close the canon unless he knew for certain that the spirit of prophecy was extinct? Even if Malachias did die before Esdras, how did Esdras know that the Lord would never raise up another ἀνὴρ θεόπνευστος to his people?"[1] In 2 Mach. ii. 13 Nehemias is recorded to have founded a library "and gathered into it the [writings] about the kings and prophets and the [writings] of David and letters of kings concerning offerings." The passage is most obscure, and in any case says nothing about the completion of the canon. In the later times, however, of the Jewish commonwealth, a distinct step in advance seems to have been made. We find the sacred books regarded as a whole with certain recognised divisions. In the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus mention is made of "the law, the prophets, and the rest of the books"; and a similar division into the law, prophets, and psalms appears in Lk. xxiv. 44.

A little later we meet with what may fairly be taken as proof for the existence of a Hebrew canon. Josephus enumerates twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon: viz. five books of the law, thirteen books of the prophets, and four which contain hymns and moral precepts. We cannot be quite certain what the books are to which Josephus refers, but undoubtedly the list which he received is almost, and probably it is quite, the same as that contained in our present Hebrew Bibles and accepted by Protestants. Reusch suggests the following as the list of books intended:—five books of Moses, thirteen books of the prophets [viz.: (1) Josue, (2) Judges and Ruth, (3) Samuel, (4) Kings, (5) Chronicles, (6) Esdras and Nehemias, (7) Esther, (8) Job, (9) Isaias, (10) Jeremias with Lamentations, (11) Ezechiel, (12) Daniel, (13) the minor prophets], and lastly, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. Melito (*c.* 179) made inquiries about the books received in the Hebrew canon, and his list corresponds to that conjecturally attributed to Josephus, except that he omits Esther. In the next century, Origen, in enumerating the twenty-two books which the Hebrews hand down, mentions not only the Lamentations, but also the letter of the prophet (Baruch vi.) under the one head Jeremias.

So far Jewish tradition seems to agree, at least very nearly, with the Protestant canon of the Old Testament; but it only seems. Up to this point we have given no more than the tradition of the Palestinian Jews. The Alexandrian Jews—or, as it would perhaps be more correct to say, the Hellenistic Jews—possessed Greek copies of the Scriptures known as the LXX, and these

[1] If we look at the reception of the Old Testament books among Christians, Esther should be reckoned as deutero-canonical, for in the time of St. Athanasius, and even as late as the sixth century, its canonicity was still an open question in the Church. As, however, it was probably always received by the Jews (see the introduction to Keil's *Commentary on Esther*), and has been generally acknowledged by the Protestant Churches, it is counted here as proto-canonical. Parts of Daniel are also deutero-canonical.

[2] Deut. xxxi. 26 *seq.*

[1] Nagelsbach in Herzog's *Encyclopaedia of Prot. Theology*, quoted by Reusch.

copies[1] contained all the books of the Old Testament which Catholics acknowledge. Obviously it cannot have been without strong reason that such a book as that of Wisdom or Ecclesiasticus was put in the same volume with Job or Proverbs. Among the Jews of Alexandria, as Westcott, one of the highest Protestant authorities on the subject, admits, translations were made of later books (1 Machab., Ecclus., Baruch, &c.), and new ones were written (Wisdom and 2 Mach.), and these "were reckoned in the sum of their religious literature and probably placed on an equal footing with the Hagiographa (*i.e.* Psalms, Proverbs, Job, &c.) in common esteem."[1] Nor is this all. As many Jews went beyond the Palestinian and Babylonish canon, so some great and orthodox Jewish teachers fell short of it. During the first century A.D. the canonicity of Canticles and Ecclesiastes was still disputed in the Jewish schools. The school of Schammai denied the canonicity of the latter, and in a Jewish council about the year 90 A.D. discussed freely the canonicity of each of these books, and finally decided it in the affirmative.[2] If the Jews did at last decidedly reject the books which they did not find in their Hebrew Bible, but which were contained in the LXX, this may reasonably be attributed to the growing aversion which they felt to Greek literature in general and to the LXX in particular. In any case, the Christian Church never received the canon of Scripture from the Jews, because till long after the Jews had rejected Christ they had no fixed canon. Nor can any Protestant consistently accept the canon of the Old Testament on Jewish authority, unless he attributes infallibility to the bitterest enemies of the Christian name.[3] The Palestinian canon, so far as it can be said to have existed in the time of Christ and His Apostles, did not receive any distinct approval from them. No doubt the deutero-canonical books (Wisdom, Machabees, &c.) are not expressly quoted as Scripture in the New Testament, though the New Testament does contain a good many allusions to them; but precisely the same may be said of several Old Testament books accepted by Protestants—*e.g.* of Judges, Ecclesiastes, Canticles. Moreover, out of, say, 350 quotations of the Old Testament in the New, about 300 are from the LXX, which contains the deutero-canonical books.[4]

[1] Article "Canon" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*.

[2] See Delitzsch, introduction to *Commentary on Canticles*, p. 14; to *Ecclesiastes*, p. 196.

[3] Prof. Robertson Smith, in his lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish church, admits that the Jewish canon was not definitely fixed in Christ's time, but tries to justify the Protestant rejection of the deutero-canonical books on the ground that these books do not contribute to the development of revelation. But, in fact, the book of Wisdom *does* develop the religious ideas of Israel, and prepare the way for the New Testament doctrine on the Λόγος, and this has been repeatedly urged by theologians, in defence of the Catholic canon.

[4] Swete, *Introd. to the Old Testament in Greek*, part iii. ch. 2.

(β) *In the Christian Church.*

We have seen that, when Christianity began to be, a definite canon of the Old Testament was not yet established among the Jews, and further that the New Testament does not furnish any list of Old Testament books received by Christ and His Apostles. It can, however, be proved from tradition, that the full list of Old Testament books (including Wisdom, Machabees, &c.) was authorized by the Apostles. The testimony of the Christian writers during the first three centuries is unanimous on this point. We can trace the reception of these books from the very time of the Apostles. Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and others quote them, and many early writers quote them as Scripture.[1] To this unanimity among the Christians of the first three centuries there is one exception and only one. Julius Africanus, in a letter to Origen, refused to accept the history of Susanna as canonical. But this exception proves how strong was the tradition of the Church; for Julius Africanus objects to the history of Susanna merely on critical grounds, and Origen expressly receives it (although well aware that it was not to be found in the Hebrew text of Daniel) because it was held as canonical in the churches—"quia in ecclesiis tenetur." Nothing, then, can be more complete than the Ante-Nicene tradition for the Catholic canon of the Old Testament. For the deutero-canonical books, we have the witness of Father after Father; we find them placed in every MS. of the LXX, translated in the Old Latin version,[2] and quoted in controversy against heretics.

Still, among the Fathers of the fourth century there was serious doubt concerning the authority of the deutero-canonical books. Jerome and Rufinus follow the canon of the Hebrew Bible, and declare that the deutero-canonical books are not "canonical," but "ecclesiastical"—*i.e.* they were read in church, but did not possess full, dogmatic authority. St. Athanasius excludes Esther from the canon and all the deutero-canonical books, except Baruch and the letter of Jeremias. With him agrees St. Cyril of Jerusalem, except that he does not exclude Esther. Gregory Nazianzen and Amphilochius exclude all the deutero-canonical books and also Esther, though the latter speaks doubtfully about Esther. On the other hand, St. Augustine gives a list of the canonical books which is precisely the same as that now accepted in the Church. A multitude of Fathers—Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Leo, &c.—quote the deutero-canonical books just

[1] Swete, *loc. cit.* ch. 3.

[2] Clem. Rom. (1 Cor iii. 27, 55) and Polyc. (*Ep.* 10) quote deutero-canonical books of the O.T.; Iren. (iv. 5, 2; iv. 26, 3), Tertull. (*Praescript.* 7; *Scorp.* 8), Clem. Al. (*Strom.* iv. 23, &c.), quote them as Scripture. The letter of Julius Africanus is edited by Routh, *Reli. Sacr.* tom. ii. The opinion of Origen is given in his *comm. in Math.* 61, apud Reusch. See Swete, *ubi supra*.

as they quote the other books of the Old Testament. Nay, so strong was the feeling within the Church in favour of the extended canon, that even Fathers who in theory rejected the deutero-canonical books, in practice quote them as Scripture. Thus the witness of the Church in the fourth century, though less strong than that of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, is still strong in favour of the deutero-canonical books. The Church as a whole received them, though individual Fathers of great name rejected them.

It was probably this divergence of opinion which had arisen which led to conciliar decisions; and here, too, we see the greater weight of authority and tradition enlisted on the side of the deutero-canonical books. There is no reason to believe that the Council of Nicaea made any list of canonical books, though St. Jerome says he had read that that council "reckoned Judith" as part of Scripture.[1] A little later, however, the Council of Laodicea (between 343 and 381), canon 60, rejected all the deutero-canonical books except Baruch.[2] But in 393 all these books were accepted by the Council of Hippo, and again approved as canonical in a letter of Pope Innocent to Exsuperius of Toulouse. A Decretal attributed to Pope Gelasius I. (492–6) giving the full Alexandrian list was embodied in the mediaeval Canon Law. From this time the reception of the deutero-canonical books became more and more established, though as yet there was no binding decision of the Church upon the point. Even late in the Middle Ages, the authority of Jerome, whose "Prologus Galeatus" was widely known, made even orthodox teachers speak doubtfully about the canonicity of Judith &c. In 1442 the matter came before the General Council of Florence, which represented the East as well as the West, and in the decree of union for the Jacobites the full list of Old Testament books was approved.[3] Finally, the Council of Trent (Sess. iv. Decret. de Canon. Scriptur.) gives the list of Old Testament books with which we began, defining under anathema that all of them with all their parts, as contained in the Vulgate translation, were "sacred and canonical."

A few words may now be added on the canon of the Old Testament outside the Church. The schismatical Greeks appear to have followed faithfully their ancient traditions and the teaching of Florence. The schismatical Council of Jerusalem, which met in 1672, gives a list of sacred books which agrees with that of Trent, and accepts the deutero-canonical books on the authority of tradition and the Church. With Protestants it has been otherwise. All Protestant sects, so far as we know, reject the canonical authority of the deutero-canonical books. Some, however, are more peremptory in their rejection than others. Lutherans and Anglicans treat these books with a certain special reverence, and as a matter of fact they have been retained in almost all Protestant translations of the Bible. On the other hand, the Scotch Presbyterians in their Confession of Faith place the deutero-canonical books on a level with any other human writings, and since 1825 there have been in Germany and elsewhere fierce discussions, whether or no the "Apocrypha" should still be bound up with the Bible (or, as a Catholic would say, with the rest of the Bible). The question, however, is no longer so important to Protestants as it used to be. The denial of all supernatural inspiration has become common among their theologians, so that, for this large and influential section of Protestants, discussion about the list of inspired books is altogether idle or can have at most only an historical value.

II. *Canon of the New Testament.*—Like the Old, the New Testament contains a certain number of deutero-canonical books, though the fact for long received comparatively very little attention in modern times, because the Protestant confessional standards, while they reject the deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament, inconsistently enough accept those of the New. The Council of Trent gives the following list of New Testament books (those which are deutero-canonical are printed in italics):—four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul (viz. to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to Thessalonians, two to Timothy, *to* Titus, *to* Philemon, *to the Hebrews*), first and *second* Epistles of St. Peter, first, *second*, and *third* Epistles of St. John, *the Epistle of St. James, the Epistle of St. Jude, the Apocalypse of St. John.*

With regard to all these books, except such as are deutero-canonical, there is no reason to believe that their authority was ever doubted in the Church, although the distinct reference to New Testament Scriptures becomes much marked and frequent in Christian writers only after the immediate disciples of the Apostles had passed away and the need of written records became more urgent. Still, from very early times we obtain testimonies to the existence of Scriptures besides those which the Christian inherited from the Jewish Church. Thus St. Peter classes St. Paul's letters with "the rest of the Scriptures" (2 Pet. iii. 16), and the epistle which is ascribed to St. Barnabas, and which belongs to a very early period, makes a quotation from St. Matthew, with the formula "it is written." About the middle of the second century Justin Martyr tells us that "Memoirs" written by the Apostles were read in the religious

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 523. [2] *Ibid.* i. 1026.
[3] Hefele, *Concil*, vii. p. 796.

assemblies of the Christians. The description which Justin gives of his "Memoirs" answers exactly to our four Gospels (*οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια*, "Apol." I. 66), and he mentions the Apocalypse by name. Shortly after Justin's time (about 180), the famous Muratorian Canon offers the earliest formal list of New Testament books. This precious relic exists only in a mutilated form and in a text which is often so corrupt that it is difficult to divine its meaning. According to Westcott, the Muratorian Canon contained all the New Testament books at present received, except "the Epistle of James, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and 2 Peter, while it notices the partial reception of the [spurious] Apocalypse of Peter," and his words express the general opinion of scholars except that many with very strong reasons add 1 Peter also to the list of omitted books.[1] The Peshito or Syriac translation, which belongs to the third century, omits Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the Apocalypse. Eusebius (H.E. iii. 25) sets down as acknowledged books (*ὁμολογούμενα*) those of the New Testament we have termed Proto-canonical and, in addition, the Epistle to the Hebrews and (with some sort of hesitation) the Apocalypse. The rest of our deutero-canonical books he classes as *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, or disputed, but recognizes their general reception in the Church, carefully distinguishing them not only from heretical or noxious writings, such as the Apocryphal Gospels, but also from edifying and orthodox books like the Shepherd of Hermas, which though laudably read by Catholics Eusebius does not hesitate to pronounce *spurious* (*νόθοι*), that is, uninspired.

From the middle of the fourth century the canon of the New Testament gradually became more settled. True, the Syrian church still clung to the canon of the Peshito, but in the Church at large the whole of the New Testament was received. Two books, however, were still regarded with partial suspicion. In the East, the Council of Laodicea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, definitely exclude or pass over in silence the Apocalypse of St. John; Amphilochius and Epiphanius mention the doubts entertained with regard to it. In the West, although the Council of Carthage in 397 and Pope Innocent ratified the full list of New Testament books, still even to a late period doubts existed in some parts of the Church as to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Even St. Isidore of Seville, writing early in the seventh century, says that most Latins were uncertain whether it was St. Paul's, "because of the discrepancy in the style." [2]

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Kanon des N. T.* p. 43.

[2] *Apud* Credner, p. 293. In the Middle Ages the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans found wide acceptance, especially in the Frankish and English churches (Credner, p. 299).

All doubts as to the canonical books of the New Testament were finally set at rest for Catholics by the Councils of Florence and Trent. Protestants, on the contrary, on their revolt from the Church, were utterly unable to find any rational principle on which they could determine the list of New Testament books. Luther accepted or rejected New Testament books, according as he found or did not find the "Gospel" in them. He called the Epistle of St. James "a letter of straw," which "attributes righteousness to works, dead against St. Paul." It was reason enough, he said, for him not to think highly of the Apocalypse "that Christ therein is neither taught nor acknowledged, although this above all was an Apostle's business"![1] He partly liked the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it enforced belief in the priesthood of Christ; partly disliked it, because of the doctrine contained in capp. 6 and 10.[2] This breach with tradition on the Scriptures of the New Testament as well as on the doctrine was healed for a time among Protestants, and for a long time the entire canon of the New Testament was generally accepted amongst them, although the Westminster Confession of 1648 contains the only list of New Testament writings drawn up by any of the older Protestant authorities. Of modern Protestant critics little need be said. The remarks made above on their treatment of the Old fully apply to their treatment of the New Testament. This method is widely different from that of Luther, but it is not without reason that they claim to inherit his spirit.

III. *The Principles on which the Canon of Scripture rests.*—Catholics, believing in the infallible authority of the Church, have full security that the books of the Catholic Bible are all true and inspired Scripture. Before the Scripture was written, or, again, the canon of Scripture was fixed, the faithful were guided by the infallible teaching of their pastors, and from this same teaching they receive with perfect confidence the written word of God in all its books and in all its parts. There are two other principles put forward as sufficient to determine the canon of Scripture—both of them, as may be briefly shewn, utterly inadequate.

According to a theory once popular among Protestants, Scripture attests itself by a "self-evidencing light." In other words, a pious person who peruses the Bible knows by the effect produced upon his conscience and feeling that the book he reads is the inspired word of God. This theory is abundantly refuted by the most obvious facts of history. The Fathers of the Church were not at one as to the canon, yet in charity we may believe that they read the books of the New Testament with pious feelings. Nay, the Reformers who are said to have restored "the Gospel" were not at one with regard to

[1] Hilgenfeld, p. 91. [2] *Ibid.* p. 93.

the books which make up the New Testament. Besides, from the nature of the case, the moral good which we get or think we can get from a book cannot possibly assure us that it was all written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and contains nothing but the truth of God. Indeed, the bare statement of this theory suffices for its refutation.

Another theory, which we may call the literary, bases the authority of the Scriptural books, and their title to a place in the canon, on a critical investigation of the internal and external evidence which can be produced in their behalf. This method is pursued by almost every learned Protestant at the present day—by extreme sceptics like Hilgenfeld and Keim, who examine tradition to undermine the authenticity of Scripture; and by sober and patient investigators like Dr. Westcott, a devout believer in the authority of Scripture. But to base the canón on critical investigations, however accurate and thorough, involves a misconception of the object for which Scripture was given. Scripture is given to the whole Church: it is meant for the guidance of all the faithful, and all, either directly, by reading it themselves, or indirectly, by hearing portions of it read or expounded by their pastors, have the right to benefit by its salutary lessons. Indeed, the argument tells yet more strongly against Protestants. If, as they hold, Scripture is the sole rule of faith, and if learning and critical training are needed to ascertain what the Scripture is, then one of two consequences necessarily follows. All, except an infinitesimal fraction of mankind, must give up the attempt to secure a right rule of faith altogether, or else, instead of the infallibility of the Church, they must accept the infallibility of some particular school among learned men.

Protestants, when they appeal to Scripture against the Church, forget that it is only from this very Church, and on her authority, that Scripture is received; and we may conclude with the words of a Protestant scholar who has done more than any other to illustrate the history of the canon. Protestants, he says, have built a new Church on the foundation of Scripture, first without understanding, then without the will to understand, that Scripture itself rests on nothing but tradition.[1] (The subject of the Canon of the Scripture is treated of by theologians in the treatise "De Scriptura," *e.g.* Franzelin, p. 405 *sqq.*; and also in the General Introductions to Scripture, *e.g.* Gigot, Cornely; Loisy, "Hist. du Canon de l'Ancien Testament," "Hist. du Canon du N. Test."; W. Barry, "The Tradition of Scripture"; Westcott, "On the Canon of the New Testament"; Zahn, "Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons.")

[1] Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Canons.*

CANON PENITENTIARY. The Council of Trent ordered[1] that in every cathedral church, if possible, a penitentiary, with a claim to hold the next vacant prebend, should be appointed by the bishop; he was to be forty years of age, and either a master of arts, or doctor, or a licentiate in theology or canon law. His duty was to hear confessions, and while so doing he was considered to perform his choral duties. The selection *de jure communi* belongs to the bishop (except in the months reserved to the Pope); but by the *jus particulare* the *concursus* is required in Italy, and some other countries. In England the bishops have been recently (1913) dispensed from this *concursus*. (See Taunton; Ferraris, *Canonicatus*, art. ix., 45 *sqq.*)

CANON, PRIVILEGE OF. [See IMMUNITY.]

CANON REGULAR. [See CANON.]

CANON THEOLOGIAN. The Council of Trent directed[2] that in all churches where a prebendal provision was already made for lectures on Theology and Holy Scripture, the bishops should see that the foundation was not defeated of its purpose; and also that for the future, in all cathedral churches, or even collegiate churches, a theologian with the above-mentioned duties should be appointed and competently provided for out of the chapter funds. The office was usually conferred upon a member of the chapter, whence the name Canon Theologian. In England the theologian must be a canon. The selection belongs to the bishop *de jure communi* (except in the months reserved to the Pope); but in some countries a *concursus* is prescribed, from the holding of which the English bishops have been recently (1913) dispensed. (See Ferraris, *Canonicatus*, art. ix., 1 *sqq.*; Taunton).

CANONS OF THE APOSTLES. [See APOSTOLIC CANONS.]

CANONESS. Chapters of Canonesses are mentioned in the capitularies of Louis le Débonnaire, which allow them to possess property, both common and private, and only require that they should take the vows of chastity and obedience. In the following centuries these chapters, especially in France and Germany, became very numerous. They were distinguished from nunneries by the permission to the members to hold private property. The duties of the Canonesses were, to teach young girls, work at church embroidery, copy and illuminate service-books, &c. The right of holding property naturally introduced much laxity, and introduced into the order of Canonesses a class of wealthy and titled ladies, who were indisposed to submit to any severity of discipline. Hence a crisis arrived in the history of these chapters, similar to that which we have described with reference to Canons; and Regular Canon-

[1] Sess. v. De Reform. cap. 1.
[2] Sess. xxiv. De Reform. cap. 8.

esses, bound by the vow of poverty and observing a strict rule of life, existed side by side with Secular Canonesses, to whom the chapter was little more than an agreeable retreat, enabling ladies who did not wish to marry, or had outlived their charms, to live in the society of persons of their own rank much as they would have done in the world. At the Reformation, such being the character of these chapters, it caused no surprise that the members of several of them—ladies of princely or noble rank—followed the example of their male relatives and repudiated the Catholic faith. Some of these still exist: at Gandersheim, Herford, &c. [Wilhelmina, sister of Frederick the Great, "Abbess of Quedlinburg," was the head of one of these Protestant chapters. If any of the Canonesses wish to marry, she must resign her canonry. On the other hand, many of the communities of Canonesses took the name and rule of the congregations of Regular Canons; "there still exist in Italy, France, Spain, Belgium, Holland, England, Germany, America, Africa, nuns and convents belonging to the Lateran or to some other congregation of canons regular." (See Allaria in "Cath. Enc."; Leclercq in DACL.)

CANONIZATION. To pay honour to the dead whom the general voice declares to have lived well is an instinct of human nature. Roman citizens brought the images of their distinguished ancestors into their villas; under the empire they recognized the far-reaching power and august majesty—sometimes the beneficence—of their rulers by deifying them after death; in China, the worship of ancestors is to this day the most living portion of the popular religion; among ourselves, the number of monuments in our public places everywhere, though in many cases rather attesting the vanity of the living than the merits of the dead, prove the universality of the impulse. Carlyle has said that everything depends on how a people "does its Hero-worship." The Church, divinely founded and divinely guided as she is, so far recognizes this view that she encourages us to distinguish with singular honour certain of her children who have gone before us in the Christian warfare, bids us reserve this honour for those whose virtue reached the "heroic" level, and, that we may not be deceived, establishes a careful and deliberate process whereby to test the truth of facts and probe the moral significance of actions. Her judgments and her processes need not fear a comparison with those of public opinion. The State, which modern irreligion invites us to regard as a moral agency the fiat of which is not to be appealed against, has also modes of conferring honour, and does not wait for their death before it rewards its servants. It has peerages, baronetcies, orders, stars, money, and offices. If we examine on what grounds these distinctions are dispensed, we find that it is for rare intellectual ability—usually attended by the gift of expression—for the capacity of amassing money, for courage with discretion, and for simple courage; a certain degree of patriotic devotion being supposed to be present in each case. In this way, and on these grounds, the modern State honours its heroes. To the Church, the more or less of ability possessed by those whom she recommends for our veneration is a matter of no concern. She is as willing to raise a St. Isidore, the gardener of Madrid, to the ranks of the Blessed, as an Augustine of Hippo or a Thomas Aquinas. The proof of eminent virtue is all that she demands, and as a conclusive and compendious test of the presence of this high order of virtue she requires the authentication of miracles wrought by, or through the intercession of, the person whose virtues are under debate. Such are, in her estimate, the only sound bases of a popular *cultus*, and when these conditions have been complied with such a cultus has been never known to be discredited.

The possession of virtue rising to the heroic level, and the illustration of that virtue by miracles, are matters of fact, which must of course be established by testimony. The witnesses, in most cases, can be no other than the countrymen and countrywomen of the reputed saint, for only they can have seen his life from so near at hand as to be competent to speak with certitude respecting it. In the early times, individual bishops, and afterwards metropolitans, acting upon this local testimony, and sifting it in the best way they could, declared the blessedness of certain persons, and proposed their memories for the veneration of the faithful. But it is notorious that local testimony is rarely free from bias, that national and provincial sympathies, or even antipathies, are apt to disturb the judgment, and that for this reason the universal Church could not safely endorse without inquiry even the unanimous judgment of his own countrymen on the virtues of a reputed saint. Earl Waltheof, put to death by William the Conqueror, was regarded by the English as a martyr, and miracles were said to be worked at his tomb; the same thing happened in the case of Simon de Montfort; but it may reasonably be doubted whether antipathy to the Norman and the foreigner was not a substantial factor in these reputations for sanctity. Considerations of this kind prevailed, many centuries ago, to cause the inquiry into reputed sanctity to be reserved to the central authority in the Church, the Holy See, and to recommend the wisdom and necessity of the decision that without the sanction of that see no religious cultus may lawfully be paid to the memory of any holy person, however eminent for virtue or notorious for miracles. As early as the fourth century, in the case of Vigilius, bishop of Trent, we find the authority of Rome

invoked to recognize a martyr or confessor as such, and sanction his being honoured in the liturgy. The procedure to be observed was gradually regularized, defects remedied, and safeguards supplied; and in the tenth century we meet with the complete process of a canonization, of which the object was St. Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg. Still, however, through the inordinate fondness with which those of a particular country or religious order regarded holy persons of their own blood or profession, instances of abusive cultus sometimes occurred; and accordingly we find Alexander III., in 1170, publishing a decree in which it is declared unlawful to honour any person publicly as a saint, however celebrated for miracles, without the consent of the Roman Church. Still more important is the bull of Urban VIII. (1634), in which the form of procedure in cases of canonization is minutely prescribed, and various abuses condemned. In this bull, however, the Pope declared "that he did not wish to prejudice the case of those [servants of God] who were the objects of a cultus arising either out of the general consent of the Church, or a custom of which the memory of man ran not to the contrary, or the writings of the Fathers, or the long and intentional tolerance of the Apostolic See or the Ordinary." (Ferraris, *Cultus Sanctorum.*)

It remains briefly to explain in what manner the duty, thus reserved to the Holy See, of testing the evidence offered in proof of sanctity is discharged. The celebrated treatise of Pope Benedict XIV. on Heroic Virtue (of which a translation was published some years ago by the English Oratorians) is the standard authority on the subject. There are properly only two recognized degrees of sanctity—that of Blessed, and that of Saint. The title Venerable is given to those whose case has passed through the preliminary processes, as will be described below.[1] At the present time, Beatification is nearly always a stage on the road to Canonization; the same rigorous proof of eminent virtue and the working of miracles is demanded in one case as in the other. But whereas the cultus of a canonized Saint belongs to the universal Church, and churches and altars can be freely erected in his or her honour, and images, pictures, or statues of him or her displayed without special permission, in the case of one of the Blessed it is otherwise. The honour and veneration which are authorized in their regard are limited and partial; and because the cultus of one of them is permitted to one country, or city, or order, or branch of an order, it does not follow that it should be practised elsewhere; and the attempt to extend it without special permission is condemned. Nor is it lawful, without such permission, to display their pictures or images in churches, nor, under any circumstances, can Mass be said or the breviary recited in their honour.

Beatification.—Thirteen or fourteen different steps may be distinguished in the process of Beatification; the general object of all these slow and lengthy inquiries—extending always over many years, and sometimes from one century to another—being to unite the credibility and authenticity which can only be founded on the reports of witnesses locally and personally cognisant of the facts to the authority of a juridical investigation conducted by trained and impartial intellects. It must be remembered that the character and behaviour of the reputed saint are subjected to the severest possible strain; that the "fierce light which beats upon a throne" is nothing to that which so minute and protracted an inquiry turns upon the everyday life of the person submitted to it. "The person who is to be beatified must have practised in the heroic degree chiefly the three theological virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity, and the four cardinal virtues, Prudence, Justice, Courage, and Temperance, with all that these suppose and involve; nor is it enough to show that these have been practised to this degree of perfection under certain circumstances: numerous acts, a permanent and habitual practice, principally of charity, are required; and, with regard to the cardinal virtues, the habit of that virtue which was the proper and distinguishing excellence of the person's calling. Thus justice and temperance are required in statesmen and prelates; in Popes, zeal for the defence and propagation of the Catholic faith; in kings, loyal attachment to the Church and the Holy See; in married women, gentleness and devotion"; &c.[1]

The first step of the process is a formal inquiry instituted by the bishop of the diocese as to the fact of the reputation of the person whose beatification is demanded for virtue and miraculous power. This being accomplished, and reported to Rome, inquiry is made into the fact of *noncultus*—that is, whether the bull of Urban VIII. (supposing the case not to be included among the exceptions therein specified) has been hitherto scrupulously complied with. Thirdly, the acts or minutes resulting from these two inquiries are sent to Rome, to the secretary of the Congregation of Rites. [CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN.] Before this body the process is now opened, at the request of the *postulators*, or supporters of the beatification. The fifth step is the nomination of a *promotor fidei* (called in popular language the "devil's advocate"), whose duty it is to point out any flaws or weak points in the

[1] Venerable Bede is a canonized saint. The lessons from his writings which are read in the breviary were, however, formerly headed "De Sermone *Venerabilis* Bedae," &c. This peculiarity is said to have arisen from the fact that his homilies were read in the office during his lifetime; and as he could not then be styled "Saint," the title "Venerable" was used.

[1] De Moy in *Kirchenlex.*

evidence adduced, and raise all kinds of objections. Sixthly, the Congregation examines, if the person were an author, all the works, printed or in manuscript, which were ascertained to be of his composition, and draws up a formal report on them. If this be favourable, the seventh stage is reached, that of the *introduction of the Apostolic process*; for Rome, so to speak, now makes the cause its own, and gives a commission to the Congregation of Rites to try it, investigating, not only the notoriety, but the reality and nature of the virtues and miracles ascribed to the *beatificandus*. This commission, without a special Papal dispensation, is never issued till at least ten years have passed since the first transmission of the acts to the Secretary of the Congregation. The holy person could now be styled "Venerable," but by a decree of 1913 the authorizing of this title is deferred until after a favourable decision has been come to in regard to the heroicity of the virtues of the servant of God in question. The next step is the appointment by the Congregation, under what are called *litterae remissionales*, of a delegation of three bishops, or other high functionaries, to deal with the case systematically, and examine witnesses in respect of the reputed virtues and miracles. The acts of this delegation, which are often extremely voluminous, are, as the ninth stage, sent to the Congregation, by which they are examined, and arguments heard, *pro* and *contra*, from the postulators and the *promotor fidei*. If the result is favourable to the *beatificandus*, a second and still more searching inquiry into the real and inmost nature of all that has been deposed respecting him is committed to a new delegation; this is the tenth stage. The process, being returned to the Congregation, is finally considered by them, both as to its form and as to its substance; and the virtues and miracles are separately the subject of debate in three successive assemblies or congregations, at the last of which the Pope himself is present. After having sought to know the will of God by prayer, the Pope makes known his judgment to the secretary of the Congregation. A new general congregation is then held, at which it is considered whether the beatification may be proceeded with without further delay; if the decision be favourable, the Pope appoints a day for the ceremony, and orders a brief, setting forth the Apostolic sentence, to be prepared. The final stage of this long process, the beatification itself, takes place in the Vatican church; it includes the public reading of the brief, the chanting of the Te Deum, the unveiling of the image or picture of the newly-beatified on the altar, the incensing of the image, the reading of the new collect, &c.

By an "equipollent beatification" is meant the Papal authorization of the public cultus of a confessor or martyr, founded on the proof of one or more of the exceptional conditions stated in the bull of Urban VIII. An interesting example is that of the English martyrs beatified by Leo XIII. in 1888.

Canonization.—Before proceeding to canonization, it must be proved that at least two miracles have been wrought through the intercession of the "Blessed" person since the beatification. This proof is attended with the same formalities, and surrounded by the same rigorous conditions, as in the case of the miracles proved before beatification. After it has been established, the three congregations (of which the last is public and in the presence of the Pope), which were requisite before beatification, are again convened; and upon the direction of the Pope, after the last congregation, the promoter of the faith and the secretary of the Congregation of Rites agree to a form of decree, declaring that no doubt exists relative to the miracles in question, and that there is no reason why the canonization should not be proceeded with. This then takes place, usually in St. Peter's. After various ceremonies, the postulator of the cause (who is usually a person of high rank or distinction in the country or order to which the saint belonged) asks twice that the name of the servant of God whose cause he pleads may be enrolled in the catalogue of the Saints; the Pope replies each time that it is best to explore the will of God still further by prayer; litanies and the "Veni Creator" are chanted; at the third request the Pope declares and ordains, "in honour of the Holy Trinity, for the glory of the Catholic faith and the progress of the Christian religion, in virtue of the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of his own plenary and proper authority," that the servant of God in question shall be inscribed on the register of the Saints ("Canon Sanctorum"), and that his (or her) memory shall be celebrated on a given day, in every part of the Church. A solemn Mass, in which the Pope himself, unless hindered by illness or old age, officiates, is then celebrated, in honour of the new Saint.

The actual procedure will be more clearly understood if we describe and partly translate some Papal Bull of Canonization; and, for this purpose, we will take the Bull of Alexander VII. concerning St. Francis de Sales, dated April 19, 1665. After a brief sketch of his life, a specification of seven miracles proved to the satisfaction of the Congregation of Rites, a reference to his beatification in 1661, and a mention of the princes and others (including Henrietta Maria, Queen of England) by whom the cause had been zealously promoted, the bull proceeds:—

"At length, deeming it to be just and due that we should give glory, praise, and honour on earth to those whom God honours in

heaven, we, with the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, the patriarchs, archbishops and bishops, our beloved sons the prelates of the Roman Curia, our officials and suite, the secular and regular clergy, and an immense multitude of people, have this day met together in the holy Vatican basilica; and after three petitions for the decree of canonization, presented to us on the part of the Most Christian King by our beloved son, the illustrious Charles, Duke of Créquy, ambassador from the said king; after sacred hymns, litanies, and other prayers, duly imploring the grace of the Holy Spirit:—

"In honour of the most holy and undivided Trinity, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and ourselves, after mature deliberation, and having many times implored the divine aid, by the counsel of our venerable brothers, the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, and of the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops met together in the city, we have decided and defined the Blessed Francis de Sales, Bishop of Geneva, to be a Saint, and have inscribed him on the catalogue of the Saints, as, by the tenor of these presents, we do decide, define, and inscribe him; appointing that his memory shall be cherished and honoured with pious devotion by the universal Church, as a holy confessor and bishop, on the 29th day of January in each year. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." A grant of indulgences, on the usual conditions, to those who shall visit the Saint's tomb on his festival, follows; a plenary indulgence to all present at the canonization is announced; and then the bull proceeds:—"We therefore bless God, who is wonderful in His saints, because we have received mercy in the midst of His temple, in that He hath granted to us in the Church a new patron and intercessor with His divine Majesty, for the greater tranquillity of the same Church, the spread of the Catholic faith, and the enlightenment and conversion of heretics and all who wander from the path of salvation." After clauses relating to the publication of the bull, and forbidding any infraction of it, the instrument ends with the date, and the signatures of the Pope and thirty-eight cardinals. (See Ferraris, *Cultus Sanctorum*; Benedict XIV., "De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione"; Ortolan in DThC.)

CANOPY. [See BALDACCHINO.]

CANTATE SUNDAY. A name given to the fourth Sunday after Easter, from the introit of the Mass, which begins with the words "Sing to the Lord a new song." The name "Cantate Sunday" often appears during the Middle Ages as well known, and was used to mark the date, even in ordinary life. The name is probably as old as the twelfth century.

CANTICLE. [See HYMN.]

CANTOR, also called "episcopus chori," "chori regens," was the official in a cathedral or collegiate church who instructed the choristers and younger clerics in music, and directed the singing of the office, &c. In many foundations, the office of cantor was raised to a dignity, in the canonical sense, and had a prebend of considerable value attached to it. A cantor thus provided for often appointed sub-cantors (*succentores*), who were selected from the choral-vicars, and entrusted with the teaching of the ecclesiastical chant, while the cantor himself exercised control over the choral-vicars and superintended the performance of the divine offices. [See PRECENTOR.]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT. It is certain from Scripture that the magistrate may lawfully put malefactors to death. Capital punishment was enacted for certain grievous crimes in the old law, and the Christian dispensation made no essential change in this respect, for St. Paul, in Rom. xiii. 4, expressly says that the magistrate "beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The unanimous opinion of theologians is in favour of the lawfulness of capital punishment; and if the Church has given no formal decision on the matter, this probably is only because the question has never till of late years assumed any great importance. Argentré, however, in his "Collectio de Novis Erroribus," i. 86, mentions an erroneous proposition of the Waldenses, denying the lawfulness of capital punishment. The theologians of that time, a number of whom are quoted by Argentré, treated the proposition as heretical.

St. Thomas defends the lawfulness of capital punishment on the following principle. The State, he argues, is like a body, composed of many members, and as a surgeon may cut off one corrupt limb to save the others, so the magistrate may lawfully put a malefactor to death and thus provide for the common good.

It is only the magistrate who can inflict the penalty of death, because as the justification of the penalty is the common good, it can be imposed by him alone to whom the care of the common good belongs—viz. by the magistrate.

A parent has the power to impose remedial chastisements, but not to kill. A private person may of course work for the common good, but if the good he would do involves the injury, above all if it involves the death, of another, he has no authority to decide that any member of the State is to be exterminated for the good of the whole.

As to outlaws, who may in certain cases be put to death by private persons, the sentence is really passed by the State, the

individual who slays them being the mere executioner.

The magistrate derives this authority from God, and it is conveyed, not only by the positive law of God in Scripture, but also by the natural law written on the heart. The number of capital offences must be determined by the good of the community; so that laws are rightly more severe at one time or in one place than in another. The strange theory of Scotus that the positive law of God forbids homicide, and that therefore a magistrate can only put to death where God Himself has dispensed him from the observance of the law—viz. for murder, adultery, blasphemy, &c. and the other cases provided for in the Pentateuch—is generally rejected. This opinion errs in taking for granted that the magistrate's authority to slay is conveyed only through the positive law, and in assuming that the judicial precepts of the Jewish code are in force among Christians.

If a capital offence has been committed, the prince, even if certain of the prisoner's guilt, must not condemn him without fair trial, although here an exception may be made if the guilt is notorious and great evils would ensue from delay of execution. Time must be allowed the prisoner to prepare for death and receive the sacraments, and this time must be given even if there is danger of his escaping. Finally, the canon law strictly forbids ecclesiastics, even if they hold temporal jurisdiction, to take any part in passing or executing sentence of death. (St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 64; Billuart, "De Justit." diss. x.; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." lib. iv. tract. iv. cap. 1. dub. 2.)

CAPITAL SINS (in English called deadly sins), so named because they are the fountain-heads from which all other sins proceed. St. Thomas, following St. Gregory the Great, enumerates seven—viz. vainglory, envy, anger, avarice, sloth (which he calls *tristitia*, "sadness," or distaste for labour in God's service, but which is generally known as *acedia*, *ἀκηδία*), gluttony, lust. Other writers substitute pride for vainglory; others, again, like Cassian, count both pride and vainglory, and so make eight capital sins. St. Thomas divides them as follows. "Man," he says, "is led to sin by seeking that which is good inordinately, or by an unreasonable aversion from that which is good, because of incidental evil which is joined, or thought to be joined, with it. Man seeks inordinately the goods of the soul (pride), or of the body (gluttony and lust), or, lastly, external goods (avarice). He has an unreasonable aversion to his own good, because of the labour needed to secure it (sloth), or to another's good, because it seems to detract from his own (envy and anger)." ($1^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 84, a. 4; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." i. 579 *sqq.*)

CAPITULARY. A set of *capitula*, or chapters, each of which was a special law, like the "chapters" in the annual volume of statutes passed by the British Parliament. The word has been extended to the ecclesiastical canons passed in provincial councils—*e.g.* to the chapters of Martin of Duma, passed at Braga in 572—but it is usually restricted to the legislation of the Frankish kings of the first and second dynasties.

These Capitularies have been published by Baluze, and more recently by Pertz; they have been carefully analysed by M. Guizot in his "Hist. de la Civilis. en France."

I. The Capitularies of the Merovingian kings begin with Childebert (554). Compiled as they were so soon after the conversion of the Salian Franks to Christianity, it is needless to say that ecclesiastical influence is apparent in every part of them. Among the more prominent matters of which they treat are the right of sanctuary, the observance of the Sunday, the right to grant lands to the Church, &c.

II. The Capitularies of Pepin le Bref, the father of Charlemagne, are five in number, but only one of them can be called in the fullest sense a work of legislation, as having been framed "in generali populi conventu." They are much occupied with clerical discipline and the regulation of marriage.

III. The Capitularies of Charlemagne, sixty-five in number, contain 1,150 separate chapters. They range in date from 769 to 803. They are classified by M. Guizot, according to their subjects, into *political* (273) *moral* (87), *penal* (130), *civil* (110), *religious* (85), *canonical* (291), *domestic* (73), and *miscellaneous* or *occasional* (12). A large proportion of them can in no sense be called *laws*; so far from it that M. Guizot distinguishes them into documents of twelve different kinds. These twelve classes include new laws (properly so called), ancient laws revived, instructions to the *missi Dominici*, circulars to the bishops and counts conveying admonitions or inviting opinions, answers of the emperor to questions put to him, judicial decrees, memoranda, &c. &c. In fact, this unwieldy collection faithfully represents the imperial system itself, which was a sort of hodge-podge of paternal government, flexible administration, and rigid law; each of these three being so far pressed as the Emperor, under the circumstances of each case, judged to be expedient.

IV. The Capitularies of Louis le Débonnaire, twenty in number, were added to those of Charlemagne, and the whole collection, digested into seven books, published between 820 and 842, by Ansegisus, Abbot of Fontenelle, and Benedict of Mayence—the same to whom many writers ascribe the fabrication of the False Decretals. Charles the Bald added fifty-two, and the succeeding Carlovingian kings, down to Charles the Simple inclusive, some ten or eleven more. After Charles the Simple, the

laws of France ceased to be called Capitularies. (See Leclercq in DACL.)

CAPITULATION. The German emperors in the Middle Ages swore to certain conditions or agreements at the time of their election. These were styled "capitulations." In imitation of these, the cardinals in conclave frequently sought to bind the future pontiff by all agreeing that whoever was chosen should observe the conditions agreed upon. Such attempts were, from the nature of Papal authority, essentially ineffective, and have been repeatedly and effectively repressed by the Holy See. (Ferraris, *Electio*; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," *passim.*)

CAPPA MAGNA. The barbarous word "cappa," said to be derived from *capere* (*quia capit totum hominem*, "because it covers the whole person"), was originally used by ecclesiastical writers to denote the pluviale, or cope, as appears from Durandus and Honorius. The cappa magna is a long vestment, the hood of which is lined with silk or with fur, according to the season of the year at which it is to be worn. It is used by cardinals, bishops, certain prelates, and, in many churches, also by canons. It seems to have been at first the choir vestment of canons regular. (From Gavantus with Meratus' notes; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 352.)

CAPUCHINS. A reform of the Franciscan order instituted by Matteo di Bassi of Urbino, who, being an Observantine Franciscan at Monte Falco, and having convinced himself that the *capuche* or cowl worn by St. Francis was different in shape from that worn by the friars of his own time, adopted a long-pointed cowl, according to what he conceived to be the original form. In 1525 he obtained the consent of Pope Clement VII. to the wearing of this habit by himself and his companions, with the further permission to live the life of hermits, and preach the gospel in every country, on condition that once in each year they should present themselves at the general chapter, wherever it might be held, of the Observantine friars. Matteo began hereupon to preach publicly in the March of Ancona; but the provincial of the Observantines, hearing of it, treated him as an apostate friar [APOSTASY] and threw him into prison. He was released through the interference of the Duchess of Camerino, the Pope's niece; and he, with two zealous followers, Louis and Raphael of Fossombrone, took refuge for a time with the Camaldoli in their convent at Massaccio. They were also kindly treated by the Conventual branch of their order [FRANCISCANS], and a bull was finally obtained from the Pope in 1528, authorizing the union which Matteo and his companions had entered into with the Conventuals, sanctioning for them the hermit life, and allowing them to wear beards and to use the long-pointed *capuche* from which they have derived their name. After this the order grew with great rapidity, and it has produced down to the present time numbers of men eminent for every Christian virtue, great preachers, and accomplished scholars; yet, strange to say, the first projectors of the institute, unlike the great majority of founders of orders, did not persevere in the observance of its statutes.

The statutes of the order were drawn up in 1529. The government was placed in the hands of a vicar-general, for they were at first subject to the general of the Conventuals, and only obtained exemption from this obedience in 1617. Matins were to be said at midnight, and the other canonical hours at the times originally assigned to them; hours for mental prayer, for silence, and for taking the discipline, were prescribed. They were to have no revenues, but to live by begging; everything about their churches and convents was to be poor and mean; the very chalices were to be of pewter, and in the decorations of the altars, gold, silver, and silk were excluded. They might eat one kind of meat in refectory, and wine was allowed; but if any Capuchin wished to diet himself more rigorously he was not to be prevented. In their begging rounds the friars were not to ask for either meat, eggs, or cheese, though they might accept them if offered. One of the most illustrious names in this order is that of St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, a zealous and powerful preacher, martyred by the Calvinists of the Grisons in 1622 (see Alban Butler, April 24).

The third vicar-general, Bernardino Ochino, attained an unhappy notoriety through having adopted Lutheran opinions and married a young girl from Lucca. This was at Geneva, where he established himself in 1542. Ochino afterwards went to England, while Edward VI. was on the throne, and after having travelled through many parts of Germany, he became known as a gifted preacher of the new opinions. His extreme views, however, led to his expulsion by his Protestant friends, and he died in obscurity.

At the time when Hélyot wrote, near the beginning of the eighteenth century, the order of Capuchins was divided into more than fifty provinces and three "custodies," numbering sixteen hundred convents and twenty-five thousand friars, besides their missions in Brazil and various parts of Africa. The French Revolution—though there were a few who yielded—tempted with no other result than illustrating the serene and stable virtue of the great majority of the Capuchins. A large number of their convents were suppressed during the revolutionary troubles; in France, however, they had revived again to a considerable extent, but the persecuting "Liberalism" of the Third Republic ejected them anew from their convents (1880). They are at present most numerous in

Austria; and they have convents in almost every country. Father Mathew, "the Apostle of Temperance," was a member of the Irish province.

The Bull "Felicitate quadam" of Leo XIII. (Oct. 4, 1897) recognizes the Capuchins as an autonomous branch of the first Franciscan Order, the other branches being the Friars Minor, simply so called, and the Conventual Friars Minor. (See FRANCISCANS; Hélyot; Benrat, "Bernardino Ochino"; Fr. Cuthbert in "Cath. Enc.")

CARDINAL (*cardo*, a hinge). Like most arrangements which, though made by man, carry out the Divine purpose, correspond to the wants of human society, and are destined to live, grow, and endure, the great institution of the Cardinalate sprang from small and almost unnoticed beginnings. The words *cardinalis*, *cardinare*, *incardinare*, are found in ante-Nicene ecclesiastical writers, and are used to designate the fixed permanent clergy of any church—those who were so built into it and necessary to its being that it might be said to revolve round them as a door round its hinge.[1] They are thus distinguished from those bishops, or priests, or deacons, whose connection with a church was loose or temporary. In the Roman Church parish churches or *Titles* seem to have been first instituted in the time of Pope Marcellus (304), and the priests to whose charge they were permanently committed were styled *cardinal priests*. The deacons of the Roman Church, as of many other important Churches, were at first seven in number, in imitation of the original Apostolic institution. They were not at first assigned to particular districts; but as time went on, and various charitable institutions for the relief of the sick and poor, with chapels attached to them, arose here and there throughout the fourteen "regions" into which the city was divided under Augustus, each deacon came to have one or more regions, with the institutions locally contained in it, assigned to his care; and from the fixed character of their charge, they were called *cardinal deacons*. For a long time there was no such thing as a cardinal *bishop*, because the Roman Pontiff himself presided in the see in that capacity. But there were several bishoprics in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome—namely, Portus (at the mouth of the Tiber), Ostia (on the opposite side of the river), Praeneste, Sabina, Tusculum, Albano, and St. Rufina—the bishops of which appear from very early times to have sat in synod with the Bishop of Rome: a relation which, with increasing exercise and deepening comprehension of the Papal prerogatives, was naturally developed by degrees into a closer connection. History does not enable us to describe or date the stages of this change. In the eleventh century we find all the above-named sees (reduced afterwards to six, for St. Rufina had been united to Portus) incorporated in the Roman Church, and their occupants holding their appointments directly and solely from the Pope. This is the picture which we derive from the writings of St. Peter Damian (d. 1071), who was himself Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. The council held at Rome in 1059, under Nicholas II., decreed that Popes should thenceforth be elected on the *judgment* of the six cardinal bishops, with the *assent* of the Roman clergy, the applause of the people, and the ratification of the Emperor. Of the Roman clergy, the cardinal priests and deacons were the most prominent and influential portion. Hence it is easy to understand, considering the instability of popular opinion, and the transitory character of human sovereignty, that the election of the Pope gradually came to be vested in the cardinals exclusively, who, in their grades of bishop, priest, and deacon, represented the ancient "presbyterium" of the Roman Church in the fullest and most satisfactory manner.

In the twelfth century the number of the cardinal bishops, as already stated, was six; that of the cardinal priests, twenty-eight; and about this time the number of the cardinal deacons was raised from seven to fourteen, one for each region, whence they were called "regionary" deacons. The dignity of their office grew, while its functions either dwindled or were otherwise discharged; and in process of time the cardinal deacons, still deriving their titles from the chapels formerly attached to the charitable institutions of which they had the charge (St. Hadrian, St. Theodore, &c.), ceased to have local duties, and, like the cardinals of higher rank, were drawn into the august circle of the immediate counsellors and assistants of the Roman Pontiffs. In the course of the twelfth century their number was further raised to eighteen, making a total of fifty-three cardinals; and this number remained fixed for a considerable time. Then a period of fluctuation ensued, during which the Sacred College was sometimes reduced to a mere handful of persons. The Council of Basle ordered that the number of cardinals should be fixed at twenty-four; but the decree was not ratified by the Pope, and no attention was paid to it. Leo X. raised the number to sixty-five. The final regulation, which prevails to this day, was contained in the constitution *Postquam vetus* of Sixtus V., published in 1586. By this it was ordered that the number of cardinals should never exceed seventy, thus composed: six of episcopal rank, holding the old suburban sees before mentioned; fifty described as priests, holding a corresponding number of

[1] It is interesting to observe that the use of this metaphor dates from the remotest antiquity. The five princes of the Philistines were called סַרְנִים, literally "axles" or "hinges" of the people. See Joshua xiii. 3; Judges iii. 3.

"Titles" or parishes in Rome; and fourteen described as deacons. By a Constitution of St. Pius V. (1567), all customs or privileges in virtue of which the name of Cardinal had been assumed by the clergy of any other church (*e.g.* by the canons of Compostella, Milan, &c.) were abrogated, and it was forbidden to apply it in future to any but the senators of the Roman Church.

One of the last acts of Pope Pius X. (1914) was to separate the see of Velletri from that of Ostia, to which it had long been united, and to raise the former into a distinct suburbicarian bishopric; the see of Ostia to be henceforth held, together with his own church, by the Cardinal Bishop who by right of seniority is Dean of the Sacred College.

The cardinals owe their appointment solely to the Pope. They have for many centuries been taken in part from all the great Christian nations of Europe, though the number of Italian cardinals has always preponderated. The appointment of a future cardinal is announced by the Pope in consistory, but the name is reserved *in petto*. At a subsequent consistory it is made public. The actual appointment, in the case of ecclesiastics residing in Rome, proceeds as follows: On a day named, the candidate goes to the Papal palace, and receives from the Pope the red biretta; afterwards, in a public consistory, at the close of an imposing ceremonial, the Pope places upon his head the famous red hat. In a second consistory he "closes his mouth" (*os claudit*)—that is, forbids him for the present to speak at meetings of cardinals; in a third, he "opens his mouth"—that is, he removes the former prohibition, giving him at the same time a ring, and assigning to him his "Title." If the candidate is absent, being prevented by just cause from visiting Rome at that time, the red biretta is sent to him, and on receiving it he is bound to make oath that he will within a year visit the tombs of the Apostles.

The duties of cardinals are of two kinds—those which devolve on them while the Pope is living, and those which they have to discharge when the Holy See is vacant. As to the first, it may be briefly said that they consist in taking an active part in the government of the universal Church; for although the Pope is in no way bound to defer to the opinions of the Sacred College, in practice he seldom, if ever, takes an important step without their counsel and concurrence. Such a school in the science and art of government in all its forms as the College of Cardinals exists nowhere else in the world. They are brought into immediate contact with the various peculiarities of national character, the prejudices and cherished aims of dynasties, the conservatism that with more or less intelligence supports, and the communism that with more or less wickedness undermines, the fabric of Christian society. In consistory, where the cardinals all meet in a kind of senate under the presidency of the Pope, and discuss affairs "exclusa omni forma judiciali," the powers of statement and reply are cultivated; in the various Congregations [see CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN], they learn to manage in detail the vast and complicated concerns of a communion which with its one faith and, substantially, one ritual, is found congenial to every people and at home in every climate. Hence flow that largeness of temper, that breadth of view, that readiness to drop the accidental if only the essential be maintained, that conciliatory bearing, and that antique courtesy, by which the finest specimens of cardinal ambassadors have always been distinguished. History can show few nobler pictures than that of Cardinal Consalvi confronting the force and cunning of the First Napoleon in the zenith of his power, and compelling the drafting of the Concordat in the form that the Pope, not the First Consul, required.

All the cardinals now take precedence of bishops, archbishops, and even patriarchs. This was not so formerly; the change was gradually introduced. They have many other privileges, which canonists—who generally hold that the rank of cardinal, in its temporal aspect, is equivalent to that of a reigning prince—have elaborately defined in their treatises. On their seals they have their own arms, with the red hat as crest; they are styled *Eminentissimi* and *Reverendissimi*.

At a vacancy of the Holy See, the duties of the cardinals become confined to protecting the Church and maintaining all things in their due order, till a Conclave (of which they are the members) can be assembled for the election of a new Pope. [CONCLAVE.] (See Ferraris; Taunton; Humphrey, "Urbs et Orbis"; Thomassin, "Vetus et Nova Disciplina," p. 1; Sägmüller in "Cath. Enc."; Forget in DThC. For the History of the Cardinal's Hat, see "Month," Jan. 1912.)

CARDINAL LEGATE. [See LEGATE.]

CARDINAL PROTECTOR. A member of the Sacred College, belonging by birth to one of the more considerable Catholic nations, who has received the purple partly on that account. His local knowledge of his own people and their ways, through being "to the manner born," qualify him to be a trusted referee when any questions affecting the interests of the nation to which he belongs, or of individuals of that nation, are brought forward at Rome, and the name of "Cardinal Protector" has hence naturally been assigned to him. A remarkable instance, illustrating the representative weight which such cardinals often enjoy in the Sacred College, was that of the French Cardinal Maury, described by Consalvi in his powerful narrative of the

Conclave which preceded the election of Pius VII. There are also Cardinal Protectors of religious orders, of colleges, &c.

CARDINAL VICAR. The Pope as bishop of Rome has a Vicar-General, who is always a cardinal, for the administration of the spiritual affairs of his diocese. The formal title of this official is "Vicarius Urbis"—the title "Cardinal Vicar" is merely a popular designation. It was Paul IV. who decreed that the Vicar should be one of the Cardinal Bishops (1558), though during the Middle Ages he was chosen from among the bishops residing near Rome. He is practically the "Ordinary" of the diocese of Rome having under him a Vicegerent—that is, a bishop auxiliary. (See Humphrey," Urbs et Orbis.")

CARDINAL VIRTUES. St. Ambrose ("In Luc." cap. vi. l. 5 PL, xv. 1649) is said to have been the first to call the four great moral virtues (prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance) the "cardinal" virtues. They are so named, according to St. Thomas, on account of their generality and importance. Prudence enables us to know what to desire or avoid; justice gives everyone his due; fortitude urges us on when difficulty stands in the way of our duty; temperance restrains us when passion excites us to what is wrong. All the moral virtues may be reduced to one or other of these headings. Thus religion belongs to justice because it gives God His due; chastity comes under temperance because it puts a restraint on certain passions. [See VIRTUE, JUSTICE, TEMPERANCE.] (St. Thomas, 1^a 2^{ae}, q. lxi. for the cardinal virtues generally; and 2^a 2^{ae}, qq. xlvii.-clxx. for the treatment of them in detail.)

CARE-CLOTH. In the old English rite of marriage a pall was held over the bride and bridegroom by four clerks. This was called the "Care-cloth." (See Rock, iv. 201.)

CARMELITES, ORDER OF. In the middle of the twelfth century a crusader named Berthold vowed at the commencement of a battle that if by the mercy of God his side was victorious, he would embrace the religious life. The victory was won, and Berthold became a monk in Calabria. Soon after, the prophet Elias is said to have appeared to him and revealed something to him in consequence of which Berthold left Italy, and repairing to Mount Carmel (1156)—that mountain, so conspicuous and so beautiful, which juts out into the sea to the south of Acre—took up his abode there. Everyone knows the connection of Carmel with some of the leading incidents of the prophet's life (3 Kings xviii.; 4 Kings iv.). A cavern near the summit was then shown as the habitation of Elias, and the ruins of a spacious monastery, the history of which is unknown, covered the ground. An eyewitness, John Phocas, who visited the holy places in 1185, thus writes:—"Some years ago a white-haired monk, who was also a priest, came from Calabria, and through a revelation from the prophet Elias, established himself in this place. He enclosed a small portion of the ruins of the monastery, and built a tower and a little church, assembling in it about ten brothers, who, with him, inhabit at present this holy place." Berthold, therefore, may in one sense be considered as the founder of the Carmelite order, and its first general. On the other hand, it cannot be questioned that Berthold found hermits living on the mountain when he arrived there, attracted by the peculiar sanctity which the residence of the great prophet had conferred on the spot; these appear to have joined him, and to have accepted along with him and his immediate followers the rule which was framed for them in 1209 by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem. These hermits may have had a long line of predecessors, nor is there any historical or moral impossibility in the assumption that holy men had lived on the mountain without interruption since the days of Elias, although positive evidence is wanting. This belief in the possible succession of a long line of saintly anchorites was gradually merged in the fixed persuasion that the very order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, such as it was in the thirteenth and following centuries, had existed there in unbroken continuity, keeping the three vows, and with hereditary succession, from the time of Elias. It was in this extreme form that the Carmelite view of the antiquity of their order was combated in the seventeenth century by the learned Papebroch, the Bollandist, who in the volumes of the "Acta Sanctorum" for March gave Lives of Berthold and Cyril, in which it was assumed that the former was the *first*, and the latter the *third*, general of the order. A violent controversy arose; several Carmelite writers published large treatises; other Jesuits came to the assistance of Papebroch, the Spanish Inquisition was induced to issue a decree censuring the published volumes of the "Acta Sanctorum"; and Rome, while refusing to adopt or ratify this censure, thought it expedient to impose silence on the disputants (1698).

The rule given to the order by the patriarch Albert was in sixteen articles. It forbade the possession of property; ordered that each hermit should live in a cell by himself; interdicted meat altogether; recommended manual labour and silence; and imposed a strict fast from the Exaltation of the Cross (Sept. 14) to Easter, Sundays being excepted.

The progress of the Mahometan power in Palestine, after the illusory treaty entered into by the Emperor Frederick II. in 1229 with the Sultan Kameel, made it more and more difficult for Christians to live there in peace; and under their fifth general, Alan

of Brittany, the Carmelites abandoned Carmel and established themselves in Cyprus (1238) and other places. They held their first chapter at Aylesford in Kent, in 1245, and elected St. Simon Stock, an Englishman, to the generalship. Under him the order was greatly extended, and entered upon a flourishing period. To this Saint Our Lady is said to have shown the Scapular in a vision. [See SCAPULAR.] After passing into Europe they found it necessary to live in common, and no longer as hermits. This, with other mitigations of the primitive rule, was sanctioned by Innocent IV., who confirmed them in 1247 under the title of Friars of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Their habit was originally striped (whence their name of "Pied" Friars), but ultimately the dress by which they are so well known, the brown habit with white cloak and scapular, was adopted. They were recognized as one of the mendicant orders; our ancestors knew them as "the White Friars." Many distinguished men and eminent ecclesiastics have worn their habit. In our own country we can point to the vast and solid capacity of Thomas of Walden, confessor to Henry V., and one of the theologians at the Council of Constance, who in a work of profound learning and great eloquence, the "Doctrinale Fidei," confuted the sophistries advanced by Wyclif against the faith and discipline of the Church.

The Papal schism led to much confusion and relaxation of discipline in the order, a portion siding with the Avignon Pope and electing a different general. England remained true to Urban VI. To put an end to the dissimilarity of practice which prevailed, Eugenius IV. issued a bull in 1431, in which permission was given to eat meat three times a week, with other indulgences. But these were not accepted in all the convents. Gradually the names of Observantines and Conventuals crept in, to distinguish the Carmelites who observed the rule as ratified by Innocent IV. from those who accepted the mitigations of Eugenius. Special congregations aiming at a strict observance of the rule arose in Italy and France; among these was the congregation of Mantua, founded by the unhappy Thomas Connecte, who is noticed by Addison in the "Spectator." In England at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries, the Carmelites were in a very flourishing condition. Impartial witnesses declare that in no country of Europe did the glory of their institute shine out with greater lustre than in England. They had fifty-two houses.[1] In London the library of the White Friars was the best to be found in the city; the books bestowed on it by Thomas Walden alone were valued at two thousand gold pieces. All these were destroyed or dispersed at the dissolution.[1]

The later glories of the order belong chiefly to Spain, and are due to the heroic virtue of a woman, St. Theresa. Carmelite nuns had first been instituted by John Soreth, general of the order in the fifteenth century. Relaxations of the rule had crept into their convents as into those of the friars. St. Theresa lived for many years in the convent of Avila, which was under the mitigated observance. Amidst great obstacles, and in the teeth of much persecution, she carried out her object of introducing a reform among the nuns by returning to the ancient rigour of the rule. She thus became the founder of the Discalced (barefooted) Carmelite nuns. Nor did her zeal stop here, but extended itself to a reformation of the friars, in which also, aided by the counsel of St. Peter of Alcantara, and the labours and sufferings of St. John of the Cross, who joined the new order, she was completely successful. At the time of her death, in 1582, she had assisted in the foundation of seventeen reformed convents for women and fifteen for men. These Discalced Carmelites, whose institute rapidly spread to all the Catholic countries of Europe, and to the Spanish colonies, were at first subject to the government of the unreformed order; but Clement VIII., in 1593, gave them a general of their own. Several other reforms have been introduced since that of St. Theresa in various countries, which we have not space here to notice. At present, in spite of the devastation wrought during the revolutionary epoch and the spirit of unbelief which engenders and is encouraged by revolutions, a number of Carmelite monasteries still exists in many countries. In France, though they were swept away at the first revolution, they had been re-introduced, and till lately possessed some sixty houses. But the iniquitous decrees of 1880 and 1901, issued by the Republican Government of France, have resulted in the violent seizure of all the houses, and in turning the friars and nuns adrift. In Spain they are at present numerous.

[1] Namely at—

Appleby	Cambridge
Aylesford	Cardiff
Berwick	Chester
Blakeney	Coventry
Bolton (York)	Denbigh
Boston	Doncaster
Bristol	Drayton
Burnham	Gloucester
Hitchin	Oxford
Hulm (near Alnwick)	Plymouth
Hull	Pontefract
Ipswich	Richmond
Lenton (Notts)	Ruthin
Lincoln	Sandwich
London	Scarborough
Losenham	Seale
Ludlow	Shene
Lyme Regis	Shoreham
Lynn	Shrewsbury
Maldon	Stamford
Marlborough	Sutton (York)
Newcastle	Taunton
Northallerton	Warwick
Northampton	Winchester
Norwich	Yarmouth
Nottingham	York

[1] *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*, Orleans, 1752.

(Hélyot; "Bibliotheca Carmelitana"; Tanner; Dugdale; Zimmerman in "Cath. Enc.")

CARNIVAL (from *caro, vale*, the time when we are about to say farewell to flesh-meat; or *ubi caro valet*—in allusion to the indulgence of the flesh in the days which precede the fast; or *carnem levare*, the putting away or removal of flesh as food), the three days before Lent, though the name sometimes includes the whole period between February 3, the feast of St. Blase, and Ash-Wednesday. The Carnival in Catholic countries, and in Rome itself, is a special season for feasting, dancing, masquerading and mirth of all sorts. In itself this custom is innocent, although the Church from Septuagesima onwards assumes the garb of penance, and prepares her children, by the saddened tone of her office, for the Lenten season. But the pleasures of the Carnival easily degenerate into riot, and the Church therefore specially encourages pious exercises at this time. Hence was introduced the custom of exposing the Blessed Sacrament through the Carnival. This devotion spread through the Church, and Clement XIII., in 1765, granted a plenary indulgence on certain conditions to those who take part in it. (EXPOSITION; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," p. 110.)

CARTHUSIANS, ORDER OF. The founder of this celebrated order was St. Bruno, in the eleventh century. A well-known story, once inserted in the Roman Breviary, ascribes his retirement from the world to the marvellous resuscitation of a noted Paris doctor, as his body was being carried to the grave. But there is no contemporary evidence to sustain the story, and it was, probably on this account, left out of the Breviary by Urban VIII. Bruno was a native of Cologne, and gave proof of more than common piety, recollection, and mortification even from his tender years. When he was grown up, he was at first entered among the clergy of St. Cunibert's at Cologne, whence he passed to Rheims, a city then celebrated for its episcopal school. Bruno made here great progress in learning, and was appointed "scholasticus" (Fr. *écolâtre*); many of the leading men of the age were his pupils. He had much to suffer from the conduct of the unworthy Archbishop of Rheims, Manasses, suspended in 1077; and the resolution to quit the world seems to have arisen in him about this time, and grew in strength continually. Leaving Rheims, uncertain in what way God willed him to carry out his clearly-seen vocation, he repaired to St. Robert of Molesme, the founder of the Cistercian order, by whom he was referred to St. Hugh, Bishop of Grenoble. With six companions, Bruno presented himself to the bishop, and opened to him their desire to found an institute in which the glory of God and the good of man should be sought on a foundation of rigorous austerity and self-discipline. The good bishop was overjoyed at seeing them; in their request he saw the beginning of the fulfilment of a wonderful dream which he had had the night before. Soon afterwards he led them to the desert of the Chartreuse, an upland valley in the Alps to the north of Grenoble, more than 4000 feet above the sea, and only to be reached by threading a gloomy and difficult ravine. High crags surround the valley on all sides; the soil is poor, the cold extreme—snow lies there most of the year—and the air is charged with fog. Bruno accepted this site with joy, and he and his companions immediately built an oratory there, and small separate cells, in imitation of the ancient Lauras of Palestine. This was in 1086, and the origin of the Carthusian order, which takes its name from Chartreuse, is dated from this foundation.

St. Bruno, when he had been only two or three years at the Chartreuse, was summoned to Rome by an imperative mandate from Urban II., who had been his pupil. With grief he left his beloved companions, the most prudent and devoted of whom, Landwin, he appointed prior in his room, and, recommending the monastery to the protection of the Abbot of Chaise Dieu, departed for Italy. He was never able to return, but after founding convents at Squillace and La Torre in Calabria, died at the last-named place in 1101. The celebrated Abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, writing about forty years after St. Bruno, describes in few words the manner of life which the saint instituted, and to which his monks—the only ancient order in the Church which has never been reformed and never needed reform—have always faithfully adhered. "Their dress," he writes, "is meaner and poorer than that of other monks; so short and scanty, and so rough, that the very sight affrights one. They wear coarse hair-shirts next their skin; fast almost perpetually; eat only bran bread; never touch flesh, either sick or well; never buy fish, but eat it if given them as an alms; eat eggs and cheese on Sundays and Thursdays; on Tuesdays and Saturdays their fare is pulse or herbs boiled; on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays they take nothing but bread and water; and they have only one meal a day, except within the octaves of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, Epiphany, and some other festivals. Their constant occupation is praying, reading, and manual labour, which consists chiefly in transcribing books. They say the lesser hours of the divine office in their cells at the time when the bell rings, but meet together at vespers and matins with wonderful recollection." This manner of life they seem to have followed for some time without any written rule. Guigo, the fifth prior of the Chartreuse (1228), made a collection of their customs; and in later times

several other compilations of their statutes were framed, of which a complete code was arranged in 1581, and approved of by Innocent XI. in 1688. The glorious difficulty of the very perfect life aimed at by the Carthusians is recognized by the Church, which "allows religious men of any of the mendicant orders to exchange their order for that of the Carthusians, as a state of greater austerity and perfection; but no one can pass from the Carthusians to any other order, as Fagnanus, the learned canonist, proves at large."[1] The name of Chartreuse was given to each of their monasteries; this was corrupted in England into Charterhouse. Among their original customs was that of taking a walk, which they called *spaciment* (*spatiament* from the Latin *spatiari*), to take a walk within the bounds of their desert. The ordinary dress is entirely white; but outside the boundaries of his monastery the Carthusian wears a long black cloak and hood. In 1391 Boniface IX. formally renewed the exemption of the order from episcopal control; and in 1508 Julius II. ordained that their monasteries in every part of the world should obey the prior of the Grande Chartreuse and the chapter general of the order.

Among the distinguished men who have borne the Carthusian habit are St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln; Cardinal d'Albergati; the learned and holy Denis Rickel, commonly called Denis the Carthusian; and Walter Hilton (1433), whose "Ladder of Perfection," a work of mystical theology, was published by Abraham Woodhead in the seventeenth century.

The Chartreuses or Charterhouses in England at the time of the dissolution were nine in number.[2] A large proportion of the monks and friars then in England, like the secular clergy, accepted, in words at any rate, the new doctrine of the royal supremacy; but the Carthusians stood firm. Even Froude, the thorough-going apologist of Tudor tyranny, acknowledges that the London Carthusians met death like heroes. Houghton, their prior, and several of the monks, were hanged in 1535; one, Maurice Chauncey, accepting the supremacy, was allowed to leave England, but bitterly repented his weakness, was reconciled to the Church, and wrote an interesting and touching narrative of the whole tragedy. The remaining eight monks of the London house perished of jail-fever, foul air, and starvation, after being imprisoned some months in Newgate. The Carthusians of Shene, in Surrey, fifteen in number, withdrew to Flanders on the death of Queen Mary, and abode in various places; at the time when Alban Butler wrote they were settled at Nieuport, and were, with the Brigittine nuns of Sion [BRIGITTINES], the only two English orders which were never dispersed. (See also Guilday, "The English Catholic Refugees, &c.," ch. ii.)

When Hélyot wrote, early in the eighteenth century, there were 172 Carthusian houses altogether, of which five were nunneries; about seventy-five out of the whole number were in France. These were all swept away at the Revolution. The Jacobin government tried to sell the Grande Chartreuse, but no one would bid for it, on account of the poverty of the soil. After the Restoration some of the monks returning from abroad were allowed to reoccupy it; amongst these was the general, Dom Moissonnier, who, like another Simeon, died in peace eleven days after his re-entry into the beloved solitude. For a long time the monks were very poor, having to pay rent for their own barren lands to the government; but since they invented the famous liqueur named after the monastery, the revenue from the sale of which is considerable, they have been fairly well off. They were, however, expelled in 1901, and the *Chartreuse* liqueur is now made at their house at Tarragona.

The Carthusian nuns have never been numerous, but have always been famed for their regularity and fervour. They date from the twelfth century. Their life is similar to that of the monks with the necessary exceptions in the direction of a milder rule.

The largest Charterhouse in the world is that of Parkminster (Sussex). (Hélyot; Heimbucher, "Orden u. Kongregationen der Kath. Kirche"; Tanner, "Notitia"; Alban Butler, Oct. 6; Hendricks, "The London Charterhouse"; Gasquet, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," ch. vi.; Webster in "Cath. Enc.")

CASSOCK (*vestis talaris, toga subtanea, soutane*). A close-fitting garment reaching to the heels (*usque ad talos*), which is the distinctive dress of clerics. The cassock of simple priests is black; that of bishops and other prelates, purple; that of cardinals, red; that of the Pope, white. Originally the cassock was the ordinary dress common to laymen; its use was continued by the clergy while lay people, after the immigration of the Northern nations, began to wear shorter clothes, and thus it became associated with the ecclesiastical state. The Council of Trent, De Reform., cap. 6, requires all clerics, if in sacred orders, or if they hold a benefice, to wear the clerical dress; although in Protestant countries clerics are excused from doing so in public, on account of the inconveniences likely to arise. (See COSTUME, CLERICAL; Thurston, *Costume, Clerical*, in "Cath. Enc."; Barbier de Montault, "Le Costume et les Usages Ecclésiastiques.")

[1] Alban Butler, Life of St. Bruno, Oct. 6.

[2] Namely at—

Beauvale (Notts)	Mount Grace (York.)
Coventry	Shene
Epworth (Linc.)	Witham (Linc.)
Hinton (Som.)	and two cells at
Hull	Mendip (Som.)
London	Shapwick (Dors.)

CASUISTRY. The science which deals with cases of conscience. [See MORAL THEOLOGY.]

CASUS. A name given to real or imaginary cases in canon law, moral theology, or ritual, collected together in order to illustrate difficult points in these branches of learning. Such a collection of cases to illustrate the "Decretum of Gratian" was made about 1200 by Benincasa Senensis; about 1245 Bernard of Bologna, afterwards Archdeacon of Compostella, made a similar collection to aid in the study of Gregory IX.'s Decretals. Since that time, collections of this kind without number, in all these three branches of learning, have appeared. At conferences of the clergy, "cases" of this kind are generally discussed. (See CONFERENCES OF THE CLERGY; Slater, "Cases of Conscience.")

CASUS RESERVATI. [See RESERVED CASES.]

CATACOMBS. We shall briefly describe their position, explain their origin, and trace their history; then, after describing the catacomb of San Callisto, as a model of the rest, we shall show, so far as our limits will allow, what a powerful light the monuments of the catacombs supply in illustration of the life, and in evidence of the faith, of Christians in the primitive ages.

The word "catacomb" had originally no such connotation as is now attached to it; the earliest form, *catacumbae* (κατά, and κύμβη, a hollow)—probably suggested by the natural configuration of the ground—was the name given to the district round the tomb of Caecilia Metella and the Circus Romuli on the Appian Way. All through the Middle Ages "ad catacumbas" meant the subterranean cemetery adjacent to the far-famed basilica of St. Sebastian, in the region above-mentioned; afterwards, the signification of the term was gradually extended, and applied to all the ancient underground cemeteries near Rome, and even to similar cemeteries in other places, at Paris, for instance. The bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul were believed to have rested at St. Sebastian's nearly from the date of their martyrdom to the time of Pope Cornelius, who translated them to where they are now (Bede, "De Sex Aet. Mundi": "corpora apostolorum de catacumbis levavit noctu"); it was therefore most natural, apart from the sacred associations which the memorials of other martyrs aroused, that for this reason alone pilgrims should eagerly visit this cemetery.

I. Some twenty-five Christian cemeteries are known, and have been more or less carefully examined; but there are many others, which, either from their having fallen into ruin, or being blocked up with earth and rubbish, remain unexplored. Those that are known and accessible are found on every side of Rome, but they are clustered most thickly at the south-east corner of the city, near the Via Appia and the Via Ardeatina. The most noteworthy of all, the cemetery of San Callisto, is close to the Appian Way; near it are those of St. Praetextatus, St. Sebastian, and St. Soteris. Passing on round the city by the east and north, we find the cemetery of Santi Quattro, near the Via Appia Nova, that of St. Ciriaca on the road to Tivoli, the extremely interesting catacomb of St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana, and that of St. Alexander, farther out from Rome on the same road. Next comes the cemetery of St. Priscilla, on the Via Salaria. Continuing on, past the Villa Borghese, we come upon the valley of the Tiber, beyond which, on the right bank of the river, we find in succession the cemeteries of Calepodius and Generosa. Crossing again to the left bank, we come upon the cemetery of St. Lucina on the Via Ostiensis, that of SS. Nereus and Achilleus (known also by the name of St. Domitilla) on the Via Ardeatina, and, finally, that of St. Balbina between the last-named road and the Appian Way.

II. The origin of the catacombs is now thoroughly understood. It was long believed that they were originally mere sand-pits, *arenariae*, out of which sand was dug for building purposes, and to which the Christians resorted, partly for the sake of concealment, partly because the softness of the material lent itself to any sort of excavation. This was the view of Baronius and of scholars in general down to the nineteenth century, when the learned Jesuit, F. Marchi, took the subject in hand. He made personal researches in the catacomb of St. Agnes, and gradually the true origin and mode of construction of these cemeteries broke upon his mind. His more celebrated pupil, the Commendatore de Rossi, aided by his brothers, continued his explorations and has given to the world a colossal work on the Roman Catacombs, which Northcote and Brownlow made the foundation of their interesting book, "Roma Sotterranea." Marchi drew attention to the fact that among the volcanic strata of the Roman Campagna three deposits are especially noticeable—a hard building stone, called the *tufa litoid*; a soft stone, the *tufa granolare*; and a sandstone of scarcely any coherency, called *pozzolana*. The sand-pits, *arenariae*, of course occur in beds of this *pozzolana*; and if they had been the origin of the catacombs, the latter would have been wholly or chiefly excavated in the same beds. But in point of fact the catacombs are almost entirely found in the *tufa granolare*, which exactly suited the purposes which the early Christians had in view. In the first place, they were obliged by the imperial laws to bury their dead outside the walls of the city. Secondly, they naturally would not place the cemeteries at a greater distance than they could help; and in fact all the catacombs above named,

except that of St. Alexander, are within two miles and a half of the city walls.[1] Thirdly, the *tufa granolare* being softer than the *tufa litoide*, the necessary galleries, chambers, and *loculi* (receptacles for the dead) could more easily be worked in it, while, on the other hand, it was sufficiently coherent to allow of its being excavated freely without danger of the roof and sides of the excavations falling in or crumbling away. The *pozzolana* was softer, but from its crumbling nature narrow galleries could not be run in it, nor *loculi* hollowed out, without the employment of a great deal of masonry for the sake of security, as may be seen in the two or three instances of *arenariae* turned into catacombs which do exist; thus greater expense and trouble would arise in the end from resorting to it than from excavating in the *tufa granolare*.

If it be asked why the Roman Christians did not bury their dead in open-air cemeteries, the answer is twofold. In the first place, the Church grew up amid persecution, and the Christians naturally strove to screen themselves and their doings from public observation as much as possible, in the burial of their dead as in other matters. The sepulchral inscriptions and decorations which they could safely affix to the graves of their beloved ones in the subterranean gloom of the catacombs, could not with common prudence have been employed on tombs exposed to public view. In the second place, the needs of prayer and the duty of public worship were in this manner reconciled with the duty of sepulture to an extent not otherwise, in their circumstances, attainable. The relatives might pray at the tomb of a departed kinsman; the faithful gather round the "memory" of a martyr; the Christian mysteries might be celebrated in subterranean chapels, and on altars hewn out of the rock, with a convenience, secrecy, and safety which, if the ordinary mode of burial had been followed, could not have been secured. Nor was the practice a novelty when the Christians resorted to it. Even Pagan underground tombs existed, though the general custom of burning the dead, which prevailed under the emperors before Constantine, caused them to be of rare occurrence; but the Jewish cemeteries, used under the pressure of motives very similar to those which acted upon the Christians, had long been in operation, and are in part distinguishable to this day.

The *modus operandi* appears to have been as follows. In ground near the city, obtained by purchase or else the property of some rich Christian, an area, or cemetery "lot," was marked out, varying in extent but commonly having not less than a frontage of a hundred and a depth of two hundred feet. At one corner of this *area* an excavation was made and a staircase constructed; then narrow galleries, usually a little more than two feet in width, with roof flat or slightly arched, were carried round the whole space, leaving enough of the solid rock on either side to admit of oblong niches (*loculi*)—large enough to hold from one to three bodies, at varying distances, both vertically and laterally, according to the local strength of the material—being excavated in the walls. After burial, the *loculus* was hermetically sealed by a slab set in mortar, so that the proximity of the dead body might not affect the purity of the air in the catacomb. Besides these *loculi* in the walls, *cubicula*, or chambers, like our family vaults, were excavated in great numbers; these were entered by doors from the galleries, and had *loculi* in their walls like the galleries themselves. There were also *arcosolia*—when above the upper surface of a *loculus* containing the body of a martyr or confessor, the rock was excavated, so as to leave an arched vault above, and a flat surface beneath on which the Eucharist could be celebrated—and "table-tombs," similar in all respects to the *arcosolia* except that the excavation was quadrangular instead of being arched. Openings were frequently made between two or more adjoining *cubicula*, so as to allow, while the Divine Mysteries were being celebrated at an *arcosolium* in one of them, of a considerable number of worshippers being present. When the walls of the circumambient galleries were filled with the dead, cross galleries were made traversing the area at such distances from each other as the strength of the stone permitted, the walls of which were pierced with niches as before. But this additional space also became filled up, and then the *fossores* were set to work to burrow deeper in the rock, and a new series of galleries and chambers, forming a second underground story or *piano*, was constructed beneath the first. Two, three, or even four such additional stories have been found in a cemetery. Another way of obtaining more space was by lowering the floor of the galleries, and piercing with niches the new wall-surface thus supplied. It is obvious that expedients like these could only be adopted in dry and deeply-drained ground, and accordingly we always find that it is the hills near Rome in which the cemeteries were excavated—the valleys were useless for the purpose; hence, contrary to what was once believed, no system of general communication between the different catacombs ever existed. Such communication, however, was often effected, when two or more cemeteries lay contiguous to each other on the same hill, and all kinds of structural complications were the result; see the detailed account in "Roma Sotterranea" of the growth and gradual transformation of the cemetery of San Callisto.

III. With regard to the history of the

[1] The walls of Aurelian.

catacombs, a few leading facts are all that can here be given. In the first two centuries, the use of the catacombs by the Christians was little interfered with; they filled up the *area* with dead, and decorated the underground chambers with painting and sculpture, much as their means and taste suggested. In the third century persecution became fierce, and the Christians were attacked in the catacombs. Staircases were then destroyed, passages blocked up, and new modes of ingress and egress devised, so as to defeat as much as possible the myrmidons of the law; and the changes thus made can in many cases be still recognized and understood. On the cessation of persecution, after A.D. 313, the catacombs, in which many martyrs had perished, became a place of pilgrimage; immense numbers of persons crowded into them; and different Popes—particularly St. Damasus, early in the fifth century—caused old staircases to be enlarged, and new ones to be made, and *luminaria* (openings for admitting light and air) to be broken through from the *cubicula* to the surface of the ground, in order to give more accommodation to the pious throng. These changes also can be recognized. Burial in the catacombs naturally did not long survive the concession of entire freedom and peace to the Church; but still they were looked upon as holy places consecrated by the blood of martyrs, and as such were visited by innumerable pilgrims. In the succeeding centuries Gothic, Vandal, and Lombard invaders desecrated, plundered, and in part destroyed the catacombs. This led to a period of translations, commencing in the eighth century and culminating with Pope Paschal (A.D. 817), by which all the relics of the Popes and principal martyrs and confessors which had hitherto lain in the catacombs were removed for greater safety to the churches of Rome. After that, the catacombs were abandoned, and in great part closed; and not till the sixteenth century did the interest in them revive. The names of Onufrio Panvini, Bosio, and Boldetti are noted in connection with the renewed investigations of which they were the object; and since the appearance of the work of Padre Marchi already mentioned, the interest awakened in all Christian countries by the remarkable discoveries announced has never for a moment waned.

IV. Having thus attempted to sketch the origin and trace the history of the catacombs, we proceed to describe what may now be seen in the most important portion of the best known among them all — the cemetery of San Callisto. Entering it from a vineyard near the Appian Way, the visitor descends a broad flight of steps, fashioned by Pope Damasus from the motive above mentioned, and finds himself in a kind of vestibule, on the stuccoed walls of which, honeycombed with *loculi*, are a quantity of rude inscriptions in Greek and Latin, some of which are thirteen and fourteen centuries old, scratched by the pilgrims who visited out of devotion the places where Popes and Martyrs who had fought a good fight for Christ, and often their own kinsfolk and friends, lay in the peaceful gloom, awaiting the resurrection. By following a narrow gallery to the right, a chamber is reached which is called the Papal Crypt; for here beyond all doubt the bodies of many Popes of the third century, after Zephyrinus (203–217) had secured this cemetery for the use of the Christians and committed it to the care of his deacon Callistus, were laid, and here they remained till they were removed by Paschal to the Vatican crypts. This is proved by the recent discovery, in and near the Papal Crypt, of the slabs bearing the original inscriptions in memory of the Popes Anteros, Fabian, Lucius, and Eutychian. A passage leads out of the crypt into the *cubiculum* of St. Caecilia, where, as De Rossi has almost demonstrated, the body of the saint, martyred in the first half of the third century, was originally deposited by Pope Urban, though it was afterwards removed by Paschal to her church in the Trastevere, where it now lies under the high altar. In this *cubiculum* are paintings of St. Caecilia and of Our Lord, the latter "according to the Byzantine type, with rays of glory behind it in the form of a Greek cross." But these paintings are late—not earlier than the tenth century. Besides the Papal Crypt and the chamber of St. Caecilia, there are in this part of the cemetery "several *cubicula* interesting for their paintings, chiefly referable to Baptism and the Eucharist, the fish being the principal emblem of the latter. In one of these crypts is a painting of four male figures with uplifted hands, each with his name, placed over an *arcosolium*; in another are representations of peacocks, the emblem of immortality; in a third, Moses striking the rock, and ascending to the mount; in a fourth, a grave-digger (*fossor*) surrounded with the implements of his trade; in a fifth, the Good Shepherd, with the miracle of the paralytic taking up his bed; in a sixth, a banquet of seven persons, supposed to be the seven disciples alluded to in the twenty-first chapter of St. John's Gospel. These paintings, as well as the greater part of the catacomb, are referred to the last half of the third century." [1]

V. For a detailed answer, accompanied with proofs, to the question, what testimony the catacombs bear to the nature of the religious belief and life of the early Christians, the reader is referred to the pages of "Roma Sotterranea," or to the larger work of De Rossi. A shorter account is given by Barnes,

[1] Murray's *Handbook of Rome and its Environs*.

"The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments." The reader will find in these works sufficient evidence to convince him of the truth of two main propositions —(1) that the religion of those Christians was a *sacramental* religion; (2) that it was the reverse of puritanical: that is, that it disdained the use of no external helps which human art and skill could furnish, in the effort to symbolize and enforce spiritual truth. With reference to the first proposition, let him consider how the sacrament of Baptism is typically represented in the catacombs by paintings of Noah in the ark, the rock smitten and water gushing forth, a fisherman drawing fish out of the water accompanied by a man baptizing, and the paralytic carrying his bed ("Roma Sotterranea," p. 265); and also how the mystery of the Eucharist is still more frequently and strikingly portrayed by pictures in which baskets of bread are associated with fish, the fish being the well-known emblem of Our Lord.[1] The second proposition is so abundantly proved by the remains of Christian art of very ancient date still to be seen in the catacombs, in spite of the havoc and ruin of fifteen centuries, that it would be a waste of words to attempt to establish it at length. Adopting the general forms and methods of the contemporary Pagan art, but carefully eliminating whatever in it was immoral or superstitious, we find the Christian artists employing Biblical or symbolical subjects as the principal figures in each composition, while filling in their pictures with decorative forms and objects—such as fabulous animals, scroll-work, foliage, fruit, flowers, and birds—imitated from or suggested by the pre-existing heathen art. A type for which they had a peculiar fondness was that of the Good Shepherd. The Blessed Virgin and Child, with a figure standing near supposed to be Isaiah, is represented in an exceedingly beautiful but much injured painting on the vaulted roof of a *loculus* in the cemetery of St. Priscilla. De Rossi believes this painting "to belong almost to the apostolic age" ("Roma Sotterranea," p. 258). Another favourite type of Our Lord was Orpheus, who by his sweet music drew all creatures to hear him. The vine painted with so much freedom and grace of handling on the roof of the entrance to the cemetery of Domitilla is also, in De Rossi's opinion, work of the first century. (See Northcote and Brownlow, "Roma Sotterranea"; Marucchi, "Les Catacombes Romaines"; Wilpert, "Le Pitture delle Catacombe Romane"; Parker, "Archaeology of Rome," vol. xii., the Catacombs; Leclercq in DACL, and "Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne," ch. ii.; Barnes, "The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments.")

[1] There were other reasons for this; but the fact that the initials of the Greek words signifying "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour," made up the word ΙΧΘΥΣ, fish, undoubtedly had much to do with the general adoption of the emblem. (Tertullian, *De Bapt.* i., *PL*, i. 1198.)

CATAFALQUE. (Etym. doubtful, but cf. *échafaud*, scaffold.) An erection like a bier placed during Masses of the dead, when the corpse itself is not there, in the centre of the church, or in some other suitable place, surrounded with burning lights and covered with black cloth. It is also called "feretrum," "castrum doloris," &c. (Meratus' "Novae Observationes" on Gavantus, Part ii. tit. 13; De Herdt, "Praxis Sacrae Liturgiae," *Absol. def.*)

CATECHISM. A summary of Christian doctrine, usually in the form of question and answer, for the instruction of the Christian people. The word "catechesis" (κατήχησις) means instruction by word of mouth, especially by means of questions and answers (cf. Lk. i. 4, ii. 46, 47; Acts xviii. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 19; Gal. vi. 6). From the beginning of her history, the Church fulfilled the duty of instructing those who came to her for baptism (Mt. xxviii. 19, 20). Catechetical schools were established, and catechetical instruction was carefully and methodically given. We can still form an accurate idea of the kind of instruction given in the early Church, for Cyril of Jerusalem has left sixteen books of catechetical discourses, explaining the Creed to the candidates for Baptism, and five more in which he sets forth, for the benefit of the newly-baptized, the nature of the three sacraments (Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist) which they had just received. St. Augustine wrote a treatise on catechizing ("De Catechizandis Rudibus") at the request of Deogratias, a deacon and catechist at Carthage. When the world became Christian there was no longer the same necessity for instructing converts, but the children, and, indeed, the people generally, still needed catechetical instruction. Hence we find a council held at Paris in 829 deploring the neglect of catechetical instruction, while the English Council of Lambeth in 1281 requires parish-priests to instruct their people four times a year in the principal parts of Christian doctrine—viz. the articles of the Creed, commandments, sacraments, &c. The treatise of Gerson, "De Parvulis ad Christum trahendis," gives some idea of catechetical instruction towards the close of the Middle Ages.

Catechetical instruction was one of the subjects which occupied the Council of Trent, and the Fathers arranged that a Catechism should be drawn up by a commission and be approved by the Council. This plan fell through, and they put the whole matter in the Pope's hands. Pius IV. entrusted the work to four theologians—viz. Calinius, Archbishop of Zara; Fuscararius (Foscarari), Bishop of Modena; Marinus, Archbishop of Lanciano; and Fureirius (Fureiro),

a Portuguese. All of them, except the first, were Dominicans. Scholars were appointed to see to the purity of style. St. Charles Borromeo took a great part in assisting the undertaking. In 1564 the book was finished, whereupon it was examined by a new commission under Cardinal Sirletus. Towards the close of 1566 the Catechism appeared, under the title "Catechismus Romanus, ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editus. Romae, in aedibus Populi Romani, apud Aldum Manutium." This Catechism possesses very high, though not absolute, authority, and has been regarded as a model of clearness, simplicity and purity of language, of method and of doctrinal precision. But it was not fitted for direct use in catechetical instruction, being intended for parish priests and others who have to catechize rather than for those who receive instruction. Catechisms, therefore, of various sizes have been prepared by bishops for their dioceses, or, as in England, the bishops in concert approve a Catechism for use in the whole country or province. The Vatican Council recommended that a general catechism should be drawn up, based upon Bellarmine's Catechism, with such modifications as the different bishops might think fit; but the suspension of the Council prevented the carrying out of this suggestion. Pius X. prescribed a new catechism for use in the province of Rome, and expressed his desire that it should be adopted throughout Italy. It has been translated into many languages, and is in use in several countries. In his great Encyclical on the teaching of Christian Doctrine (April 15, 1905) Pius X. laid down strict regulations regarding the catechetical instruction to be given by those who have the care of souls. Much good work has been done by the Catechetical Congresses which are held annually in Germany, France, and other countries. (Mangenot in DThC, *Catéchisme*; Bareille, ib. *Catéchèse* and "Le Catéchisme Romain"; Knecht in "Kirchenlex."; Scannell in "Cath. Enc." *Doctrine.*)

CATECHIST. A name originally given to those who instructed persons preparing for baptism. Catechists were in early times also called *ναυτόλογοι*, because they brought the sailors on board the ship of the Church. [See CATECHISM; CATECHUMEN.]

CATECHUMENS. Those who are being instructed and prepared for baptism. The word is found in Gal. vi. 6: "Let him that is instructed in the word (*ὁ κατηχούμενος, is qui catechizatur*) communicate to him that instructeth him (*τῷ κατηχοῦντι, ei qui catechizat*) in all good things" (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 19; Lk. i. 4; Acts xviii. 24). In the early ages of the Church, before a man became a Christian he was taught what he had to believe and to do (Mt. xxviii. 19, 20). In the course of time an elaborate system of instruction and probation was carried out, in order to guard against the false doctrines of the pagan philosophers and the torments of the persecutors. By the end of the second century this was in full force. Tertullian severely rebukes the heretics for disregarding it ("De Praescr." xli., PL, ii. 56). The great catechetical school at Alexandria was under the care of Origen (Euseb. "Hist." vi. 3). As typical examples of the instruction given to catechumens in patristic ages we may refer to the "Catecheses" of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the "Oratio Catechetica" of St. Gregory of Nyssa, and above all, the "De Catechizandis Rudibus" of St. Augustine.

When a pagan expressed his desire to become a Christian he first received some elementary instruction and had to give proof of the sincerity of his desire. At this stage he was called *audiens* (*ἀκροώμενος*) and was admitted to the early part of the Mass, being dismissed after the sermon. If he persevered, he was promoted to the rank of catechumen proper. He now remained for a short time longer than the *audientes*, while a special prayer was recited over him. The admission to the catechumenate was made by means of ceremonies which were at first simple, but gradually became elaborate—traces of which survive in our baptismal rite. This stage usually lasted about two years, but many catechumens voluntarily postponed their baptism for a much longer period. Thus, Constantine the Great was not baptized until his last illness. When, however, the catechumen had finished his time of preparation he was enrolled among the *competentes*, *i.e.* those seeking baptism. Lent was the season for the immediate preparation. The ferial Masses contain many survivals of these ceremonies (see esp. Wednesday of the fourth week). The actual initiation (Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion) took place at the Easter Mass (that is, in the night between Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday), but the white robes were not put off until Low Sunday (*in albis depositis*).

St. Augustine says that a catechumen was a Christian, but not one of th faithful." (In Joan. xliv. 2, PL, xxxv. 1714.) The fate of the unbaptized catechumen was much discussed among the Fathers. (See Franzelin, "De Ecclesia," p. 414; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," 169 *sqq.*; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. ix.; Chardon, 11, *sqq.*; Bareille in DThC; Scannell in "Cath. Enc.")

CATHARI (Gr. *καθαρός*, "pure"). A mediaeval sect of Manichaeans, commonly called Albigenses [*q.v.*].

CATHEDRA: EX CATHEDRA. Cathedra (*καθέδρα*), in the ecclesiastical sense, means (1) the chair in which the bishop sits. It was placed in early times behind the altar, which did not stand, as it usually does now, against the wall, but was surrounded by the

choir. The wooden chair which St. Peter is said to have used is still preserved in the Vatican basilica. Eusebius relates that the chair of St. James still existed in Jerusalem down to the time of Constantine. The chair of St. Mark at Alexandria was regarded with such religious awe that Peter of Alexandria, archbishop and martyr, did not dare to sit upon it, though it was used by his successors. (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes.")

(2) Cathedra was used by a natural extension of meaning for the authority of the bishop who occupied it, so that the feast of the Cathedra or chair commemorated the day on which the bishop entered on his office. Thus we have three sermons of St. Leo on the "natalis cathedræ suae"—*i.e.* his elevation to the pontificate. In the Sacramentary of St. Gregory we find a Mass for "the Chair of St. Peter," on the 22nd of February. According to John Belith, a liturgical writer of the Middle Ages, this feast was intended to celebrate St. Peter's episcopate both at Antioch and Rome. A feast of St. Peter's chair is mentioned in a sermon attributed to St. Augustine, and in a canon of the Second Council of Tours which met in 567. In the course of the Middle Ages, the feast in February was associated with St. Peter's chair at Antioch. Paul IV., in a Bull of the year 1558, complains that although the feast of St. Peter's chair at Rome was celebrated in France and Spain, it was forgotten in Rome itself, although the feast of his chair at Antioch was kept in Rome. Accordingly Paul IV. ordered that the feast of St. Peter's chair at Rome should be observed on January 18. The feast of St. Peter's chair at Antioch is kept on February 22. (Thomassin, *ib.*; Leclercq in DACL, *Chaire*; Cabrol in DACL, *Chaire de S. Pierre.*)

(3) Cathedra is taken as a symbol of authoritative doctrinal teaching. Our Lord said that the Scribes and Pharisees sat "super cathedram Moysi"—*i.e.* on the chair of Moses (Mt. xxiii. 2). Here plainly it is not a material chair of which Christ speaks, but "chair," as Jerome says, is a metaphor for the doctrine of the law. This metaphor became familiar in Christian literature. Thus Jerome speaks of the "chair of Peter and the faith praised by apostolic mouth." Later theologians use "ex cathedra" in a still more special sense, and employ it to mark those definitions in faith and morals which the Pope, as teacher of all Christians, imposes on their belief. The phrase is comparatively modern, and Billuart adduces no instance of its use before 1305. It is often alleged that theologians explain the words "ex cathedra" in many different ways, but a clear and authoritative account of the meaning is given by the Vatican Council, which declares that the Pope is infallible "when he speaks 'ex cathedra'—*i.e.* when, exercising his office as the pastor and teacher of all Christians, he, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, defines a doctrine concerning faith and morals, to be held by the whole Church." (Ballerini, "De Primatu," and the Bull "Pastor aeternus," cap. iv.) [See POPE, p. 675.]

CATHEDRAL. The cathedral church in every diocese is that church in which the bishop has his chair or seat; whence *see*, the English form of *siège*. It is sometimes called simply Domus, "the house" (*Duomo*, Ital.; *Dom*, Ger.); for, as "palace" sufficiently indicates the residence of a king, "so the Lord's house, which is the cathedral church, the palace of the king of kings, and the ordinary seat of the supreme pastor of a city and diocese, is sufficiently denoted by the single word Domus." (Ferraris, *Ecclesia.*) A cathedral was in early times called the Matrix Ecclesia, the "Mother Church," but that name is now given to any church which has other churches subject to it.

The establishment of a cathedral church, the conversion of a collegiate church into a cathedral, and the union of two or more cathedrals under the same bishop, are all measures which cannot be legally taken without the approbation of the Pope. The temporal power has often performed these and the like acts by way of usurpation, as when the revolutionary government of France reduced the number of French dioceses from more than a hundred and thirty to sixty; but a regular and lawful state of things in such a case can only be restored by the State's entering into a convention with the Holy See, which is always ready, without abandoning principle, to conform its action to the emergent necessities of the times. Thus, in the case just mentioned, by the Concordat with Napoleon in 1802, Rome sanctioned the permanent suppression of many old sees. Others were restored later, so that the French episcopate now numbers eighty-four bishops instead of the larger number existing before the Revolution. Analogous changes are provided for in the Anglican communion by the theory of the Royal Supremacy, though this theory has been slightly modified by the progress of political development since the Reformation. The sovereign is still supreme in theory "in all causes and over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil," within the Anglican communion; but the supremacy cannot be exercised in any important matter without the consent of the majority of the House of Commons, expressed through a responsible ministry. An Act of Parliament, embodying as it does the united will and action of sovereign and Parliament, solves all difficulties. Thus in 1833 ten Protestant sees in Ireland were suppressed at a stroke, and within the last few years several suffragan sees, at Nottingham and elsewhere, have been erected—

always by Act of Parliament. In every such case, whatever legality the Act may have is solely due to the action of the temporal power; ecclesiastical authority has nothing to do with it.

The Council of Trent forbids the holding of more than one cathedral church, or the holding of a cathedral along with a parish church, by the same bishop.[1] It enjoins that ordinations shall, so far as possible, be publicly celebrated in cathedral churches, and in the presence of the canons.[2] (Leclercq in DACL, *Chaire Episcopale*; Taunton; Boudinhon in "Cath. Enc.")

CATHEDRAL and MONASTIC SCHOOLS. [See SCHOOLS.]

CATHEDRATICUM. This payment, as originally regulated by the Second Council of Braga (572), was a visitation fee due from every parish church in his diocese to the bishop on the occasion of his annual visit to it. The amount was two shillings (*solidi*) in gold. In process of time coins of greater value were tendered—thus in the kingdom of Naples the cathedraticum was considered to be two *ducats*—and when such had become the established custom a return to the smaller money was not allowed. Wherever there is a beneficed clergy this fee is still legally due to the bishop, nor can any period of actual immunity from the burden, however prolonged, confer a claim to future exemption. But since the Council of Trent it has been customary to pay it in synod, not during the visitation; whence it is also called "Synodaticum." The churches and monasteries of the regular clergy are exempt from the payment of the cathedraticum, though it must be paid on account of all secular benefices which are in the possession of monasteries. (Ferraris; Fleury, "Hist. Eccl." xxxiv.; Taunton.)

CATHOLIC ("general" or universal). The word occurs in profane authors—*e.g.* in Polybius—but among Christians it received a special or technical sense, and was applied to the true Church, spread throughout the world, in order to distinguish it from heretical sects. Thus one of the very earliest Christian writers, Ignatius of Antioch, says, "Where Christ is, there is the Catholic Church; where the bishop is, there must the people be also." ("Ad Smyrn." n. 8.) Thus "Catholic" became the recognized name of the Church. As "heresy," Clement of Alexandria tells us, denotes separation (since heresy signifies individual choice "oportet et haereses esse," 1 Cor. xi. 19), so the words "Catholic Church" imply unity subsisting among many members. Again, St. Augustine, in his epistle against the Donatists, tells them that the question at issue is "Where is the Church?" He appeals to the traditional name "Catholic Church," which is given to one body and to one body only; he proves that the name has been given rightly, as is shown by the very fact that the Catholic Church, unlike the Donatist sect, is diffused throughout the world; and he concludes that as the Church is one, as this one Church is the Catholic Church, as the Catholic Church is the body of Christ, therefore that he who is without its pale cannot "obtain Christian salvation."

The name "Catholic" was also applied from very early times to individual members of the Church. The use occurs, *e.g.*, in Cyprian, and the saying of Pacian (Ep. 1 ad Sempron.) is familiar to everybody: "Christian is my name; Catholic is my surname." Lastly, the word "Catholic" is used of the faith which the Church of God holds. We meet with the phrase "Catholic faith" in Prudentius, and frequently of course in later writers. (For CATHOLIC CHURCH see CHURCH OF CHRIST; Leclercq in DACL; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 351–4.)

"Catholic" is also used in various subsidiary senses, viz.:

(1) Of letters addressed to the faithful in general, whether by the Apostles, who wrote "Catholic epistles" as distinct from Epistles to the Galatians, &c., or by later bishops. (See Euseb. iv. 23.)

(2) In Greek, of cathedral churches as distinct from parish churches; of the chief church as distinct from oratories; and, in the later Byzantine period, of parish as distinct from monastic chapels.

(3) "Catholicus," originally a civil title used during Constantine's time in Africa and given apparently to the "procurator fisci," was bestowed on the Bishop of Seleucia, as representing the Patriarch of Antioch, and also on the chief ecclesiastic among the Persian Nestorians. The title was also current among Armenians and Ethiopians. It is said to have denoted a primate with several metropolitans under him, but himself subject to a patriarch. [See CATHOLICOS.]

(4) "Catholic thrones" was a title given to the four patriarchal sees.

(5) "Catholic King" was a title given to Pepin (767), and other kings of France (Froissart says it was borne by Philip of Valois), who were afterwards called "Most Christian." "Catholic King" became in modern times the usual title of the Spanish sovereigns. The title "Catholic" was conferred by Alexander VI. on Ferdinand and Isabella. (Leclercq; Kraus, "Real Encyklopädie"; and for the title "Catholic King" see also Fleury, cxvii. 11.)

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY. [See TRUTH, CATHOLIC.]

CATHOLICOS. Certain Oriental patriarchs in Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Persia have anciently borne and perhaps still bear this name. It must have been intended to

[1] Sess. vii. 2; xxiv. 17, De Reform.
[2] Sess. xxiii. 8, De Reform.

signify the wide sweep of the jurisdiction which the bearer of this dignity enjoyed over the provinces and dioceses under his rule. Yet the *catholici* were never placed on a level with the patriarchs of the five great sees, Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. On the erection of the Armenian church, through the labours of Gregory the Illuminator, early in the fourth century, its episcopal head was named "Catholicos." As time went on, we find him indifferently styled the Catholicos of Persia or of the Armenians. There was also a Catholicos of Seleucia on the Tigris. Both these, after the general revolt of the Oriental churches against the Council of Chalcedon, lost the orthodox faith; one was Monophysite, the other Nestorian. The Nestorian Catholicos of Seleucia had many archbishops and bishops under his jurisdiction, whose dioceses are said to have reached even beyond the Ganges. Both were originally subject to the Patriarch of Antioch; but the Catholicos of Seleucia, pleading the remoteness of his see, obtained the consent of the Patriarch to his ordination of archbishops by his own sole authority; and the concession of this right was almost equivalent to the erection of a new patriarchate. Thus we find the Arabic canons of Nice directing that the *Patriarch* of Seleucia shall have the *sixth* place in councils, after the five patriarchs above mentioned, and that the seventh should be assigned, with the title of Catholicos, to the patriarch of the Ethiopians. Persecution seems to have driven the Armenian Catholicos out of Persia; in the fifteenth century we find him established at Sis in Cilicia, but almost isolated there, and knowing little of what went on in the real Armenia. This state of things led to the assumption of patriarchal power by the Abbot of Etchmiadzin, near Mount Ararat, and by his successors down to the present day. Latterly, the Armenian uniate Church, which is in communion with the Holy See, has been prospering and advancing; a late patriarch of this Church, Mgr. Hassun, who resided at Constantinople, was made a Cardinal (d. 1884); the Kupelianist schism has been extinguished; and there is a fair prospect of the return of the whole Armenian nation to Catholic unity. [See ARMENIAN CHRISTIANS.]

Anastasius the Sinaite, writing in the seventh century, speaks of a Catholicus of the Nestorians, who was obeyed by a great number of bishops and metropolitans. (Thomassin, "Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina"; Lequien, "Oriens Christianus"; Butin, in "Cath. Enc."; Fortescue, "The Lesser Eastern Churches.")

CELEBRANT. The priest who actually offers Mass, as distinct from others who assist him in doing so. Celebration of Mass is equivalent to offering Mass. But "celebrant" is also used by good liturgical writers —*e.g.* by Gavantus—for the chief officiant at other solemn offices, such as vespers.

CELEBRET. A letter given by a bishop to a member of his clergy testifying that he is a duly ordained priest free from canonical censure, and commending him to be allowed to celebrate Mass in other dioceses. "No cleric," says the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiii., c. 16, De Ref.), "who is a stranger, shall, without letters commendatory from his ordinary, be admitted by any bishop to celebrate the divine mysteries." When, however, a priest is personally known to the rector of a church to be of good repute, the latter may permit him to say Mass until such time as he can reasonably be expected to provide himself with a *celebret*. In many dioceses the visé of the bishop of the place where Mass is said is also required. [See COMMENDATORY LETTERS; Taunton.]

CELESTINIAN HERMITS. A branch of the Franciscans, authorized by St. Celestine V. in 1294, and named after him. The object of their institution was to practise the rule of St. Francis with greater exactitude. They suffered much persecution, and soon after the death of their first superior, Liberatus, ceased to exist as a separate body.

CELESTINIANS. This branch of the Benedictine order was founded about 1254 by the holy hermit Peter of Morone, and took the above name after the elevation of their founder to the supreme pontificate, with the title of Celestine V., in 1294. Its rule was austere; the religious had to rise at 2 A.M. to say matins; abstain perpetually from meat unless in case of illness, and fast every day from the Exaltation of the Cross to Easter, and twice a week for the rest of the year. They increased rapidly, and spread into France and Germany, but do not appear to have ever established themselves in England. Most of their priories in Germany were in those provinces which were most affected by the movement begun by Luther, and they consequently perished. In the early part of the eighteenth century there were ninety-six priories in the Italian, and twenty-one in the French province; the chief or mother house being the convent of the Holy Ghost at Morone, near Sulmona, the only abbey in the order. The French Celestinians, whose principal house was at Paris, were included among the fifteen hundred convents which, upon various grounds more or less specious, were suppressed by the commission of 1766 presided over by the contemptible Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse. An attempt to revive the order in the nineteenth century met with indifferent success. Of the once numerous Italian priories none remains. (Hélyot.)

CELIBACY of the clergy. The law of the Western Church forbids persons living in the married state to be ordained, and persons in Holy Orders to marry. A careful distinc-

tion must be made between the principles on which the law of celibacy is based and the changes which have taken place in the application of the principle.

The principles which have induced the Church to impose celibacy on her clergy are (α) that they may serve God with less restraint and with undivided heart (see 1 Cor. vii. 32); and (β) that, being called to the altar, they may embrace the life of continence, which is holier than that of marriage. That continence is a more holy state than that of marriage is distinctly affirmed in the words of our blessed Lord ("There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that can receive it, let him receive it," Mt. xix. 12). It is taught by St. Paul ("He that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well, and he that giveth her not doeth better," 1 Cor. vii. 38), and by St. John (Apoc. xiv. 4). Christian antiquity speaks with one voice on this matter, and the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. De Matr. can. 10) anathematizes those who deny that "it is more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be joined in marriage." Thus all Catholics are bound to hold that celibacy is the preferable state, and that it is specially desirable for the clergy. It does not, however, follow from this that the Church is absolutely bound to impose a law of celibacy on her ministers, nor has she, as a matter of fact, always done so.

There does not seem to have been any Apostolic legislation on the matter, except that it was required of a bishop that he should have been only once married. In early times, however, we find a law of celibacy, though it is one which differs from the present Western law, in full force. Paphnutius, who at the Council of Nicaea resisted an attempt to impose a continent life on the clergy, still admits that, according to ancient tradition, a cleric must not marry after ordination (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 620 *sqq.*). This statement is confirmed by the Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 17, which forbid bishops, priests, and deacons to marry, while the 27th (*al.* 25th) Apostolic Canon contains the same prohibition. One of the earliest councils, that of Neocaesarea (between 314–325) (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 326 *sqq.*), threatens a priest who married after ordination with degradation to the lay state. Even a deacon could marry in one case only—viz. if at his ordination he had stipulated for liberty to do so, as is laid down by the Council of Ancyra, in 314. Thus it was the recognized practice of the ancient Church to prohibit the marriage of those already priests, and this discipline is still maintained in the East.

A change was made in the West by the 33rd Canon of Elvira (about 300). It required bishops, priests, and all who served the altar ("positis in ministerio") to live, even if already married, in continence (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 238 *sqq.*). The Council of Nicaea refused to impose this law on the whole Church, but it prevailed in the West. It was laid down by a synod of Carthage in 390, by Innocent I. twenty years later; while Jerome (against Jovinian) declares that a priest, who has "always to offer sacrifice for the people, must always pray, and therefore always abstain from marriage." Leo and Gregory the Great, and the Eighth Council of Toledo in 653, renewed the prohibitions against the marriage of subdeacons.

So the law stood when Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII., began to exercise a decisive influence in the Church. Leo IX., Nicolas II., Alexander II., and Hildebrand himself when he came to be Pope, issued stringent decrees against priests living in concubinage. They were forbidden to say Mass or even to serve at the altar; they were to be punished with deposition, and the faithful were warned not to hear their Mass. So far Gregory only fought against the corruption of the times, and it is mere ignorance to represent him as having instituted the law of celibacy. But about this time a change did occur in the canon law. A series of synods from the beginning of the twelfth century declared the marriage of persons in Holy Orders to be not only unlawful but invalid. With regard to persons in Minor Orders, they were allowed for many centuries to serve in the Church while living as married men. From the twelfth century, it was laid down that if they married they lost the privileges of the clerical state. However, Boniface VIII., in 1300, permitted them to act as clerics, if they had been only once married and then to a virgin, provided they had the permission of the bishop and wore the clerical habit. This law of Pope Boniface was renewed by the Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. cap. 6, De Reform.). The same Council (can. 9, sess. xxiv.) again pronounced the marriage of clerks in Holy Orders null and void. At present, in the West, a married man can receive Holy Orders only if his wife fully consents and herself makes a vow of chastity. If the husband is to be consecrated bishop, the wife must enter a religious order.

We may now turn to the East, and sketch the changes which the law of celibacy has undergone among the Greeks. In the time of the Church-historian Socrates (about 450), the same law of clerical celibacy which obtained among the Latins was observed in Thessaly, Macedonia, and Achaia. Further, the case of Synesius in 410 proves that it was unusual for bishops to live as married men, for he had, on accepting his election as bishop, to make a stipulation that he should be allowed to live with his wife. The synod in Trullo (692) requires bishops, if married, to separate from their wives, and forbids all clerics to marry after the subdiaconate

However, a law of Leo the Wise (886–911) permitted subdeacons, deacons, and priests, who had married after receiving their respective orders, not indeed to exercise sacred functions, but still to remain in the ranks of the clergy and exercise such offices (*e.g.* matters of administration) as were consistent with the marriage which they had concluded.

The practical consequences of these enactments are (1) that Greek candidates for the priesthood usually leave the seminaries before being ordained deacons, and return, having concluded marriage, commonly with daughters of clergymen; (2) that secular priests live as married men, but cannot, on the death of their wives, marry again; (3) that bishops are usually chosen from the monks. (From Hefele, "Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte, Archäologie und Liturgik"; Thomassin, I. lib. ii. cc. 60–67; Vacandard in DThC, *Célibat*; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Fortescue, "The Lesser Eastern Churches.")

CELL. (1) A colony or offshoot from some large monastery. Cells were first heard of in the Benedictine order, and were usually planted on estates that had been granted to the mother house. They were also called "provostships," "obediences," or "priories." They were originally ruled by provosts or deans, removable at the discretion of the abbot of the mother house. Some cells were of sufficient importance to be called abbeys; but their abbots could only be elected with the consent and subject to the confirmation of the abbot of the mother house. The inmates of the cell were bound to render yearly a stated portion of their revenues to the house on which they depended, and to present themselves there in person on particular days. Instances of important cells in this country were Tynemouth Priory, depending on St. Albans; Leighton Buzzard, on Woburn (Cistercian); and Bermondsey, a cell of the Cluniac abbey of La Charité, in France. This last is also an instance of an "alien priory," of which there were great numbers in England at the Dissolution. (Ferraris, *Monasterium.*)

(2) The separate chamber or hut of any monk, friar, or hermit, is popularly termed his "cell," as in Milton's lines—

> And may at last my weary age
> Find out the peaceful hermitage,
> The hairy gown, and mossy *cell.*

(3) In primitive times the name "cella" was given to a small memorial chapel, erected over the tomb of some friend or relative in a sepulchral area, in which "agapae" and commemorative celebrations were held on the anniversary of death. (Leclercq in DACL.)

CELTIC RITE. Of the distinctive features of the Liturgy as carried out in the Early British Church and among the Scots and Irish we have some evidence from the Stowe Missal (8th or 9th century), the Antiphonary of Bangor, the Book of Deer, the Book of Dimma, and various fragmentary documents.

The Anglican hypothesis of a special Ephesine or Eastern Rite, distinct from the Petrine or Western, may be at once set aside as a figment. The Celtic Rite is markedly Roman, one might almost say aggressively so, as for instance the insisting on "Christe eleison" to be added to the elsewhere general "*Kyrie* eleison" alone repeated. The Irish Stowe Missal, with its "Canon Dominicus Papae Gilasi," for the historian of the Roman Liturgy is of fully as great value as the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum" itself. The frequency of "Bidding Prayers" such as those in our Good Friday Office, on which Anglican conjectures are mainly based, is essentially Roman, they being in the East almost invariably replaced by diaconal Litanies. We content ourselves here with pointing out certain variants from our present Missal order, useful especially in tracing the development of the Roman Liturgy. They are:

1. The preparation of the elements earlier in the rite than at the Offertory, as in the Dominican Use.

2. A Litany Prayer for all conditions of men now disused at Rome, except as appearing in another form in the Good Friday Mass of the Presanctified.

3. The Fraction of the Host preceding the "Pater noster," as at Rome previous to the Reform of St. Gregory the Great.

4. The extraordinary enumeration of the names of holy men from Abel the just to the Irish Abbots of the seventh and eighth centuries at the Memento for the Dead, before the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus."

5. The singular custom of half uncovering the chalice before the singing of the Gospel.

6. A Solemn Benediction given by the Bishop, replacing or developing our "Pax Domini," before the "Agnus Dei."

In regard to the recital of the Canonical Hours, the Celts appear to have taken full advantage of the liberty given in early times to all heads of Dioceses or of Religious Houses to arrange the repetition of the Psalter and to select Lections, &c., in accordance with local tradition and devotion. The "Cursus Scotorum" appears in almost all its forms to have been of inordinate length, owing chiefly to the continual repetition of certain special Psalms.

As was to be expected, among the Celts, some sought to introduce the Gallican Rite. Hence we read of a period in which "holy men sang different Masses." But in general the Roman Rite appears to have held its own to the end. One or two practices distinctively Gallican or even Eastern appear, however, to have obtained, such as that all the people should, together with the priest, repeat over the Lord's Prayer at Mass. (See

Gougaud in DACL (good bibliography); Jenner in "Cath. Enc."; Warren's "Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church," but it should be used with caution.)

CEMETERY (κοιμητήριον, sleeping-place). In this article only burial-grounds or churchyards "sub dio," or in the open air, will be noticed; for subterranean burial-places see CATACOMBS.

Even during the ages of persecution open air cemeteries were in use at Rome, as has been shown by De Rossi, as well as in the provinces. Thus the cemetery named after Callistus, who was placed in charge of it by Pope Zephyrinus, was partly above and partly below ground; that at Vienne on the Rhone entirely above ground. After Constantine, subterranean interment was of course abandoned. The old Roman law, as old as the Twelve Tables, which forbade intramural sepulture, was gradually disregarded; after 619 it became common to bury at Rome within the walls; and it is only in modern times that the sounder practice of antiquity has been everywhere restored.

A cemetery or churchyard, in order to be fit to receive the bodies of Christians, must first be consecrated and set apart by the bishop for that purpose. The rite may be seen in the Pontificale. From its tenor it is evident that it contemplates the burial of none but Christians within the space to be consecrated; indiscriminate burial is therefore an abuse. The admission to ecclesiastical burial in a cemetery so consecrated is regarded as a species of communion. Hence it has ever been held that the burial of excommunicated persons, and others with whom in their life we could not communicate, in a Catholic cemetery, is unlawful. If such an interment has been violently effected, Innocent III. ordered that the remains of the excommunicated person so buried among those of the faithful should, if they could be distinguished, be exhumed; if not, that the cemetery should be reconciled by the aspersion of holy water solemnly blessed, as at the dedication of a church.

Cemeteries enjoyed the same right and degree of asylum, in the case of criminals fleeing to them for shelter, as the churches to which they were attached.

The Council of Lyons (1244) ordered that all trading, marketing, adjudication, trial of criminals, and secular business of every kind, in churchyards no less than in churches, should be put an end to. (Ferraris, *Coemeterium*; Leclercq in DACL, *Cimetière*; Taunton; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

CENACLE (*Coenaculum*). The great upper chamber in which Christ and His apostles partook of the Last Supper (Mk. xiv. 15; Lk. xxii. 12). It was also the place in which the Apostles assembled "with Mary the mother of Jesus" after the Ascension (Acts i. 13). "The tradition which fixes the site of the Cenacle on Mt. Zion is one of the most ancient and authentic among the topographical traditions of the Holy City." (Leclercq in DACL.)

CENACLE, RELIGIOUS OF THE. This institute was founded at La Louvise in France in 1826 for the purpose of providing persons in the world with spiritual retreats. Its title is "Society of Our Lady of the Cenacle," in memory of the retirement of Our Lady in the Cenacle (Acts i. 13). The constitution was approved by Leo XIII. There are houses in many countries, including England and the United States.

CENOBITE. [See COENOBITE.]

CENSER. A vessel used for burning incense at various offices of the Church. It is also called a thurible [*q.v.*]. [See INCENSE.]

CENSOR, CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS. [See INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS.]

CENSURE may be defined as a spiritual penalty, imposed for the correction and amendment of offenders, by which a baptized person, who has committed a crime and is contumacious, is deprived by ecclesiastical authority of the use of certain spiritual advantages. Thus a censure presupposes not only guilt but obstinacy; its immediate effect is the deprivation of spiritual goods; it only affects those who by baptism have become subjects of the Church. It may be true, as Fleury[1] says, that under Gregory VII. censures were multiplied in a manner unknown to the early Church, and this may have been necessitated by the increasing wickedness of the times. But it is certain that the use of censures dates from the very infancy of the Church.

Censures are divided, according to the nature and extent of the pains they inflict, into excommunications, suspensions, and interdicts [see under those articles]. "Censurae latae sententiae" are incurred on the violation of the law, *ipso facto*; "Censurae sententiae ferendae," only on the sentence of the ecclesiastical judge. They may be passed *ab homine*—*i.e.* they may be issued by a mandate respecting some single action or business; or, again, *a jure*—*i.e.* a permanent law may be passed, binding under censure In the former case, unless already incurred, they expire with the death of the legislator; in the latter, they continue still in force. Some censures are *reserved*, others *not reserved*—*i.e.* the superior may reserve the power of absolution from censures to himself, or he may commit it to the ordinary ministers. [See ABSOLUTION.]

That the Church has the power of inflicting censures appears from the words of Christ—"He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican" (Mt. xviii. 17)—as well as from the constant practice of the Church herself.

[1] See the Discourse prefixed to livr. ix.

Censures can be imposed according to the ordinary law, by ecclesiastics possessing jurisdiction in the external courts "forum externum" (as distinct from the internal court or tribunal of confession). Thus censures may be imposed by the Pope or a general council for the whole Church; by an archbishop for his own diocese, also in the dioceses of his suffragans during a visitation, or with respect to cases brought to his tribunal by appeal from one of his suffragans; by bishops and vicars-general in their own dioceses; by cardinals in the churches from which they take their titles; by legates in the territory of their legation; by provincial councils in the province; by chapters in the vacancy of a see till the election of a vicar-capitular, on whom the power then devolves; by generals, provincials, local superiors of regulars, according to the statutes of their order. Thus parish priests as such have no power of this kind. Still such authority may be delegated to all ecclesiastics: not, however, to women—*e.g.* to abbesses.

Persons who have not reached the age of puberty are not included among the persons whom the censure strikes; nor again are sovereigns, unless the censure be inflicted by the Pope. Cardinals are not subjected even to Papal censures, unless they are specially mentioned as so subject. In 1869 the constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" enumerated the different censures and their kinds. (Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vii. 215 *sqq.*)

Theological censures (*i.e.* condemnations of propositions contradictory or injurious to faith or morals) are not to be confused with censures as mentioned above. (See PROPOSITIONS, CONDEMNED; Ferraris; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. vii. 1 *sqq.*; Slater, "Mor. Theol." ii. 367 *sqq.*; Taunton.)

CAEREMONIALE ROMANUM, CAEREMONIALE EPISCOPORUM. Two official books containing the order to be observed in papal and episcopal functions. They are founded upon the old "Ordines Romani." [See ORDO ROMANUS.]

CEREMONY (SACRED), in its widest sense, denotes any external act used in the worship of God. Some ceremonies are essential—such, for example, as concern the matter and form of the sacraments; others are accidental—*e.g.* the sacraments can be given validly, or the worship of God could be carried on, without them. Of accidental ceremonies, some descend from the apostolic age, others have been added in the course of time by the Church. That the Church has power to institute or to change such ceremonies is plain from the practice in all ages, and is defined by the Council of Trent.[1] The Council further declares that the approved rites of the Church, in the solemn administration of the sacraments, cannot be despised, or changed by individual caprice, without sin.[1]

Scripture and reason combine to show the wisdom of the Church's doctrine on this head. Scripture—for God ordained ceremonies in the old law, and Christ made outward ceremonies essential to the administration of Baptism and the Eucharist. Reason—because it is natural for man, who is composed of body and soul, to express his interior devotion by exterior acts; because man is impressed by teaching which is conveyed in the form of symbol, and which appeals to his eyes as well as to his ears; because, lastly, as both body and soul come from God, we are bound to use both in His service.

The position, however, and importance of ceremonies in the Christian is very different from that which they held in the Jewish Church. In the latter a multitude of ceremonies were binding by divine law; in the Christian worship, on the other hand, only a very few ceremonies have been instituted by Christ; the rest are alterable at the will of the Church. Another reason gave ceremonies a much more important place in the Jewish than they have in the Christian Church. The Jews, St. Thomas says, were looking forward in faith and hope, not only to heavenly joys, but also to the means by which these joys could be obtained. Heaven and the means of getting there were both future to them, and both were symbolized by their ceremonies. With us the means of salvation are secured by acts already past (*e.g.* Christ's passion), or by acts actually performed in our midst (*e.g.* the sacraments). Our ceremonies symbolize grace already won for us, and regard the future only so far as they typify heaven. The blessed in heaven have nothing more to hope for; therefore with them there are no figures or symbols ("nihil figurale"), "but only thanksgiving and the voice of praise, and so it is said concerning the city of the blessed: I saw no temple in it, for the Lord God Almighty is its temple and the Lamb."[2] (Van der Stappen, "Sacra Liturgia"; Martinucci, "Manuale S. Caeremoniarum"; Baudot in DACL.)

CERINTHIANS. Cerinthus was a native of Alexandria, but taught his heresy in proconsular Asia. He was a contemporary of St. John, who on one occasion left the public baths at Ephesus because Cerinthus was there, the Apostle fearing to be in the same place with an "enemy of the truth." Irenaeus says St. John wrote his Gospel to confute him. Cerinthus was (1) a Judaizer. He seems to have held a gross doctrine on the Millennium, to have enforced the rite of circumcision and the observance of sabbaths. Moreover, it is related that the Cerinthians, like the Ebionites, accepted only St. Matthew's Gospel.

[1] Sess. xxi. cap. 2, De Communione.

[1] Sess. vii. can. 13, De Sacram. in gen.

[2] 1ª 2ae, q. 103, a. 3.

(2) He was also a Gnostic, so that he forms the link between the Judaizing and Gnostic sects. He attributed the creation of the world and the giving of the Jewish law to an angel or angels far removed from and ignorant of the Supreme Being. The reader will observe that Cerinthus made his creative angel ignorant of, but not antagonistic to, the supreme God; so that he was not obliged to break entirely with Judaism, as the later Gnostics did. (From Lightfoot on Colossians, "Essay on the Colossian Heresy"; Bareille in DThC.)

CESSATIO A DIVINIS. A prohibition which obliges the clergy to abstain from celebrating divine offices, or giving Church burial, in some specified place. It is distinct from an interdict, because (1) an interdict may affect only certain persons: *cessatio a divinis* is always local—*i.e.* it forbids anyone to celebrate the divine offices in a particular place; (2) an interdict is a censure, and therefore inflicted to correct offenders: not so *cessatio a divinis*, which may be ordered as an expression of the Church's sorrow, to repair some injury done to the divine honour, &c.; (3) during an interdict offices may be celebrated with closed doors, and publicly on certain feasts: neither is permissible during *cessatio a divinis*.

Cessatio a divinis is in some cases prescribed, as a matter of course, by the general law of the Church—*e.g.* when a church is desecrated; but it may also be imposed by all who have power to inflict censures (Ballerini, "Theol. Moral." vii. 323 *sqq.*). Fleury gives several instances of *cessatio a divinis* from the history of the French church in the sixth century.[1]

CHAINS. [See PETER'S CHAINS.]

CHAIR. [See CATHEDRA.]

CHALCEDON, GENERAL COUNCIL OF. The fourth General Council, which, in 451, condemned the errors of Eutyches and affirmed two natures in Christ.

The opposition to Nestorius, who said there were two persons in Christ, led many, particularly among the monks, into the opposite extreme of maintaining that there was one nature, as there was one person only, in our Lord. Among those who fell into this error, which was closely connected with Apollinarianism, a conspicuous place belonged to Eutyches, an old monk who had been for thirty years Archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople which numbered not less than 300 religious. In 448 Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused Eutyches of heresy in a synod at Constantinople. Eutyches expressed his belief as follows: "I confess that our Lord was of two natures before the union, but after the union [*i.e.* the union of the two natures in the Incarnation] I confess one nature. The synod, over which Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, presided, maintained two natures in Christ "*after* the union" [*i.e.* Incarnation], and Eutyches was condemned and deposed. His error cut at the very roots of true belief in the Incarnation. He maintained that in Christ the human was absorbed in the divine nature, so that Christ's body was not of one substance with ours—was not, indeed, the "body of a man." Carried to its logical consequences, the Eutychian heresy involved a denial of Christ's humanity and even of His divinity, for Christ would have had one mixed nature, partly human, partly divine, and in reality neither divine nor human.

After the synod, Eutyches appealed to Pope Leo, professing his desire that the matter had been laid before Leo sooner, and his readiness to accept the Pope's judgment. He also wrote to Chrysologus of Ravenna, who referred him to the chair of Peter; and it is probable, though not quite certain, that he also addressed himself to Dioscorus and other bishops. Leo, after examining the acts, approved the sentence passed in the synod at Constantinople. Dioscorus, on the other hand, who was really of one mind with Eutyches, managed through his influence with the Empress Eudocia, to secure the convocation of a general synod at Ephesus. Thereupon Leo, who received on May 13, 449, an invitation to take part in the council, despatched three legates to represent him there, and gave into their hands several letters, among which was his famous "dogmatic epistle" to Flavian (Ep. xxviii., PL, liv. 755 *sqq.*; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 567 *sqq.*). In it the Pope teaches with all possible fulness and clearness the existence of two distinct natures in the incarnate God. "He who, remaining in the form of a God, made man, also in the form of a servant was made man. For each nature without defect preserves its proper characteristics (*proprietatem suam*), and as the form [*i.e.* nature] of a servant does not take away the form of God, so the form of God does not diminish the form of a servant. . . . Each form in union with the other does what is proper to it: the Word, that is to say, operating that which is proper to the Word, and the flesh performing that which is proper to the flesh. . . . The one [*i.e.* the divine nature] shines forth in miracles, the other [*i.e.* the human nature] succumbs to injuries. And as the Word does not fall away from equality with the Father's glory, so the flesh does not leave the nature of our race. For one and the same, a point often to be repeated, is truly son of God, and truly son of man. . . . To hunger, to thirst, to be weary, and to sleep, is evidently proper to man. But to satisfy five thousand men with five loaves, and to give the woman of Samaria living water . . . is without doubt divine. . . . It does not

[1] Liv. xxxiv. 53. He calls them all interdicts, but one or two of his instances (*e.g.* the cessation of the offices at St. Denys, in Paris, because it had been polluted by bloodshed) exactly correspond to the *cessatio a divinis*.

belong to the same nature to say, I and the Father are one, and again, the Father is greater than I." In August of the same year the bishops began to assemble at Ephesus in the council which for its evil repute has earned the name of "Latrocinium" or "Robber-synod." The council met on the 8th of the month and consisted apparently of about 130 bishops, though one ancient account raises the number to 300. Dioscorus presided, while two Papal legates, besides Domnus of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavian of Constantinople, were present. Flavian and Eusebius were condemned as heretics and deposed, as it was pretended, by the unanimous vote of the council, but the coarse and fanatical Dioscorus would allow no notes of the proceedings to be made except by his own creatures, and he was afterwards accused of having falsified the Acts. He called in soldiers and monks armed with cudgels, cruelly maltreated Flavian and cast him into prison, and forced the other Fathers by outrage and starvation to sign a blank paper, on which he afterwards wrote the condemnation of Flavian, who died shortly afterwards of the ill-usage he had received. Leo, with the whole West, rejected this council, while the churches of Syria, Asia Minor, Pontus, would hear nothing of it. It was, however, confirmed by the Emperor Theodosius II., and for the time it was impossible to convoke another synod.

Better times came with the accession of Marcian and Pulcheria to the throne. Marcian at once annulled the decrees of the Latrocinium, and in concert with Valentinian III., the Western emperor, and with the approval of Pope Leo and of Anatolius, the new bishop of Constantinople, who had now subscribed Leo's letter to Flavian, convoked a new council, which was to meet at Nicaea. Afterwards, however, Chalcedon was chosen as the place of meeting, because of its proximity to Constantinople, which made it possible for Marcian to attend the council and at the same time to look after civil affairs in the capital of his empire. The council opened on October 8, 451, and closed on November 1 of the same year. The Fathers held their sessions in the church of St. Euphemia, which stood near the Bosporus on a gentle eminence just opposite Constantinople. The number of assembled bishops was about 600. The external order of the council was in the hands of an imperial commission, consisting of civil officers; but the papal legates "manifested an unmistakeable superiority over the other voters, as representing, according to their own explicit statement, the head of the whole Church, and as holding fast to the conviction that every resolution of the synod to which they did not agree was null and void."[1] This claim was fully recognized by the council, as will presently appear.

In the first session, Dioscorus was declared guilty of murder and of other moral offences, particularly of violence and outrage upon the Fathers who met at Ephesus. In the second, the epistle of Leo to Flavian was unanimously approved. The Fathers exclaimed, "That is the faith of the Fathers: that is the faith of the Apostles. So we all believe. Peter has spoken through Leo. That was also Cyril's faith, and that is the faith of the Fathers." In the third session Dioscorus was deposed. In the fourth the letter of Leo to Flavian was approved by a formal vote. In the fifth session, the dogmatic formula of Chalcedon which had been drawn up by a commission was adopted by the council.

In this formula the council defined that there was "one and the same Christ the Son, Lord, only begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without change [this is directed against Eutyches], without division, without separation [this against Nestorius, who divided Christ into two persons]; the difference of the natures being in no wise destroyed on account of the union, but rather the property (ἰδιότητος) of each nature being preserved and meeting (συντρεχούσης) in one Person and Hypostasis." At the close of the council the Fathers wrote to Pope Leo, who "had presided over all the assembled [bishops] as the head over the members," begging him "by his assent also to honour their decision" (τίμησον καὶ ταῖς σαῖς ψήφοις τὴν κρίσιν). The Emperor also asked the Pope to confirm the decrees of the council. Accordingly, on March 21, 453, Leo addressed a circular to the bishops who had attended the council confirming their definition of the faith.

The confirmation of the council would have been obtained much sooner and much more easily, if the dogmatic controversy had been the only matter of discussion. But it was not so. At the end of the fourteenth session, the Papal legates withdrew, and in their next meeting the Fathers of the Council passed thirty canons, relating to Church government, clerical and monastic discipline, &c., of which the 28th is the most important. The Church of Constantinople, though not of Apostolic foundation, naturally acquired great influence as an imperial city, and as early as 381 the second General Council assigned it "the pre-eminence of honour" after the Church of Rome, on the ground that Constantinople itself was New Rome. This canon, however, was ignored by Rome. At Chalcedon, Anatolius of Constantinople saw that the time was unusually favourable for asserting the doubtful privilege of his see and for extending it. He had not much to fear from the jealousy or conservatism of the great patriarchates or exarchates in the East. The sees of Alexandria and Ephesus were vacant, Maximus of Antioch was his creature, Juvenal of Jerusalem was in his debt for helping him to

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 668.

obtain jurisdiction over the three Palestinian provinces. In these circumstances, the 28th canon of Chalcedon was agreed to with little difficulty. The former part of this canon merely reaffirms the decree of the second general synod to which the canon of Chalcedon expressly refers. The Fathers, the bishops of Chalcedon say, had rightly assigned [patriarchal] privileges to the elder Rome, because of its imperial dignity, and had from similar motives assigned the second rank to New Rome—*i.e.* Constantinople. The latter part of the 28th canon goes much further. It sanctions the practice which had prevailed since Chrysostom's time—viz. that the Bishop of Constantinople should be supreme, not only over the district (διοίκησις) of Thrace, but also over Pontus and Asia, which had been formerly independent. The metropolitans of these districts were to receive consecration from Constantinople.

Leo absolutely refused to confirm this canon, and Anatolius acknowledged that "the whole force and confirmation of that which had been done was reserved to the authority of [his] beatitude"—*i.e.* to the authority of his Holiness the Bishop of Rome. In like manner the council itself and the Emperor Marcian had expressly allowed that the canon was invalid without the approbation of the Apostolic See. Indeed, for a considerable time the Greeks themselves did not appeal to the canon in question, and their canonists[1] omitted it in their collections. Justinian, however, confirmed the high rank of Constantinople, and this very canon of Chalcedon was confirmed at the great Eastern synod in Trullo,[2] although Rome still abstained from sanctioning it. But after a Latin Empire had been established in the East, and a Latin Patriarchate at Constantinople, the Fourth Lateran Synod under Innocent III., in the year 1215, ordained that the Patriarch of Constantinople was to hold rank immediately after the Pope, and therefore above the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. (Hefele-Leclercq, vol. ii., where the bibliography will be found, 650, *note*; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," iii. 389 *sqq.*)

CHALDEAN RITE, CHRISTIANS OF. The name Chaldeans in ecclesiastical use signifies the Catholics who belong to the Church formed by conversions from Nestorianism. Assemani ("Bibliothec. Orient." tom. iii. p. 410 *seq.*) distinguishes between particular conversions—*i.e.* conversions of individual bishops and their dioceses, and general conversions—*i.e.* unions effected with a large section of the Nestorians which led to the recognition of a Catholic patriarch. Under the former head he mentions—(1) the conversion of the Bishop Sahaduna and the Gamaraeans, A.D. 630; (2) that of Timothy of Tarsus, metropolitan of the Nestorians in Cyprus, and of his subjects, A.D. 1445; (3) that of the Nestorians on the Malabar Coast; (4) that of the Christians of St. John, called Sabacans, by the Carmelite Fathers, in Bassora, *circ.* A.D. 1630. The story of the third of these conversions will be given in the article of the CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS. We doubt the accuracy of Assemani's statement about the Sabaeans, whose history has been investigated by Chwolson.[1] The third case is interesting from its connection with the Council of Florence. Timothy was converted by Andrew, archbishop of Rhodes (Colossensis), whom Eugenius IV. sent to Cyprus. The union was effected in the second session of the continuation of the council in the Lateran, August 7, 1445. Eugenius, in his bull containing the decree of union, forbids anyone to call the Chaldeans heretics. So that here we have a formal recognition of the name "Chaldean."[2] (Hefele-Leclercq, vol. vii. p. 815 *seq.*)

Assemani enumerates the following "general conversions." (1) In 1247 Asa, "Vicar of the East"—*i.e.* representative of the patriarch in China and Eastern Tartary—under the Nestorian Patriarch Sabarjesu (1226–56), made a profession of Catholic belief to Innocent IV. It was subscribed by the Archbishop of Nisbis, two other archbishops, and three bishops. (2) The Patriarch Jaballaha was reconciled under Benedict XI., A.D. 1304. (3) A dispute about the succession to the patriarchate between Sulaka and Shimoom led to the reconciliation of the former under Julius III., A.D. 1552. (4) The Patriarch Elias became Catholic under Paul V., A.D. 1616. None of these conversions had any wide or lasting influence. (5) The conversion of the Nestorians at Diarbekir led Innocent XI. to establish a new Chaldean patriarchate in that city. Joseph I. was the first patriarch; the last died in 1828. (Badger, "The Nestorians and their Rituals," vol. i. p. 150.)

[1] Till the time of Photius. Hergenröther, *Photius*, i. p. 87.

[2] But the decision of the council in Trullo on this point was not received in the other Eastern patriarchates. Hergenröther, *ib.* p. 223.

[1] See, especially, his criticism of Assemani (*Die Sabier und der Sabismus*, vol. i. p. 48).

[2] "Meshihaya," which simply means "follower of the Messias"—*i.e.* Christian—is now used as a distinctive name for the Chaldean Catholics, as opposed to the Nestorians of the same rite. The word (ܡܫܝܚܝܐ "Meshichojo" frequently occurs in Syriac literature as a general name for Christian. (Payne Smith, *Thesaur. Syr.* col. 2242.) The Greek word Χριστιανὸς has been adopted in the Syriac language, and occurs constantly, not only in the Peshitto, but also in late authors, *e.g.* in the chronicles of Barhebraeus. The reader must not suppose that the name Chaldean has anything to do with the Chaldee language. The Catholics of the Syrian and Chaldean rites agree in the use of the Syriac tongue in the liturgy, the former, however, using the Western or Jacobite, the latter, the Eastern or Nestorian, dialect. The differences between the dialects, which are slight and chiefly affect the pronunciation of the vowels, are noted in all the recent grammars. Martin (*Syro-Chaldaicae Institutiones*, p. 60) gives a transcription of the Nicene Creed in Roman characters, as he heard it pronounced by a Chaldean priest.

Here Assemani's narrative ends, but since his great work was published at Rome (1719–28) the most important accession of Nestorians to the Church has taken place. There had been since the middle of the sixteenth century a schism among the Nestorians themselves, and they had two patriarchs, one residing at Kochanes in Central Koordistan, the other at Mosul or Alkôsh. Elias, the patriarch at the latter place, on his death in 1778, left two nephews, Hanna (= John, the name he took at ordination, his own name being Hormuzd) and Jeshuyan. Both were already metropolitans, both became Catholics, and both were candidates for the patriarchate. The latter had scarcely reached the object of his ambition when he relapsed into Nestorianism. John, who remained Catholic, claimed the patriarchate in his place, A.D. 1782. He had bitter disputes, not only with his Nestorian relatives, but also with the Carmelite missionaries and the Patriarch Joseph, who still exercised jurisdiction at Diarbekir. It was not till the close of the 18th century that he was recognized by Rome as the spiritual head of all the Chaldeans, and allowed to use the patriarchal seal and exercise patriarchial functions, and he then took the name Elias. He only received the pallium shortly before his death at Bagdad in 1841. He must have been bishop for more than sixty-three years; but it appears from his autobiography, translated by Badger, that he was consecrated metropolitan at the age of sixteen. This last conversion to the Church embraced most of the Nestorians in the plains by the Tigris. Badger, writing in 1852, estimates the number of Catholics belonging to the Chaldean rite at 20,000, thinly scattered through the vast territory which extends from Diarbekir to the frontiers of Persia, and from Tyari to Bagdad. The Chaldeans, says Badger (i. p. 176), are superior to their Nestorian countrymen "in civilisation, general intelligence, and ecclesiastical order." This is important testimony, coming as it does, from an author who had extraordinary opportunities of judging correctly, and who writes with passionate vehemence against everything Catholic.

Rome utterly abolished the hereditary succession to the patriarchate which had long prevailed among the Nestorians, and John was forbidden to make any of his relations bishops, but it was difficult to root out this abuse. A nephew of the Patriarch John actually became Nestorian for a few months, in 1834, that he might be consecrated metropolitan by the Nestorian patriarch and succeed his uncle, who is said to have approved of this proceeding. The devotion to the old patriarchal house nearly led to a schism, which was fomented by a Nestorian patriarch, Shimoom, who fled from the Kurds to Mosul. Great discontent was caused in 1843 by an attempt of the Patriarch Zeiya to make the Chaldeans keep Easter according to the Latin reckoning. This patriarch was himself cited before the Holy Office on a charge of embezzlement, and resigned in 1846. The next patriarch, Joseph Audu, came into conflict with Rome on account of his claims to exercise jurisdiction over the Chaldeans in India, and because of his uncanonical ordinations. He was forbidden to consecrate bishops without leave from Rome. He refused to accept the decrees of the Vatican Council, which he attended, and renounced communion with Rome. A Capuchin, Bishop Fanciulli, was sent as Apostolic visitor to Mosul, and the patriarch made a qualified submission in July 1872. Soon after, the patriarch renewed the schism, induced some of the bishops and nobles to join him, and consecrated bishops in defiance of the Pope. The revolt was fostered by the Turkish Government. The patriarch made his final submission in January 1877.

According to the ordinary law the patriarch—unless Rome has previously appointed a coadjutor with right of succession—is chosen by the bishops. The election, if canonical, is confirmed at Rome. He is subject not only to Propaganda but to the Latin Archbishop of Bagdad, as apostolic visitor. He resides at Alkôsh and Mosul.

The metropolitans and bishops, who are chosen from the monks, are nominated and consecrated by the patriarch. The metropolitan sees are Amedia, Mosul (both immediately subject to the patriarch), Kerkuk, and Sehna. The episcopal sees are Akra, Diarbekir, Gezireh, Mardin, Salmas, Seert, and Zaku. The secular priests are usually married, and partly support themselves by manual labour. The monks belong to the order of St. Anthony, and there are two monasteries—a very ancient one, that of Rabban Hormuzd, at Alkôsh, which in 1843 had an abbot and four monks, and a small one founded in modern times, and with scarcely any religious, that of Mars Yurgis (= St. George), on the left bank of the Tigris, a few miles above Mosul. The monks live apart in cells which are mostly in the rock. They abstain from wine and spirits and from flesh, except on Christmas Day and Easter Sunday.

The number of priests, secular and regular (1914), was about 250; the number of Catholics over 50,000. (Streit, "Atlas Hierarchicus.")

Bickell ("Conspectus rei Syrorum litterariae," Münster, 1871, §§ vii.-x.) mentions the following printed editions of liturgical books of the Chaldean rite: "Missale Chaldaicum, et Decret. S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide," Romae, 1767; "Psalterium Chaldaicum in usum nationis Chald." Romae, 1842; "Breviarium Chaldaicum in usum nationis Chald. a Josepho Guriel, secundo editum," Romae, 1865. He also gives the titles of four liturgical books of the Chaldean rite, but

intended for the church of Malabar—viz. "Ordo Chaldaicus Missae B. Apost. juxta ritum Eccles. Malabar." Romae, 1774; "Ordo Chaldaicus Rituum et Lectionum juxta morem Eccles. Malabar." Romae, 1775; "Ordo Chaldaicus Ministerii Sacrament. SS. quae perficiuntur a Sacerdot. juxta morem Eccles. Malabar." Romae, 1845; "Ordo Baptism. Adultorum juxta ritum Eccles. Malabar. Chaldaeorum," Romae 1859. In three instances there is an exceptional use of the word Chaldee instead of Syriac in the titles of books meant for the Maronites—viz. "Missale Chaldaicum juxta ritum Eccles. nationis Maronitarum," Romae, 1592; "Officium Defunctorum ad usum Maronitarum Gregorii XIII. impensa Chaldaicis characteribus impressum," Romae, 1558, vol. ii.; "Breviarii Chaldaici aestiva pars" (the former part, printed ten years earlier, is entitled simply "Offic. Sanctorum juxta ritum Eccles. Maronit. pars hiemalis"), Romae, 1666.

(Assemani has been our authority for the history down to the close of the seventeenth century, then Badger, carefully compared with Silbernagl's "Kirchen des Orients"; and for the events of the last few years, Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. ii. p. 1009 *seq.*; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," 101 *sqq.*)

CHALICE (*calix*, *ποτήριον*). The cup used in Mass, for the wine which is to be consecrated. The rubrics of the Missal require that it should be of gold or silver, or at least have a silver cup gilt inside. It must be consecrated by the bishop with chrism, according to a form prescribed in the Pontifical. It may not be touched ordinarily except by persons in Holy Orders.

We know nothing about the chalice which our Lord used in the first Mass. Venerable Bede relates that in the seventh century they exhibited at Jerusalem a great silver cup, with two handles, which our Saviour Himself had used in celebrating the Eucharist, but antiquity knows nothing of this chalice, and it has no better claim to be regarded as genuine than the chalice of agate which is still shown at Valencia and claims also to be that used by Christ [see GRAIL, HOLY]. Probably, the first chalices used by Christian priests were made of glass. It seems likely at least, though the inference cannot be called certain, from Tertullian's words, that in his time glass chalices were commonly used in church, and undoubtedly such chalices were still common during the fifth century, as appears from the testimonies of St. Jerome and Cyprianus Gallus, the biographer of St. Caesarius of Arles. Gregory of Tours mentions a crystal chalice of remarkable beauty, which belonged to the church of Milan.

However, even before persecution had ceased, the Church began, from natural reverence for Christ's Blood, to employ more costly vessels. The "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, i. 143) says of Pope Urban I. (226) that "he made all the holy vessels (ministeria sacrata) of silver." So, too, we read in the acts of St. Laurence's martyrdom, that he was charged by the heathen with having sold the altar vessels of gold and silver, and with having given the proceeds to the poor; while St. Augustine mentions two golden and six silver chalices, which were exhumed from the crypt of the church at Crita. Of course, such precious chalices became more common when the Church grew rich and powerful. Thus St. Chrysostom describes a chalice "of gold and adorned with jewels." In 857 the Emperor Michael III. sent Pope Nicolas I., among other presents, a golden chalice, surrounded by precious stones, and with jacinths suspended on gold threads round the cup. A precious silver chalice adorned with figures belonged to the church at Jerusalem, and was presented in 869 to Ignatius of Constantinople. But it is needless to multiply instances on this head.

For a long time, however, chalices of horn, base metal, &c., were still used, and Binterim says that a copper chalice in which Ludger, the Apostle of Münster, in the eighth century, said Mass, is still preserved at Werden, where he founded an abbey. But very soon afterwards chalices of glass, horn, base metal, &c., were prohibited by a series of councils in England, Germany, Spain, and France, although chalices of ivory and of precious stone (*e.g.* of onyx) were still permitted. Gratian adopted in the *Corpus Juris* a canon which he attributes to a Council of Rheims, otherwise unknown. The words of the canon are "Let the chalice of the Lord and the paten be at least of silver, if not of gold. But if anyone be too poor, let him in any case have a chalice of tin. Let not the chalice be made of copper or brass, because from the action of the wine it produces rust, which occasions sickness. But let none presume to sing Mass with a chalice of wood or glass." (Hefele, "Beiträge," ii. p. 322 *seq.*)

The practice of consecrating chalices is very ancient. A form for this purpose is contained in the Gregorian Sacramentary, as well as in the most ancient "Ordines Romani," and such consecration is usual among the Greeks and Copts. In the Latin Church, the bishop anoints the inside of the chalice with chrism, using at the same time appropriate prayers. The consecration is lost if the chalice be broken or notably injured, or if the inside is regilt. A decree prohibiting all except those in sacred orders to touch the paten or chalice is attributed to an early Pope, St. Sixtus, by the author of the "Liber Pontificalis." But Meratus, who quotes this statement, admits that a Roman Ordo regards it as lawful for acolytes to do so. However, a Council of Braga, held in 563,

confines the right of touching the sacred vessels to those who at least are subdeacons.

Besides the chalice from which the priest took the Precious Blood, the ancients also used "baptismal chalices," from which the newly-baptized received communion under the species of wine, and "ministerial chalices" ("calices ministeriales," "scyphi"), in which the Precious Blood was given to the people. This "ministerial" chalice was partly filled with common wine, and into this wine the celebrant poured a small quantity of the Precious Blood from the "calix offertorius"—*i.e.* the chalice with which he said Mass. (Benedict XIV., "De Missa," i. cap. 4; Rohault de Fleury, "La Messe," vol. iv.; Barbier de Montault, "Le Mobilier Ecclésiastique"; Leclercq in DACL, *Calice*, and "Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne," i. 349-351; Baudot in DACL, *Calice ministériel*; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

CHALICE-VEIL. The veil with which the chalice is covered, called also "peplum" and "sudarium." It used to be of linen, but must now be of silk, as the rubric requires. The Greeks use three veils, one of which covers the paten, another the chalice, a third both paten and chalice. They call the third veil ἀήρ, because it encompasses the oblations. Cardinal Bona says this Greek custom began in the church of Jerusalem, and thence spread through the East. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." i. cap. 5.)

Benedict XIV. considers the antiquity of the chalice-veil to be proved by one of the Apostolic canons—viz. 72 (*al.* 73), which forbids the application of the church vessels or veils (ὀθόνην) to profane uses. Hefele thinks this canon may belong to the latter half of the third century. But there does not seem to be any reason for alleging that the veil meant is the chalice-veil. Gavantus says that the chalice-veil is mentioned in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom (which, however, has been altered since the saint's time); that silken chalice-veils were given to Pope Hormisdas (514–523), and that Amalarius mentions the Roman custom of bringing the chalice to the altar wrapped in a veil.

CHAMBERLAIN (*Camerarius*). An official of the Papal court. [See CURIA ROMANA.]

CHANCEL. The part of a church between the altar and the nave, so named from the rails (*cancelli*) which separated it from the nave. The word was in use before the Reformation, and the Anglicans still retain it. Among English Catholics it is now little used, the portion of the church near the altar, separated by rails from the nave, being designated the "sanctuary." In cathedrals and conventual churches, where space is required to accommodate the canons or the religious, a portion of the church between the sanctuary and the nave is taken for the purpose; it is not, however, called the "chancel," but the "choir," Fr. *chœur*. [See CHOIR.]

CHANCELLOR, EPISCOPAL (*cancellarius*, from *cancelli*, a lattice, railings). The place, surrounded by railings or lattice work, where the legal instruments which decisions in an imperial or royal court made necessary were prepared, was called "cancellaria." The word "cancellarius" is first used in the sense of a secretary or notary by Cassiodorus—that is, in the middle of the sixth century. The jurisdiction of the bishop was in primitive times exercised by his archdeacon [ARCHDEACON]; but in proportion as the powers of the archdeacons were enlarged, a tendency manifested itself to make their jurisdiction independent of episcopal control, until at last an appeal actually lay from the archdeacon to the bishop. Such a state of things would inevitably make the bishop's own official, his "chancellor"—the person, whether a clerk or a layman, who had the charge of the judicial records of the diocese—a personage of greater importance. We find, accordingly, that in the three centuries preceding the Reformation, while the power of the archdeacon had everywhere declined, or was declining, the influence and importance of the bishop's chancellor were always on the ascendant. We find St. Edmund Rich, archbishop of Canterbury, in the thirteenth century, carrying on an important and delicate negotiation with the monks of Christchurch chiefly through Richard, his chancellor, afterwards celebrated in the Church as St. Richard, bishop of Chichester. (See Gervase of Canterbury.) Canon law contains many regulations respecting the fees of office which chancellors are entitled to demand. (Ferraris, *Cancellaria*.)

CHANCERY, EPISCOPAL. (See the article on Episcopal Chancellors.) From the chancery of a bishop proceed all those documents, deeds; certificates, licences, dispensations, &c., which are necessary to the publication, recognition, and execution of the acts which he performs in the exercise of the fivefold jurisdiction attributed to him by the canon law, in which are included the powers of *ordering*, *judging*, *correcting*, *dispensing*, and *administering*. To these may be added the power of delegating or deputing. (Soglia, "De Potestate Jurisdictionis.")

CHANCERY, PAPAL: CHANCERY TAXES, &c. [See CURIA ROMANA.]

CHANT, ECCLESIASTICAL AND GREGORIAN. The official musical setting of the Liturgy of the Roman Rite: "Gregorian," because believed to have been brought to its final stage of development by St. Gregory the Great (590–604): "official," because it is the chant provided by ecclesiastical authority for the whole of those parts of the liturgy appointed to be sung, and is prescribed exclusively for the clergy officiating at those rites. It is "official" also, to distinguish it from the "private venture" music which is permitted, under certain restrictions, to

be used by the choir at the liturgical offices.

How considerable the amount of this official music is may be gathered from the fact that it provides chants as follows. For the singing of Mass; "Asperges" 3; "Vidi aquam" 1; "Kyrie" 29; "Gloria in excelsis" 21; "Credo" 4; "Sanctus" 21; "Agnus Dei" 20. These texts comprise what is called the "Ordinary of the Mass," *i.e.* the invariable portions, which are repeated day by day at Mass. For the special texts, varying in accordance with the festival or season, called the Proper, the chants include: Introits 222; Graduals 165; "Alleluia" verses 246; "Tractus" 60; "Sequentiae" (metrical compositions) 5, viz. "Dies Irae" (for the Dead), "Lauda Sion" (Corpus Christi), "Stabat Mater" (Seven Dolours B.V.M.), "Veni Sancte Spiritus" (Pentecost and Masses of the Holy Ghost), "Victimae paschali" (Easter); "Offertoria" 164; "Communiones" 222; Antiphons 32; Responds 32; Hymns 3, viz. "Benedictus es" (Ember Sat. Advent), "Gloria, laus" (processional, Palm Sunday), "Pange lingua" (processional, Good Friday). In addition to these there are the much more numerous chants for the Divine Office throughout the year, consisting of Matins, Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and Compline. The chants provided for these Canonical Hours in the Pars Hiemalis (winter quarter) alone, and there are four such quarters, comprise some 27 invitatory verses, 750 antiphons, 80 hymns, and 390 responds. Add to these the chants proper to pontifical functions—Ordinations, Confirmation, Consecrations of Bishop, Churches, Altars &c., contained in the Roman Pontifical, consisting mainly of antiphons and responds—and it will be seen that the whole body of official church-song is as complete as it is vast.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Church's chant is all of any one age, or is derived from any one source, or can be comprised under any one term, such as Gregorian, or Plain Chant. It is a fusion of various elements, at various epochs (from the first century to at least the end of the seventh), of which the principal are Hebrew, Syrian, Hellenic-Roman, and Frankish (or Gallic).

The Hebrew Element.—At its birth in Judea nineteen centuries ago, the public worship of the Christian Church differed in nothing from the national worship of the Jewish people. The first disciples, all of them converts from Judaism, frequented the services of the Temple (Lk. xxiv. 53; Acts iii. 1; xxi. 26; xxii. 17). In the neighbouring regions the Apostles preached the Gospel in the synagogues during the Hebrew liturgy. But in addition to this public worship, which remained for them completely Jewish, the first Christians met in the house of one or other of the disciples for the "breaking of bread"—the only distinctly Christian element of their worship. When converts from paganism became numerous, attendance at the synagogues necessarily fell into desuetude, but Christians still continued to observe the sabbaths and other Jewish festivals (1 Cor. xvi. 2); and "the breaking of bread" was preceded by readings from the Old Testament and chanting of the Psalms, after the manner of the Jewish worship, and thus the Christian liturgy came into being.

As M. Georges Houdard has well said: "From Antioch went forth the first Christian missionaries, bearing with them the first elements of Christian worship—rites, sacred texts, and music. The rites were of the simplest, such as time and place permitted. The sacred texts represented something very precise and definite: the Holy Scriptures for reading and the book of Psalms for chanting. Thus the song of the primitive Christian Church was the chanting of the Psalms, transmitted to them, as has been said, from Antioch, and hence immediately Syrian though originally Hebrew. . . . It seems reasonable to suppose that they sang them to the Hebrew chants."

No ancient MSS. of Hebrew chants have come down to us. They were transmitted merely orally, but with alterations so ancient and so general that it may be regarded as impossible to restore with certainty the genuine Jewish traditional music. Certain fragments, however, which we are entitled to consider as representing the ancient tradition, transcribed in the first quarter of the sixteenth century (1518–24), are closely analogous to the second and fifth ecclesiastical tones, and these are the tones of three-fourths of the Gradual-responds of the Roman liturgy (Gastoué, "Les Origines du Chant Romain," 1907).

In the fourth century, after the persecutions were ended, the liturgical chant was enriched and developed under an influence analogous to that which at the same period transformed the primitive sanctuaries and crypts of the catacombs into stately basilicas. Without uprooting the old foundations, the Church appropriated to her own purposes, as in architecture, so in music, what was purest and noblest in profane art. Syria was pre-eminent amongst all the countries of Christendom in the development of sacred chant.

The Syrian Element.—As M. Georges Houdard says: "The natural tendency of the West was to directness of expression. When a Western composed, he was drawn to a syllabic form of chant, *i.e.* a single note to each syllable of his text. He rebelled against aimless vocalisation, against singing for singing's sake, against a mere display of vocal skill; whereas to the Oriental mind the art consisted in all these things. Thus the florid chants of the East introduced with Christianity were in violent conflict with received

Western ideas. They were not, however, rejected on that account, but out of regard for their first missionaries the Latins received them with respect, and thus for the first time melody for its own sake was introduced into the Western world—an innovation that was destined in the course of centuries to bring about a relaxation of the native severity of Western music." The extraordinary part of the matter is that the extensive development of these florid chants seems to have been borrowed from the Gnostic heretics, who, in their exaggerated mysticism, discarded words, as being too material, and, after the manner of the heathen priests of Egypt, elaborated their sacred chants to the sounds of the seven vowels (including the two forms of both *e* and *o* in the Greek alphabet), the result being a sort of song without words. There are still extant some fragments of these Gnostic chants in documents dating from the fourth to the seventh century, which are thus contemporary with the classic period of the development of the Church's chant. The extent to which this musical form was adopted by the Western world may be judged from the fact that in the Ambrosian chant a *jubilus* (as these florid passages are called) sometimes runs to as many as 332 notes to a single syllable; and this influx of Orientalism into Latin Christianity may perhaps be accounted for by the fact that some of the leading churchmen, for one cause or another—Eusebius of Vercelli, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory the Great himself—spent long years in the East, and that at the period in question Latins of every condition began to flock from all parts of Europe to visit the Holy Places, and on their return recounted with enthusiasm (as witness the noble pilgrim Silvia, or Etheria) what they had heard and seen during their sojourn in the Holy City (D. Morin, "Examen du Système de M. Gevaert.")

St. Augustine, who elsewhere testifies to the emotions aroused in him by the Ambrosian chant at Milan ("Confess." ix. c. 6, PL, xxxii. 769), attempts a mystical interpretation of, and perhaps an apology for, the apparently "aimless vocalisation" of the *jubilus*. It is the joyous outpouring of the heart, seeking to express its sentiments, without being able to understand them. When a man is carried away by joy, he uses, not the expressions that his understanding or his ordinary language suggests; he breaks out into inarticulate sounds, so that, while manifesting his joy, he seems at the same time to lack terms in which to express it. (In Ps. xxxii., PL, xxxvi. 283.)

The Hellenic-Roman Element.—When, in the year 146 B.C., Greece became a Roman province, the Greek arts began to spread throughout the Roman world. Hellenic-Roman melodies have come down to us in documents and inscriptions which are sufficient to prove the continuity with them of the Church's chant. Throughout the classic and Hellenic-Roman periods five modes were in use—the Dorian, Eolian, Iastian, Phrygian, and Lydian. These modes, especially the first three, most frequently occur in the church-chants.

The pagan music, when rendered in public, always implied an instrumental accompaniment, especially that of the lyre, an instrument which Dom Leclercq says was for that period what the piano is at the present day. The primitive Church seems to have given but little encouragement to the use of instrumental music in her public worship—a tradition which has been persevered in to this day in the Eastern Church, in which the singing is always unaccompanied, and still survives in the practice of the Papal choir.

In the Middle Ages a large use was made of an accented metre of four feet:

Tantum	ergo	Sacra-	mentum
Vene-	remur	cernu-	i

This was not a new invention, but an inheritance from the popular songs of the classic period, such as the song of Caesar's soldiers:

Nico-	medes	Caesa-	rem
qui sub-	egit	Galli-	as
qui sub-	egit	Caesa-	rem

We have in our liturgy a series of chants which rhythmically are identical with the popular songs of the first centuries of our era; so much so that Dom Leclercq does not hesitate to say that "if the soldiers of Vitellius or the legionaries of Caesar, or the most stay-at-home or the least warlike of the Romans were to come back to life, they would recognize, at any rate in the general character of some of our liturgical chants, the rhythms and music in which of old they delighted." (DACL, iii. col. 261.)

The Gallic or Frankish Element.—In what has been said we have described the genesis of the psalmody (including Introits, Graduals, and Antiphons, which were originally taken from the Psalms) as being of Hebrew and Syrian origin, and that of the hymns as being Hellenic-Latin. It remains to account for another important section of the liturgical chant—the *Ordinarium Missae*, which includes the "Kyrie," "Gloria in excelsis," "Credo," "Sanctus" and "Agnus Dei," all of which in the Vatican edition are comprised under the name *Kyriale*. It is admitted that these portions of the sacred text were not primitively assigned to the choir; that they are not to be found in the most ancient MSS., and that they formed no part of the Antiphonal attributed to St. Gregory. (DACL, iii. 295.) Whence do they come? M. Georges Houdard suggests that they were of Gallic or Frankish origin. In 753 King Pepin sent an embassy to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, the principal member of which was Chrodegand, Bishop of Metz, who on his return introduced

the Roman chant into his diocese. Paul I. (758–68), successor of Stephen, sent to Pepin a Roman Antiphonal and Responsorial, and Simeon, one of the singers of his *Schola cantorum*. Charlemagne declared that, thanks to the zeal of his father Pepin, the Roman chant was established in all the churches of Gaul; and in a Capitulary of the year 789 he imposed upon all the clergy of the empire the adoption of the Roman chant for the Mass and Office. But these Roman chants were found difficult of execution by the Gallic singers by reason of their ornate character, whence we may conclude that their own chant was more simple. "When the Roman chant of Oriental origin," says M. Georges Houdard, "the 'Gregorian chant,' properly so called, was introduced amongst the Franks under Charlemagne, in the ninth century, they found these elaborate compositions beyond their powers of appreciation and of execution; and they either modified them or composed new ones within the limits of their vocal powers, and in accordance with the musical traditions of their race. Thus originated the 'Plain Chant' properly so called."

Summing up, the same author says: "Briefly, then, in our liturgical books we have comprised four distinct elements: 1. Hebrew, represented by the Psalm tones; 2. Oriental, represented by the elaborate Graduals and Alleluias; 3. Hellenic-Latin, represented by the hymns; 4. Frankish, largely syllabic, represented by the chants of the Ordinarium Missae." Thus was apparent from the first the catholicity of the Roman Church; not a national or provincial church, but the church of all nations; as in philosophy, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, so in music, with marvellous assimilative power, making her own whatever was purest and noblest in all the arts.

The part of St. Gregory.—By a tradition of more than a thousand years' standing, a chief part in the development and final organization of the liturgical music of the Roman Church has been attributed to Pope St. Gregory the Great (590–604). What was the nature of that work? The Saint's biographer, John the Deacon (c. 872), though he lived 250 years after the event, may be regarded as deposing to a well-founded and genuine tradition. He says, in his life of St. Gregory, "In the house of the Lord, like another wise Solomon, he compiled for the use of the singers the collection of chants called the Antiphonal, which is of great utility. He also founded a choir-school which to this day [about 872] executes the sacred chants of the Roman Church in accordance with the lessons they received from him."

St. Gregory's claim to the authorship of the Antiphonal was first seriously called in doubt in 1729 by a certain George Baron Eckhart, chiefly on the ground of the absence of any contemporary evidence. He assigned to Gregory II. (715–731) the liturgical work hitherto attributed to St. Gregory the Great. The same thesis has recently been maintained by Fr. Aug. Gevaert, in his "Les Origines du Chant liturgique de l'Église Latine," 1890; who says (op. cit. p. 19) "The compilation of the Roman Antiphonal has been antedated by more than a century; and if the epithet 'Gregorian' has any right to appear there it designates either Gregory II. (715–731) or more probably his successor, Gregory III., who died in 741." This thesis has been as vigorously opposed by Dom Germain Morin in his "Les véritables Origines du Chant Grégorien," 3rd edition, 1912. Dom Morin, after quoting the passage from John the Deacon, above referred to, goes on to show in a series of texts that the attribution can be traced backwards through references to it by various ecclesiastical writers until we come to our own Egbert, Bishop of York (732–766). On the question of when the Ember-tides are to be observed Egbert says "As for us in the church of the English, we always observe the fast of the first month in the first week of Lent, on the authority of St. Gregory, who thus regulated it in the copy of his Antiphonal and of his Missal, which he sent us through the intermediary of our master, the blessed Augustine." Finally, within a hundred years of the death of St. Gregory, Venerable Bede (H.E. iv. 2), speaking of Putta, Bishop of Rochester (669–676), says "He was extraordinarily skilled in church singing, after the Roman manner, which he had learnt from the disciples of the holy Pope Gregory."

The conclusion at which Dom Leclercq (DACL, iii. 286) arrives in regard to the part of St. Gregory is this: if the attribution of the Antiphonal to St. Gregory is not altogether proved, the fact of the musical authority attaching to the name of this pope cannot be called in question. It must be admitted that St. Gregory gave a vigorous impulse to the chant as executant, as teacher, and as pope; and we have every reason to suppose that he compiled a collection of Roman chants in conformity with the Sacramentary. Copies of this collection, together with the Sacramentary, were preserved in Rome and elsewhere within less than a century of his death. If St. Gregory as pope published an official text of the Antiphonal, it was doubtless one that he had compiled when, as abbot and archdeacon (570–590), he had occasion and opportunity to devote himself to such an undertaking.

Manner of Singing.—The primitive manner of singing the psalms and scriptural canticles was what is termed *responsorial*. In view of the scarcity of MS. copies and the restricted diffusion of reading, a single cantor sang the psalm, and the Faithful joined in by intercalating between the verses acclamations, such as Alleluia, or some particular phrase taken from the psalm itself. This manner

of singing, as practised by the Hebrews, is well exemplified by Ps. cxxxv., *Confitemini Domino.* The text changes for the first half of every verse, and this was sung by the cantor, but the second half is always the same: "His mercy endureth for ever," which was intoned by the Faithful, over and over again, as a refrain.

Antiphonal or Choral Psalmody.—The practice of the singing the psalms by two choirs, called antiphonal psalmody, was of Oriental origin. The historian Socrates records that St. Ignatius, third bishop of Antioch, had a vision in which he saw the angels in heaven singing hymns in alternate choirs, and he introduced this practice into the church of Antioch, whence later on it came to Constantinople. It was introduced into Milan by St. Ambrose (d. 397), into Rome by Pope St. Celestin (422–432), as St. Augustine testifies ("Confess." ix. 7, PL, xxxii. 770), and spread throughout all the churches of the West.

Hymnody.—To the East also is due another form of chant—popular hymn-singing. In a life of St. Ephrem of Edessa, by an anonymous author, it is recorded that the saint, recognizing how strongly all men were attracted by singing, and desiring to withdraw his flock from profane songs and indecorous amusements, instituted a choir of maidens dedicated to God, and taught them hymns, full of lofty and spiritual thoughts about the birth of Christ, His baptism, fasting, life, passion, resurrection, and ascension; about the martyrs, penitence, the dead; and caused them to assemble in the church on solemn festivals and martyrs' feasts, and he, as their father in the midst of them, taught them the musical modes and the rules of hymn-singing. The purpose of this innovation was to combat the Gnostic heretics with their own weapons, viz. popular songs. St. Hilary of Poitiers brought back from his exile in Asia Minor recollections of the Greek and Syrian sacred lyrics, from which he drew his inspiration in the hymns which he composed; but the real author of hymnody in the West was St. Ambrose, who also had in view the combating by this means of the Arian heresy. So slow in obtaining official recognition was this form of chant that at the beginning of the twelfth century hymns had not been incorporated in the liturgical offices of the Roman basilicas.

Texts of the Chant.—The most ancient MSS. that are extant (ninth century) of Italy, Germany, France, England, and Spain are in substantial agreement as to their reading of the text of the melodies. This traditional chant continued to be faithfully preserved until about the middle of the sixteenth century. From the sixteenth century onwards the introduction of measured and polyphonic music came gradually to bring about a decadence of the Church's chant. The melodies of that chant were used as themes for their motets, &c., by the polyphonic composers, and for that purpose were reduced to strict time, to the consequent destruction of their own proper free rhythm. Gregory XIII. was persuaded that it was necessary to correct the ancient church chants so as to bring them into line with the modern developments of musical art. He entrusted the work to no less a person than the great Palestrina, who took it in hand, but died (1594) before it was completed. Later the task was committed to two celebrated musicians, Anerio and Soriano, and this new version was published by a Roman printer, Raimondi, who obtained from the Pope the exclusive rights in this edition for fifteen years, the main object of which was to abbreviate what was considered the excessive length and elaboration of some of the melodic formulae. Various editions more or less based on this recension were published in different countries, amongst the best known of which were the Mechlin and the Medicean. The latter, published by Frederick Pustet at Regensburg (Ratisbon) in 1870, was granted by Pius IX. an exclusive privilege for thirty years. This edition of the chant was superseded by the Vatican edition, now in course of publication, the editing of which was entrusted ("Motu Proprio" of April 25, 1904) by Pius X. to the Benedictine monks of the French congregation of Solesmes, now established at Quarr Abbey, in the Isle of Wight. Their qualifications for this work were due to the fact that Dom Guéranger, their founder, in connection with his general work of liturgical restoration in France, had commissioned Dom Pothier, of the same congregation, to make a profound study of the most ancient MSS., with a view to an authentic edition of the chant. This led to the publication by Dom Pothier in 1880 of his "Mélodies Grégoriennes," a theoretical work, and of his revised versions of the church chants in his "Liber Gradualis," "Liber Antiphonarius," and the Processional and Responsorial. Later the same work was taken up still more scientifically by a band of Solesmes monks under the leadership of Dom André Mocquereau, who in his "Paléographie Musicale" (begun in 1889 and still in progress) has given to the world photographic reproductions of all the known ancient MSS. of the Chant, and has thus provided an *apparatus criticus* that cannot be gainsaid. The main achievements of the Solesmes school have been by their editions to restore the text of the Church's Chant to its original richness and fulness, and by their method of singing to revive the lost arts of rhythm and flow in the execution of these ancient melodies.—J. C.

(See Leclercq-Gatard in DACL, *Chant*, where copious references to the chief writers on the subject are given; Bewerunge, in "Cath. Enc."; also "The Vatican Edition, a Critical

Study," in "Irish Eccl. Record," Jan. 1906; Georges Houdard, "La Question Grégorienne en 1894," "La Science Musicale Traditionelle"; Gevaert, "Les Origines du Chant Romain"; Gastoué, "Les Origines du Chant Romain"; Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook, "A Grammar of Plainsong" and "Gregorian Music.")

CHANTRY (Lat. *capellania*, Fr. *chapellenie*). The ancient name in this country—

(1) of a chapel, aisle, or part of an aisle, in a church, set apart for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice for the benefit of the soul of a particular person, generally the founder, or for some other pious purpose;

(2) of the institution and endowment of such a service: as when Chaucer praises his "Persone" for not leaving his parish

"To seeken him a chaunterie for soules."

All chantries were dissolved by the Acts of 1545 and 1547. They were then found to be more than a thousand in number.

Chantries in the second of the above senses are divided by the canonists into three classes. (1) *Mercenary*, as when a testator leaves property to a layman with the charge of causing Masses to be said for his soul. (2) *Collative*, when property is left with an express injunction that out of the revenue arising from it daily Mass, or a certain number of Masses in the year, should be celebrated; as to these chantries, the *collation* of the priests to serve them properly belongs to the bishop. (3) Chantries in private patronage. These only differ from the second class in that the nomination to them rests with the private patron; but the institution must still come from the bishop. (Ferraris, *Capellania*; Rock, iii. 84–113.)

CHAPEL. The word *capella*, according to Brachet, is derived from *capa* (cloak), being originally the shrine in which St. Martin's cloak was preserved. Hence it came to be applied to the buildings, smaller than churches, which kings or bishops erected in their own palaces, that they might more conveniently and frequently attend divine worship. It is also applied to any place other than the collegiate or parish churches, *e.g.* chapels of ease, subject to the rector of the parish, convent chapels, chapels of confraternities, &c., all of which come under the technical designation of public or semi-public Oratories. It is also applied to special portions of a church set apart for Mass or particular devotion, *e.g.* Blessed Sacrament chapel, Lady chapel, &c. (See CHANTRY; CHAPLAIN; Ferraris, *Capella*; Leclercq in DACL, *Chapelle*.)

CHAPLAIN. The priest appointed to the charge of a chapel was called the "capellanus" or chaplain. As the number of such chapels increased, the chaplains became a numerous body, and were placed under an arch-chaplain, who was also called the Grand Almoner. Charlemagne selected bishops for this office of Grand Almoner.

There are chaplains of many kinds, as the following enumeration shows:

1. *Army* chaplains. Various indults, privileges, and faculties have been granted to Catholic sovereigns by the Holy See in relation to priests stationed in barracks or serving with an army in the field. In modern times sovereigns have usually endeavoured to place army chaplains under the sole control of a royal or imperial chaplain-major. This has been resisted by the Church, and it is decided that such chaplains, in the absence of an Apostolic brief otherwise providing, must be approved by the Ordinary of the place. Thus a marriage contracted before an army chaplain, in the absence of such brief as aforesaid, is held to be null if celebrated without the licence of the bishop.

2. *Auxiliary* chaplains. Appointed by parish priests as their coadjutors, and removable by them, but not without just cause. (See Ferraris, *Capellanus*, § 41.)

3. *Cathedral* chaplains. After the *common* life of canons ceased, and each drew his portion or prebend from the common fund, it became usual for them to reside at a distance from the cathedral or collegiate church to which they belonged, and to pay chaplains to perform their duties in choir for them. This practice was checked by the Council of Trent. [See CANON.]

4. Chaplains of *chantries* (capellaniae). [See CHANTRY.] A large proportion of the chantries which once existed were founded, not that Mass might be said for souls, but in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or of some saint, or some particular mystery. The chaplains serving these were and are carefully regulated by the canon law, so that the course of episcopal and parochial discipline might not be troubled by their presence in a diocese.

5. Chaplains of *confraternities*. [See CONFRATERNITY.] Such chaplains cannot have processions without the express licence of the bishop. They are not to be removed without cause by the bishop against the wish of the brotherhood.

6. *Court* chaplains. How these originated under the early Frankish kings has been already explained. Charlemagne gave to his episcopal arch-chaplain precedence over all the archbishops and bishops of his empire. The chaplains of the imperial and royal Courts had great power for centuries. By a Papal brief dated in 1857 the Holy See restored the office of arch-chaplain or Grand Almoner in France; but with the collapse of the Second Empire the brief became inoperative. At the Courts of Catholic sovereigns in Germany the chaplains of an imperial or royal chapel now constitute a body of canons, and the chapel of the palace is regarded as a collegiate church.

7. *Domestic* chaplains. Priests appointed

to say Mass in the chapels attached to private houses.

8. *Episcopal* chaplains. In early times the bishops had their private oratories, and as their dwellings grew to be palaces their first care was to provide them with suitable chapels, the clergy attached to which became episcopal chaplains. In large and wealthy dioceses these became numerous, and were then placed under an episcopal arch-chaplain. At the present day, when the Church has in most countries of Europe been reduced to the greatest poverty, the chaplains of bishops usually act as their secretaries, or as masters of the ceremonies when they celebrate High Mass.

9. Chaplains of *nunneries*. These are of course very numerous, and to be found in every part of the Catholic world. Canon law requires that they shall be of mature age, and in other ways enacts a minute discipline for their guidance.

10. *Pontifical* chaplains, attached to the Pope's chapel. They are of three classes: honorary, ceremonial, and secretarial.

11. Chaplains of *public institutions*: *e.g.* workhouses, prisons, hospitals, and lunatic asylums. In all such appointments the chaplain is, as a rule, nominated by the civil authority, with the approval of the bishop of the diocese. (Ferraris; Taunton.)

CHAPLET. Originally a wreath for the head. In ecclesiastical use it is a name for a rosary [*q.v.*].

CHAPTER, CATHEDRAL. [For the derivation, see CHAPTER, CONVENTUAL.] The ancient name for the clergy of a cathedral church was Presbyterium; the term "chapter" was borrowed from the assemblies of regulars. The history of chapters has been already partly traced in the article CANON. With the increase of the corporate property of chapters, the extended patronage arising from that increase, and the sense of dignity which the possession of that patronage engendered, a strong tendency developed itself in the course of the Middle Ages towards the independent existence of chapters, both cathedral and collegiate, and their exemption from episcopal control. There was a danger lest the canons of his cathedral, instead of forming the trusted council of the bishop, and assisting him in the administration of the diocese, as in primitive times, should be transformed into a body of dignified and wealthy ecclesiastics, burdened by very light duties, admission amongst whom would be desired by the upper classes for their sons, from motives much short of the purest. This happened to a great extent, and as a natural consequence collisions between bishops and chapters came to be of frequent occurrence. The Council of Trent applied itself to remedy this state of things, and partially restored the authority of the bishops over the chapters. A general right of visitation and correction was asserted for them.[1] A bishop was authorized to convene the chapter for any affairs which did not solely concern the interests of the canons and their dependents; this power, however, was not to extend to his vicar-general. At meetings so convened the bishop was to preside, and due rank and honour were to be accorded him. On the other hand, many things important for the welfare of the diocese could at no time be settled by the bishop without the consent or advice of his chapter; and in this respect the Council made no change. Thus the *consent* of the chapter is required in the administration or alienation of the see-property, or in any case in which diminution of the authority and privileges of the cathedral is threatened; their *advice* must be had by the bishop before ordaining or instituting clerks,[2] before proclaiming public processions, convening synods, &c. In England, in consequence of the Elizabethan schism, the reforming influence of the Council of Trent could not assert itself; and hence, though the chapters were left, no attempt was made to bring back their action and authority into that harmony with those of the bishops which primitive piety required. Thus the present singular state of things gradually arose. The dean and chapter of an Anglican cathedral have their own separate property, the bishop of the same cathedral has his, and neither side interferes with the other. The chapter, say of Worcester Cathedral, has complete power over the church itself, with the exceptions presently to be mentioned; but there its connection with the diocese ceases. It has no more to do with its government by the bishop than the chapter of Munich has. At a vacancy of the see, indeed, the chapter meets to go through the mockery of electing a new bishop; but, as everyone knows, in the *congé d'élire* sent down to them from London, the name of the Crown nominee is specified, and the chapter is not at liberty to reject it. On the other hand, the bishop has a legal right to a chair or throne in the cathedral, and to hold confirmations in it, and here his power ends. He has no authority to summon meetings of the chapter for any purpose whatever, nor to control the dean or the canons in any way, except so far as, in their merely clerical capacity, they may become amenable to his jurisdiction. The result is that an Anglican chapter has entirely lost the primitive character of the "senatus episcopi." In the Catholic Church, amidst the unnumbered ills that have come upon it in every country of Europe, it is consoling to reflect that this particular evil at least, so rife in the Middle Ages, has in our day almost disappeared; everywhere harmony and co-operation reign between the bishops and the cathedral chapters.

[1] Sess. vi. c. 4, De Reform.
[2] Ferraris, "Capitulum," art. ii. § 16.

In England every Catholic diocese has its chapter, presided over by a provost, and usually numbering ten canons. In Ireland only some of the dioceses have chapters, but these are presided over by deans and usually contain five or six dignitaries or officials of the diocese besides the Canon Theologian and Canon Penitentiary prescribed by the Council of Trent. (See CANON; Ferraris; Taunton; Bouix, "De Capitulis"; Leclercq in DACL, *Chapitre des Cathédrales.*)

CHAPTER, CONVENTUAL (*capitulum*, a chapter). It was and is the common practice of monks to assemble every morning to hear a *chapter* of the rule read, and for other purposes. Both the meeting itself and the place of meeting gradually obtained the name of Capitulum or chapter from this practice. The assembly of the monks of one monastery being thus designated "the chapter," it is easy to understand that assemblies of all the monks in any province, or of the whole order, came to be called "provincial" or "general" chapters. A general chapter, in the case of most of the orders, is held once in three years.

CHAPTER-HOUSE. The place of meeting of the canons of a cathedral, or the religious of a monastery. Till the thirteenth century it was generally rectangular; after that time the polygonal or round form came in, as at Salisbury, Lincoln, and York. Chapter-houses were sometimes richly adorned; at Westminster Abbey, for instance, a band of fresco, the painting of which has considerable merit, ran round the interior of the building; the remains of this, lately opened to public view, are of great interest. A large round chapter-house, with seats for sixty—the number of the monks—extremely plain in its architecture, but effective from the symmetry and boldness of its forms, was lately erected by the Cistercians at their house of Mount St. Bernard in Leicestershire. (Rock, iii. 79; Gasquet, "English Monastic Life"; Cabrol in DACL, *Abbaye*; Leclercq, ib. *Chapitre des Cathédrales.*)

CHAPTER, THE OLD. After the extinction of the old hierarchy in England there was no English Catholic bishop until the appointment of Dr. William Bishop as vicar-apostolic in 1623. He established a chapter of twenty-four canons, the status of whom, however, was always of an anomalous character. The Roman authorities never gave them any formal recognition, though the canons exercised ecclesiastical rule for thirty years, during a vacancy when there was no vicar-apostolic (1655–1685). In 1688, when four vicars-apostolic were created, the status of the chapter became still more anomalous: there being now four quasi-dioceses with only one chapter unattached to any diocese. Dr. Leybourne, the first of the new vicars-apostolic, was required to swear that he would not recognize the Chapter, and henceforth it became a sort of friendly society without any jurisdiction. The vicars-apostolic were usually chosen from their number. On the restoration of the hierarchy and formation of chapters in each diocese, the Old Chapter changed its name to the "Old Brotherhood of the Secular Clergy," by which it is known at the present day. The list of capitulars contains the names of bishops Leybourn, Gifford, Challoner, Milner, Poynter, and thirty other bishops; as also Tootle (Dodd), Gother, Lingard, Kirk, Rock, Tierney, and John Savage, Earl Rivers (1723–1736). (Sergeant, "An Account of the Chapter erected by William, Titular Bishop of Chalcedon, and Ordinary of England and Scotland"; Dodd, "Church Hist. of England," ed. Tierney; Kirk, "Biographies"; B. Ward, "Dawn of the Catholic Revival"; Burton, "Life of Challoner.")

CHAPTERS. [See THREE CHAPTERS, THE.]

CHARACTER (*χαρακτήρ*). A stamp on coins, seals, &c., and, in its theological sense, a spiritual mark indelibly impressed on the soul, by Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Order, which sacraments cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. That these sacraments do really impress a character is taught by the Council of Florence, in the "Decree of Union," and is solemnly affirmed by the Council of Trent (Sess. vii. can. 9, De Sacram. in Gen.) as an article of faith. The Fathers of Trent content themselves with defining character as a "spiritual and indelible mark," on account of which the three sacraments which confer it cannot be reiterated. But St. Thomas, who is followed by other theologians, points out that character marks the recipient in some special way for the worship of God and also conveys certain powers. Thus Baptism stamps a man indelibly as a Christian and enables him to receive the other sacraments: Confirmation makes him a good soldier of Christ, and conveys particular powers of confessing the faith: by Holy Order he becomes a minister of Christ, and is empowered to perform certain sacred functions.[1]

The truth of the Church's doctrine on this matter is shown by the fact that it has always been accounted sacrilege to reiterate the three sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Order. There must, therefore, be something in these sacraments which separates them from the other four, which may be lawfully received over and over again. Nor can it be said with any show of reason that the modern doctrine of character is an invention of the Middle Ages, first set forth by Innocent III. From the earliest times, Christian writers—*e.g.* Clement of Alexandria[2]—speak of Baptism as "the seal of the Lord" (*σφραγῖδα τοῦ κυρίου*, cf. *ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι*, Eph. i.

[1] 3a, q. 63, a. 2.
[2] *Quis Dives Salvatus*, c. 42, *PG*, IX. 648.

13). So Confirmation was known as the "seal," and it is still conferred in the Greek rite with the words the "seal of the Holy Ghost." What can this language mean, if considered in connection with the fact that Baptism, Confirmation, and Order were never reiterated, except this, that these sacraments set a seal on the soul which could never be blotted out, by sin or even by apostasy? St. Augustine gives clear witness to the tradition of the Church on character, and as the sense of his statements has been disputed, we will quote a brief summary of his teaching from the most eminent of Protestant Church historians. Augustine, says Neander,[1] "in connection with Baptism often uses the comparison with the mark ('character militaris') which was impressed upon soldiers, as a token of imperial service, and which remained indelibly fixed even on those who were untrue to their service, though in that case it only witnessed against them." This is simply the Tridentine doctrine of sacramental character. (St. Thom. 3ª, q. 63; De Augustinis, "De Re Sacramentaria," i. p. 306 *sqq.*; Billot, "De Sacram." i. p. 138 *sqq.*; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Man. Theol." ii. p. 375.)

CHARISMATA, CHARISMS. The word χάρισμα means favour, kindness; and hence, gifts or graces arising from the goodness and kindness of God (Rom. v. 15, 16 &c.). In a narrower sense it is used for the graces granted to every Christian for the due fulfilment of his work in the Church: "Every one hath his proper gift (χάρισμα) from God; one after this manner, and another after that" (1 Cor. vi. 7). But in the strict theological sense a charism is an extraordinary grace granted to individual Christians for the benefit of others (1 Cor. xii., *cf.* Rom. xii. 6–8; Ephes. iv. 11). The full discussion of these belongs to the commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. (See GRACE; St. Thom. 2ª 2æ, qq. 176–178; Engelman, "Die Charismen"; Prat, "La Théologie de S. Paul," i. p. 180; Wilhelm in "Cath. Enc."; Leclercq in DThC.)

CHARITY. The theological virtue of Charity may be described as "a virtue divinely infused by which we entirely give ourselves up to God as the Sovereign Good, that by doing His will we may please Him and be united with Him." This description sets forth the object and the substance of the act of Charity. The object is our union with God, for it is of the nature even of disinterested love to seek union with the beloved object; the substance of the act is a loving gift of ourselves to God, which is also called union. "It pertains to charity, that man gives himself up to God so as to adhere to Him by some union of the mind (*spiritus*)," *i.e.* by making God the object of his thoughts and affections (St. Thomas, 2ª 2æ, q. 82, a. 2, ad 1). St. Bonaventure describes charity as "a life which unites the lover with the beloved" ("vita copulans amantem cum amato." St. Bonav. "Comp. Theol. Verit." l. v. c. 23). Considered as a habit, charity is an infused virtue which elevates the soul, enables and disposes it to bring forth the acts proper to charity, viz. love of God above all for His own sake, and of our neighbour for the sake of God. Charity may be perfect or imperfect: the former justifies man by its own efficacy; the latter only in the Sacrament of Penance. [See the arts. ATTRITION and CONTRITION.] Perfect charity admits of three degrees: first, love of God above all things which grievously displease Him; second, love above all things which only slightly displease God; and third, love of God even above such things as do not displease Him, but still are less pleasing than others. The first degree excludes all mortal sin and is necessary and sufficient for salvation. The second excludes venial sin and belongs to Christian perfection. The third is the summit of perfection to which no command obliges us, but Divine grace invites. Habitual charity or the habit of charity is lost by mortal sin only (Trid. Sess. vi. c. 15). Venial sins, however numerous, do not diminish it, though their frequent repetition gradually unfits the soul for the retention of charity, just as disease gradually unfits the body for the retention of the soul (St. Thomas, 2ª 2æ, q. 24, a. 10). Christ has laid down the commandment of charity as the first and highest of all commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind" (Mt. xxii. 37, 38). This precept directly forbids hatred or indifference to God, and indirectly the wilfully offending Him in any way. In as far as it commands positive acts of love it is not binding at all times; yet a single act of love in a lifetime is not sufficient to comply with it. (Propp. damn. 2 Mart. 1679, pr. 5, 6, 7.)

The love of our neighbour belongs to the virtue of charity, as is plain from numberless texts: *e.g.* "He who loveth God loveth his brother also" (1 Jn. iv. 21). (See CHARITY, WORKS OF CHRISTIAN; St. Thomas, 2ª 2æ, qq. 23–44 and commentaries.)

CHARITY, BROTHERS OF. A religious congregation of men founded by Canon Triest and approved by Leo XIII. in 1899. Their aim is to do for men and boys what the Sisters of Charity do for women. They have many houses in Belgium, and they have also extended their work to England, Ireland, America, and Holland. (Br. Philemon in "Cath. Enc.")

CHARITY, FATHERS OF. [See ROSMINIANS.]

CHARITY, SISTERS OF. There are a number of distinct religious congregations of women bearing this name. The chief are:

1. The Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul, called also "Grey Sisters" and

[1] *Kirchengeschichte*, iv. p. 441.

"Daughters of Charity." This congregation was founded at Paris in 1634 by St. Vincent of Paul for the work of nursing the sick in hospitals and in their homes, and was placed under the care of Mme. Legras. According to his idea, the Daughters of Charity "were to have no convent but the homes of the sick, no cell but a hired lodging, no chapel but the parish church, no cloister but the streets and hospitals, no enclosure but obedience, no grill but the fear of God, no veil but modesty." Their present habit is the ordinary dress worn by the common people of the time, the "cornette" being the head-dress of the peasants of the Isle of France. They take simple vows which are yearly renewed; and they bind themselves, by a fourth vow, to serve the sick. Postulants are admitted to the habit at the end of six months; the period of probation lasts five years. The constitutions have remained unchanged since St. Vincent's time. No formal approbation has been sought or obtained from Rome, though of course the sisters have received countless marks of favour from the Popes. They are subject to the Superior General of the Congregation of the Mission (see LAZARISTS). Their fame has gone forth into every land wherever poverty, sickness, and misery are to be found; but it has been reserved for the country which had the honour of giving them birth to have now the infamy of expelling them from its borders. (The early history of the congregation may be seen in the lives of St. Vincent, *e.g.* Bougard, Eng. tr.; Hélyot; Steele, "Monasteries and Religious Houses of Great Britain and Ireland.")

2. Sisters of Charity (Irish). Founded in 1815 by Mary Francis Aikenhead. The Sisters, though not in any way connected with St. Vincent's foundation, have nearly the same objects in view. The congregation was approved by the Holy See in 1834. The vows are perpetual; the rule being that of the Society of Jesus, so far as it is suitable for women; a probation of two years and a half is undergone before admission to the habit. The authority is strongly centralized, the Superioress in Dublin, or wherever she may reside, having jurisdiction over all the convents and members in Ireland. The congregation, however, has convents in England and in other countries. ("Mary Aikenhead: her Life, her Work, and her Friends.")

3. Sisters of Charity of St. Paul. Founded in 1704 at Chartres by Mgr. Maréchaut. They devote themselves to various good works, *e.g.* teaching, nursing, visiting the poor, and taking care of orphans and the insane. There are no lay sisters. They had more than two hundred and fifty houses in France before the expulsion in 1902. They have also flourished exceedingly in England and in other countries.

4. There are also Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul (American) who follow the rule of St. Vincent with some modifications; Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Sisters of Charity of Our Lady of Mercy, and other similar congregations. (*Charity, Sisters of*, in "Cath. Enc.")

CHARITY, WORKS OF CHRISTIAN. Our Lord himself declared "By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another" (Jn. xiii. 35), and the heathen felt that a new spiritual power was in their midst when they beheld the manifestations of Christian love. The fact that the Christian religion taught its disciples to pray for all men, to love all, and to sacrifice themselves for all, is a most solid and a most touching proof that the Christian religion is divine. With scarcely an exception, every work and institute of mercy existing in the world is of Christian origin, direct or indirect. (See especially Harnack, "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," i. 146 *sqq.*; and Leclercq in DACL. *Charité*.) The same kind of proof may be brought to show that the Catholic religion is the one true form of Christianity. No doubt, many Protestants have been conspicuous for philanthropy, and, as Protestants have preserved much of the Catholic belief, we need not be surprised to find this belief producing its natural fruit in works of mercy. It is true, however, on the other hand, that the Catholic Church has laboured for the souls and bodies of men to an extent unknown in other systems, and Protestants offer an unconscious testimony to the superiority of the Catholic religon by imitating many of its institutes for the relief of the poor and suffering. Much information on this head will be found in the articles on religious orders founded for works of this kind. Here, we can only give a brief account of the different directions in which Catholic charity has shown itself. We shall speak first of spiritual, then of corporal, mercy.

(*A*) We find religious orders erected with the special view of succouring the fallen, or saving those who are exposed to danger of sin. Such was the double order of Fontevraud, erected for male and female penitents, towards the close of the eleventh century, by Robert of Arbrisselles, who was endowed with wonderful power for the conversion of sinners. The order spread over France, Spain, and England. A century later, the famous preacher Fulk of Neuilly and Raymund de Palmariis also laboured for fallen women. Other orders with this object have been founded in modern times. The orders established for the instruction of the poor in Christian doctrine by means of missions, &c., and for the teaching of youth, both of the higher and lower classes, are past reckoning. The missions to the heathen are a creation of the Catholic Church. They were adopted by Protestants long after the rise of the new belief, and, like Sunday-

schools, missions to people already Christian, sisterhoods, &c., are borrowed from the old religion.

(*B*) The care of the Church for the bodies of the poor shines forth, not only in the lives of saints, but in the Church's ordinary law. By ancient regulation, a fourth part of the Church revenues was devoted to the poor: if extreme distress prevailed, even the sacred vessels were sold for the support of the needy. In many monasteries hundreds of poor people were fed every day; while in most churches funds for the poor, called "mensae pauperum," "mensae S. Spiritus," were established. Further, the Church showed her care for the suffering and the indigent by the foundation of houses in which they were received and tended. Public institutions of this sort were scarcely possible during the period of heathen persecution; but whenever the peace of the Church was secured, the bishops began to have houses erected for the reception of strangers (Xenodochia), of the sick (Nosocomia), of the poor (Ptochotrophia), of orphans and foundlings (Orphanotrophia and Brephotrophia), and of old people (Gerontocomia). About the middle of the fourth century, we hear of a hospital for the sick at Sebaste, in Armenia; while the hospital erected through the zeal of Basil the Great was of a size so vast that it was often compared to a town. In the different sections of the building unfortunate people of every kind were received—the poor, exiles, lepers, &c. Some years later, St. Chrysostom spent all the spare revenues of his church in restoring old hospitals and erecting new ones. In the West, Paulinus founded a house for the poor, for the sick, and for widows. It is to be observed that in Western as well as Eastern Europe the first institutions of this kind were erected by bishops. Not that the laity were remiss in promoting works of charity. Fabiola, the friend of St. Jerome, the Emperor Justinian, the Empress Eudoxia, and a multitude besides, were all distinguished as the founders of hospitals; still, the bishops led the way.

During the Middle Ages, the Scottish monks—*i.e.* monks from Scotland or Ireland—seem to have founded the earliest hospitals. The good work was greatly promoted by Alcuin, who seems to have influenced Charlemagne in this direction, and to have encouraged the bishops to found hospitals in their dioceses. Two years after Charlemagne's death, a Council of Aix-la-Chapelle issued statutes on this matter which deserve special notice. The bishops were required, after the example of the Fathers, to provide a house for the poor, and to support it from the Church funds. The canons were to resign a tenth part of their income in its favour. It was to be near the church and under the care of a cleric, and in penitential seasons the canons were to wash the feet of the poor. (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 14.)

Whether these hospitals were endowed by clerics or lay people, they were placed under the jurisdiction of the Church, a point settled in the East, *e.g.* by the ordinances of Justinian, and in the West by Charlemagne and the decrees of councils and Popes. Even if a prince founded a hospital, still it was not as a secular ruler, but as a Christian, that he did so; it was not State policy but the living spirit of Christianity which had called hospitals into being: it was not State revenues but gifts bestowed, sometimes by ecclesiastics, sometimes by secular rulers, sometimes by private individuals, but always for the love of God, which maintained them after their foundation. The Council of Trent, again, enforces the obligation which lay upon bishops of watching over benevolent institutions. (Sess. vii. De Ref. c. xv., and Sess. xxv. c. viii.) And the Church did her work well. "With such intelligence," says Von Raumer, "was the inner management [of such institutions] conducted as in truth to excite astonishment and admiration." True, even in the Middle Ages lay administrators did occasionally, to the great injury of the suffering poor, usurp the control of hospitals. But it was the Reformation which began to sever on principle the bond which connected works of benevolence with the power of the Church till modern statecraft completely snapped the link and substituted natural for Christian benevolence. No Catholic can approve of a change which is opposed to the whole tradition of the Church and to every Catholic instinct. Nor do results recommend the so-called emancipation of benevolence from the Church. The feeling of brotherhood between rich and poor has been changed to a great extent into positive enmity, and the State itself has suffered in consequence from the spread of Socialism. The poor accept State aid without gratitude, because it is very often given without real charity. Every experienced person knows the horror with which they regard the workhouse, and, on the other hand, the readiness with which indigent Catholics enter a house of refuge cared for by religious—such, for example, as the Little Sisters of the Poor or the Sisters of Nazareth.

This leads us to speak of another characteristic feature in Catholic charity. It was not only, or even chiefly, that the Church founded houses for the relief of the poor and suffering; she infused into her children a spirit which made them count it an honour to tend their suffering brethren, and, if need be, to sacrifice life itself in their behalf. From early times, bishops, like St. Basil the Great and St. Gregory Nazianzen, found time to tend the sick and minister to them with their own hands. Persons of the highest rank, such as Placilla, wife of

Theodosius the Great, performed the most menial services for them. In the Middle Ages St. Elizabeth of Hungary, from the time of her widowhood—*i.e.* from her twenty-first year—went daily to the hospital, gave the patients food and medicine, bound up their wounds and applied remedies to ulcers, from the very sight of which others shrank in horror. Everybody knows the love St. Francis had for the poor, and his tender care of the suffering, particularly of lepers. Whole orders were founded for this personal attendance on helpless sufferers, and the poor learned to love those who were born to wealth, when they saw the richest and the noblest among them making themselves the servants of the poor; they learned to bear their own poverty patiently, when they saw the rich counting it an honour to be poor for Christ's sake. Among such orders we may name the Canons Regular of St. Antony of Vienne, founded by a French nobleman, Gaston, towards the end of the eleventh century, for the succour of persons afflicted with "St. Antony's fire," a horrible disease, then raging in Western Europe; the Jesuats, a confraternity formed by B. John Colombino, which occupied itself in the preparation of medicines, &c., for the sick; the "Clerks Regular, Ministers of the Sick," also called "the Fathers of a Good Death," established at the end of the sixteenth century by St. Camillus of Lellis; the "Sisters of Charity," founded by St. Vincent of Paul; and other orders founded for the same ends and animated by the same heroic zeal, the name of which is legion.

The Catholic Church has also alleviated the hardships of prison life. The lot of prisoners was changed wherever Christianity became the religion of the State. The sexes were separated; care was taken that they should never lack the consolations of religion; greater liberty and better food were allowed to them on Sundays; the bishop had to visit the prisons every week, and to see that there were no abuses in the administration of discipline. In the Middle Ages, the Church exercised her tempering and restraining influence on the roughness and barbarity of the times. During that period, the constant wars subjected many innocent persons to imprisonment; and, accordingly, it was common for pious persons to devote large sums of money to the redemption of captives. Help was given in other ways, but all the works of mercy to captives were surpassed by the Trinitarian Order—an institute devoted to the redemption of captives from slavery under the Saracens. The rule of the Order of the Trinity was approved by Innocent III. in 1198. [See TRINITARIANS.] In 1223 a similar order, "for the redemption of captives," was established in Spain. [See RANSOM, OUR LADY OF.] In the seventeenth century, St. Vincent of Paul laboured for the galley-slaves, and changed places which had been like hell on earth into abodes of penance, resignation, and peace. The Sisters of Notre Dame de la Charité, of St. Joseph, &c., have undertaken the superintendence of female prisoners, and till lately almost every prison for women in France and Belgium was under the care of nuns. Statesmen themselves have admitted that by religious, and religious only, could prisons be successfully managed.

We pass over, for want of space, the orders devoted to the care of the insane, the blind, deaf and dumb, &c., and will only touch in conclusion on one other work of Catholic charity. In early times and in the Middle Ages it was often difficult to borrow money except at usurious rates. To meet this evil, the Franciscan Father Barnabas of Terni, under Pius II. (1458–64), erected the first Monte di Pietà, at Perugia, in the States of the Church. The rich contributed capital, from charitable motives, and this was lent to the poor, on security indeed, but at a very low rate of interest. Soon almost every city in Italy had its Monte di Pietà. Several Popes, the Fifth Lateran Council, and the Council of Trent confirmed these institutions, which in past times produced incalculable good. [See MONS PIETATIS.]

No doubt many of these orders and institutes of charity fell away from their first zeal, and were abused for selfish ends. But holy souls have never been wanting to reform what was amiss, and to come with fresh help to the relief of their brethren. The example of Fr. Damien and his companions has shown that their heroic devotion is not extinct. The words of the Psalm have been constantly fulfilled by Christ in His Church: "He will judge the poor of his people, and save the children of the poor." (From Hefele, "Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte, Archäologie," &c.) (See MERCY, SPIRITUAL and TEMPORAL WORKS OF. Ratzinger, "Armenpflege"; Henderson, "Modern Methods of Charity"; Monnier, "Hist. de l'Assistance Publique"; Leclercq in DACL; Ryan in "Cath. Enc.")

CHARTERHOUSE. [See CARTHUSIANS.]

CHARTOPHYLAX (more often spelt *Carthophylax*). The name signifies "keeper of the records" merely, and such was the original function of the ecclesiastics who held the office in the Eastern Church, answering to that of *bibliothecarius* among the Latins; but in course of time other duties, carrying with them a corresponding increase of charge, influence, and dignity, were imposed on the chartophylax. Yet it appears from the canons of Nicaea that in the fourth century the chartophylax of a cathedral was inferior in rank to the archdeacon, and was bound to obey him. But at Constantinople the power and pre-eminence of the chartophylax, as a kind of secretary or grand chamberlain to

the Patriarch, attained after a time to a great height. An exact appreciation of his office, and of the dignities attaching to it, as they stood in the ninth century, is given by a contemporary writer—Anastasius the bibliothecarian. The post of chartophylax in other cathedral churches in the East appears to have been assimilated more or less to that of the church of Constantinople; and hence this official, representing the bishop and exercising his jurisdiction, held in the Eastern nearly the same position as the archdeacon in the Western Church. Even at this day the Uniat Greeks of the Austrian Empire retain the office; with them, "the carthophylax directs the business of the episcopal chancery, and is one of the members of the metropolitan or cathedral chapter, along with the archpriest or chief provost, the archdeacon or lector, the primicerius or precentor, the ecclesiarch or churchwarden, and the scholaster or master of ceremonies." (See the rest of the article by Hausle, in "Kirchenlex."; Fortescue in DACL.)

CHARTREUX. [See CARTHUSIANS.]

CHASUBLE (Lat. *casula, paenula, planeta*; and in Greek, φελόνιον or φελώνιον, from φαινόλης, or φελόνης, identical with *paenula*). The chief garment of a priest celebrating Mass. It is worn outside the other vestments. Among the Greeks, it still retains its ancient form of a large round mantle. Among the Latins, its size has been curtailed, but it still covers the priest on both sides and descends nearly to the knees. In France, Belgium, and very often in England, a cross is marked on the back; in Italy, this cross is usually in front. In the West, all who celebrate Mass wear the same chasuble, but among the Greeks the chasuble of a bishop is ornamented with a number of crosses (φαινόλιον πολυσταύριον), while an archbishop wears a different vestment altogether, viz. the σάκκος, which is supposed to resemble the coat of Christ during His Passion. In Russia, even bishops, since the time of Peter the Great, have worn the σάκκος.

The chasuble is derived from a dress once commonly worn in daily life. Classical writers often mention the "paenula," or large outer garment which the Romans wore on journeys or in military service. "Casula," from which our word chasuble is obtained, does not occur in pure Latinity. It was, however, used in later ages, as an equivalent for the "paenula," or mantle. We first meet with the word in the will of Caesarius of Arles (about 540), and in the biography of his contemporary Fulgentius of Ruspe. In both instances, "casula" denotes a garment used in common life. Isidore of Seville (about 630) uses the word in the same sense, and explains it as a diminutive of "casa," because, like a little house, it covered the whole body. The same author tells us that "planeta" comes from the Greek πλανάω, "to wander," because its ample folds seemed to wander over the body. It is plain, from the examples given by Ducange, that "planeta," like "casula" and "paenula," denoted a dress worn by laymen as well as clerics.

It is in the former half of the sixth century that we find the first traces of the chasuble as an ecclesiastical vestment. In the famous mosaic at San Vitale, in Ravenna, the archbishop, Maximus, is represented wearing a vestment which is clearly the chasuble, and over which the pallium is suspended. The chasuble has the same shape which prevailed till the eleventh century. The Fourth Council of Toledo, in 633, makes express mention of the "planeta," as a priestly vestment. Germanus, Archbishop of Constantinople, about 715, uses the word φελώνιον in the same technical sense; while at the beginning of the ninth century, Amalarius of Metz speaks of the "casula" as the "general garment of sacred leaders" ("generale indumentum sacrorum ducum"). Almost at the same time, Rabanus Maurus gives the derivation of "casula" quoted above from Isidore of Seville, and goes on to say that it is "the last of all the vestments, which covers and preserves all the rest." Later authors of the Middle Age copy their predecessors; and even Innocent III. adds nothing of his own save certain mystical meanings implied in the use of the vestment.

To sum up, the chasuble was first of all an ordinary dress; from the sixth century at latest it was adapted to the use of the Church, till gradually it became an ecclesiastical dress pure and simple. But did it at once become distinctive of the priesthood? The question admits of no certain answer. The eighth "Ordo Romanus" distinctly prescribes that acolytes, in their ordination, should receive the "planeta" or chasuble. Amalarius, in like manner, declares that the chasuble belongs to all clerics. On the other hand, almost all ancient writers who refer to the Church use of the chasuble regard it as the distinctive dress of priests. Cardinal Bona mentions this difficulty without venturing to explain it. Hefele suggests that as the Greek φελόνιον signifies (1) a chasuble in the modern sense, (2) a kind of collar, reaching from the neck to the elbows, which is worn by lectors or readers, so the Latin word "planeta" may have been also employed as the name of two distinct vestments. But even if this explanation is correct, the fact remains that even now the deacon and subdeacon in High Mass during Advent and Lent wear chasubles folded in front, laying them aside while they sing the Gospel and Epistle. This custom is mentioned by Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1140). "The precise origin of this pinning up of the chasuble is still obscure, but like the deacon's wearing of the broad stole (*stolone*)—which represents

the chasuble rolled up and hung over his shoulder like a soldier's greatcoat—during the active part of his functions in the Mass, it probably had something to do with the inconvenience caused by the mediaeval chasuble in impeding the free use of the arms." (Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

The form of the chasuble has undergone great alterations. The ancient chasuble, which enveloped the whole body, was found very inconvenient, and hence, in the twelfth century, it was curtailed at the sides, so as to leave the arms free. Of this kind is a chasuble said to have been used by St. Bernard. In shape, it resembles what is now known as the Gothic chasuble, although the ornaments upon it are not Gothic, but Romanesque. At a later date, the chasuble was still further curtailed, till in the Rococo period all resemblance to the original type disappeared. However, even in Italy, attempts are being made to recall the ancient shape. St. Charles Borromeo, in a provincial council, ordered that the chasubles for the Ambrosian rite should be about four and a half feet wide, and should reach nearly to the heels.

Various symbolical significations have been given to the chasuble. The earliest writers make it a figure of charity, which, as Rabanus Maurus says, "is eminent above all the other virtues." This is the most popular explanation of the symbolism; but we also find it regarded by an ancient writer as typical of good works; ancient Sacramentaries and Missals consider it as the figure of sacerdotal justice, or of humility, charity, and peace, which are to cover and adorn the priest on every side; while the prayer in the Roman Missal connects the chasuble with the yoke of Christ. (Hefele, "Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte, Archäologie und Liturgik," p. 195 *seq.*; Rock, i. 257 *sqq.*; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 149-239; Barbier de Montault, "Les Costumes et les Usages Ecclésiastiques," ii.; Leclercq in DACL; Thurston in "Cath Enc."; see VESTMENTS.)

CHERUBIM. Superhuman beings, often mentioned in Scripture. They guarded the entrance to Paradise after the Fall; the images of two cherubim overshadowed the ark; God is represented in the Psalms as sitting or throned upon the cherubim; Ezekiel saw them in vision, with wings, with human hands, full of eyes and with four faces, viz. those of a man, lion, ox, and eagle. The Fathers generally are agreed in regarding them as angels; for the opinion of Theodore of Mopsuestia,[1] who denied this, seems to be quite singular in Christian antiquity. They form the second among the nine orders of angels. What the meaning of the word is, it is difficult even to conjecture. Most of the Fathers explain the word as meaning knowledge, or the fullness of knowledge; but, as Petavius justly remarks, this derivation finds no support either in Hebrew or Chaldee. Many conjectural derivations have been suggested by modern scholars. In a cuneiform inscription copied by M. Lenormant, "Kirubu" is a synonym of the Steer-god, whose winged image filled the place of guardian at the entrance of the Assyrian palaces. With this word, the Hebrew *cherub* may be connected, and the etymology may belong to some non-Semitic language.[1] (Knabenbaur, "Commentarius in Ezechielem," 21-24; Arendzen in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Petav. *De Angelis*, lib. ii. cap. 3.

CHILD OF MARY. About the year 1560 a Jesuit professor at the Roman College, named John Leonius (?), used to assemble a number of his students after lecture to give them pious discourses and to guide them in their spiritual difficulties. These gatherings were placed under the protection of the Blessed Virgin. The members undertook to do their best to advance in piety and learning; they heard Mass every morning; once a week they went to confession, and once a month to Holy Communion. On Sundays they visited the hospitals and performed other works of mercy. The young society soon began to attract attention. Gregory XIII., in 1584, gave it his hearty approval. Numerous branches were formed in imitation of the original. The only bond of union between them, besides identity of aim and practices, was aggregation to the parent congregation in Rome which is called "Prima Primaria." The members were everywhere distinguished for their virtue, and were looked upon as the champions of orthodoxy against heretics and infidels. In 1748 Benedict XIV., himself a member, published the "Golden Bull," *Gloriosae Dominae*, in which the confraternity was strongly commended and enriched with numerous indulgences. The expulsion of the Jesuits from France, in 1762, where the "Congregation," as it was called, especially flourished, led to the suppression of the confraternity there. After the Revolution it revived; and during the Restoration a fierce battle raged between the "Congrégationistes" and the Liberals, ending in the suppression of the former once more in 1830. It has since, however, been re-established. Pius IX. and Leo XIII. both highly favoured the institute.

The confraternity was thrown open to women and young girls, and in this form is perhaps more familiar to us than the male branch from which it originally sprang. (See SODALITY; "La Congrégation," by M. de Grandmaison; Mullan, "The Sodality of Our Lady studied in the Documents.")

CHILDREN'S COMMUNION. The importance of this subject at the present time requires a short special article. In the early ages the reception of Holy Communion was part of the rite of initiation into the Church

[1] See Cheyne on Isaiah, vol. ii. p. 273.

(Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. ix. 6). The catechumens were usually grown-up persons who had been thoroughly instructed as to the sacred mysteries. When infant Baptism became the custom, Holy Communion was still part of the rite of initiation. According to the general principle that the sacraments work *ex opere operato*, an infant really and truly received Our Lord's Body and Blood and derived due benefit from the sacrament. But in the course of time it became the custom to put off the reception of the Eucharist until such time as the child had reached the years of discretion, and could "discern the body of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 29). Thus the IV. Council of the Lateran (1215) decreed that "All the faithful, after they come to the years of discretion shall . . . confess their sins . . . and receive the sacrament of the Eucharist." This was confirmed at Trent (sess. xiii. can. 9). Neither council specifies any particular age as the age of discretion; and it should be noted that no distinction is made between the age required for confession and Holy Communion. But, moved no doubt by the desire of safeguarding the honour due to so august a sacrament, the pastors of the Church gradually introduced such a distinction; requiring a fuller knowledge and a more mature preparation for Holy Communion than for confession. Thus while the age for confession came to be fixed at about seven years, the age for Holy Communion was delayed until the age of ten, twelve, or even fourteen. Once, however, it is admitted that a child is capable of mortal sin, there is surely no reason for refusing him the most powerful means of preserving his baptismal innocence. "As for the age at which the Sacred Mysteries are to be given to children, none can determine it better than the father and the priest to whom they confess their sins. It is their business to find out, by asking the children, whether they have acquired any knowledge of this admirable Sacrament, and have a desire for it" ("Catech. of the Council of Trent," p. 2; "Of the Sacrament of the Euch." n. 63). A decree of Pius X. laid down the rules which are to be observed regarding children's First Communion (8 August, 1910). The age of discretion is declared to be seven, more or less; from this time begins the obligation of confession and Communion; a full and perfect knowledge of Christian Doctrine is not necessary; it is sufficient that the child can distinguish the Eucharistic Bread from common and material bread; after their first Communion the utmost care must be taken that they receive very often, and if possible even daily. (The whole subject is treated at length in the decree quoted; see also De Lugo, "De S. Euch. Sacram." Disp. xiii.; St. Alph, "Theol. Mor." lib. vi. tract; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. iv. p. 685 *sqq.*)

CHILIASM. [See MILLENNIUM.]

CHINESE RITES. St. Francis Xavier desired to preach the Gospel in China, but his wish was not fulfilled, and he died in the forty-fifth year of his age A.D. 1552, on the little island of Sancian, close to the great empire which was the object of his longing. His religious brethren entered on the labour which he had left undone, and worked with great success. Father Ricci's mathematical knowledge secured the favour of the Imperial Court. He devoted himself to the mission twenty-seven years (1582-1610), and left behind him 300 churches, one of which was in the capital, Pekin. A German Jesuit, Schall, who came on the field in 1622, was also a distinguished mathematician. Shortly afterwards a great change occurred in the fortunes of the Chinese mission. It had been left entirely in Jesuit hands; indeed, Gregory XIII. had in 1585 forbidden the members of other orders to enter China. But this restriction was removed, and in 1631 the first Dominican missionaries appeared, who were followed in 1633 by another Dominican, Morales, and by Franciscans. The new missionaries, and especially Morales, accused the Jesuits of gaining so-called converts by an unworthy compliance with Chinese idolatry and superstition; and the famous controversy on the Chinese rites began. We shall have occasion to enter upon the precise nature of the Jesuit concessions later. Here we content ourselves with stating the main contention as given by the Jesuit advocate Pray ("Hist. Controversiarum de Rit. Sinicis," p. 9 *seq.*). Ricci and his successors, Pray tells us, considered the offerings of food and the mark of homage given to the dead in general, and to Confucius the great Chinese philosopher in particular, as certainly free from idolatry, and probably even from superstition. Further, the Jesuits allowed their converts to use as the name of God the Chinese words signifying "Lord of Heaven," or "Lord of the Sky," or even the single word Tien—"sky" or "heaven," and they exhibited in their churches tablets with the inscription "King tien," "adore the sky." These were the practices known as the Chinese rites or usages.

In 1643 the Dominicans sent Morales to Rome, and he submitted to the Congregation of Propaganda seventeen propositions on the Chinese usages tolerated by the Jesuits. These usages, after consultation with theologians and the Roman Inquisition, were prohibited by Innocent X., till the Holy See should otherwise determine. Meanwhile, the Jesuit Martini tried to convince the authorities at Rome that the impugned customs had nothing to do with religion, and that the success of the Catholic Church in China depended on their being permitted. He obtained from the Inquisition a decree, confirmed in

1656 by Alexander VII. This edict allowed the practice of the Chinese rites, provided they possessed a merely civil character, were free from all admixture of idolatry, and could not be omitted without grave loss to the Chinese Christians. The complaints, however, were renewed by three Lazarists whom Alexander VII. had made vicars-apostolic, and Clement IX. in 1669 renewed the decrees of 1645 and 1656, with a significant addition in which the regulars were ordered to obey the vicars-apostolic. While these disputes were dividing the missionaries into two hostile camps, the Jesuits were rising in the favour of the Court, and in 1692 the emperor Khang Hi publicly announced that the Jesuits had full leave to preach, and his own subjects to embrace Christianity. Still the opposition of the other missionaries lasted. The Lazarist vicar-apostolic forbade the rites in 1693, and sent a priest to Rome three years later to justify the step which had been taken. Innocent XII. died before the commission he had appointed had settled the question, but his successor Clement XI. took the matter vigorously in hand, and, desirous of full information, sent Tournon, patriarch of Antioch, to China as Apostolic legate in 1703. After examination of the points at issue, Tournon in 1707 condemned the Chinese rites as idolatrous, and in consequence of his evangelical courage was imprisoned by the Chinese emperor. It is a melancholy fact that the Portuguese at Macao were not ashamed to act as his gaolers, and there he died in 1710, after his elevation to the dignity of cardinal. The Jesuits and bishops who thought with them appealed against the legate's decision to Rome; but they found less favour there than at Pekin. Clement XI. confirmed decrees of the Inquisition (1709 and 1710) in accordance with Tournon's decision, and finally closed the question by the Bull "Ex illa die" (1715). Every Catholic missionary in China was required to promise on oath all possible resistance to the rites. It was in vain that a new legate, Mezzabarba, tried to modify Clement's ruling. The prohibition was renewed in all its force, the concessions of Mezzabarba recalled, and the oath again exacted by Benedict XIV.

We have abstained of set purpose from discussing the serious charges of rebellion against and cruelty to Cardinal Tournon which are made against the Jesuits. They are contained in the "Anecdotes sur l'état de la religion dans la Chine" (first volume, 1733), by Villermaules; in the "Memorie Storiche del Cardinale di Tournon" (Venice 1761–2), prepared, as is commonly alleged, by that determined opponent of the Jesuits, Cardinal Passionei; and in the Lazarist "Memoirs of the Congregation of the Mission" (vol. iv.–viii.), collated with other authorities in the Vatican library by Father Theiner, but suppressed by Pius IX., and now an exceedingly rare book. The charges have often been repeated, *e.g.* by the Protestant historian Mosheim, and they are answered by Pray in the work mentioned above. The writer of this article does not possess the knowledge which would entitle him to an opinion, and what he has read on either side proceeds from writers too much influenced by party spirit to inspire confidence. But, after all, the conduct of the Jesuits to Tournon is not a question of theological moment. It affects the conduct of individuals, or at most of a religious order, but it has nothing to do with the great principles at stake. Fortunately these principles have been stated with Christian moderation and with rigid impartiality by the celebrated Dominican, Natalis Alexander. It is only right to compare his account with that of Pray, but we are confident that the result can only enhance the credit of Natalis Alexander. Besides this, a very clear and authoritative statement of the controversy will be found in the decree of the Roman Inquisition which bears date November 20, 1704, and is printed at length in the "Mémoires pour Rome sur l'état de la religion chrétienne dans la Chine" (1709; no place of publication given).

It is well known that Confucius, who lived about 600 years before Christ, was in no sense a religious teacher, or even a philosopher, if by that term we understand one who investigates the ultimate causes of things. He laid down rules of life based on utility, inculcated great respect for order and for public authority, and great reverence for ancestors, for ancient custom, for all, in short, which represented the traditions of Chinese civilization. For the rest, he was content to let religion alone; and the ruling classes then, as now, were mostly atheistic, their atheism, however, being perfectly compatible with belief in fate, and in a quasi-immortality of the soul, so far as this, that the forces which constitute man's life were supposed to endure after death mingled with other powers of nature, and with a boundless toleration of popular superstition as a means of restraint suitable to the multitude. Now the Jesuits may have had some excuse for allowing the neophytes to call God the "Lord of Heaven," or even "Heaven," though apparently the Chinese literati used these terms in a pantheistic and materialistic sense. Even here they went to lengths manifestly dangerous and even reprehensible, and we cannot wonder that the Roman Inquisition refused to sanction the inscription "Adore the sky" as suitable for a Christian church. (See the second article in the questions proposed to the Inquisition.) But the worship of ancestors, and especially of Confucius, was far more scandalous. We will quote a description of this worship by a Jesuit Father, Le Comte, who took a prominent part in the

dispute. "They prostrate themselves before the name of Confucius, before the name and the tomb of the ancestors. Offerings are made of food and vegetables. Incense is burnt. The duty is acknowledged of respect for the one (Confucius) and gratitude to the others (the ancestors). Such has been their immemorial practice; this is the essence of the rites. That, then, is good and laudable. What more do we want? We do not even ask so much, and we limit ourselves to that which is indispensably attached to the functions of public office" (Lettre du R.P. le Comte, p. 74; apud N. A. Lettre 1, p. 25). Even this is a very inadequate account. Confucius was venerated as the greatest of the sons of man (see decree of the Inquisition in 1904, super iv. artic.) He was addressed in these words—"All hasten to offer thee sacrifices and prayers. . . . Let thy spirit come towards us" ("Apologie des Dominicains," append. pp. 37 and 211; apud N. A. Lettre 1, p. 41). Ancestors were worshipped according to a maxim of Confucius, as actually present, and they were invited to rest in their pictures. Even the atheistic Mandarins believed that the subtle air of the sky into which the souls of the dead had been dissolved was attracted to earth by sacrifice and the other rites, and devotion to ancestors was believed to ensure good luck.

The ruin of the Chinese mission is said to have followed the decision hostile to the "rites." But ruin was preferable to success bought so dear. No one who has read St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians can reasonably doubt what his decision would have been. Christ has no fellowship with idols, and the religion which is from above, as another great authority reminds us, is first "pure," then, and only then, "peaceable."

(The authorities consulted for this article are Pray, "Hist. Controvers. de Rit. Sin." Buda-Pesth, 1789; Pignatelli, "Consult. Canon." tom. v. Consult. 45; Natalis Alexander, "Lettres d'un docteur de l'ordre de S. Dominique sur les Cérémonies de la Chine"; an anonymous work in the British Museum, "Mémoires pour Rome sur l'état de la religion chrétienne dans la Chine," 1709, which contains important documents; Cardinal Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. ii. p. 629 *seq.*; article "Accommodationstreit," in the "Kirchenlexikon." Brucker in DThC, an able defence of the Jesuit position; Wieger in DAp, *Chine.*) Information has also been derived from the *Saturday Review*, December 13, 1884, and the *Month*, February, 1885.

CHIVALRY (Lat. *caballus*, a horse). The system of ideas prevalent among the mounted men-at-arms (Fr. *chevalier*, It. *cavaliero*, Span. *cabalero*, Ger. *Ritter*, Eng. *knight*) of the Middle Ages, and which still influences their descendants and European society in general, to a greater or less degree, is known by this name.

The Equites, the equestrian order, of ancient Rome summon before the mind no corresponding associations. The three patrician tribes constituted, indeed, the "horsemen" in the organisation of Servius Tullius, and had the first place both in arms and in politics. But before the end of the Republic commercialism invaded the equestrian order, and when we speak of a "Roman knight," or *eques*, the name suggests a selfish capitalist, wringing taxes out of oppressed provincials, and living in vulgar luxury at Rome; it is as far as possible from calling up any of the ideas which we associate with the term "chivalry." (Juvenal, "Sat." iii. 153 *sqq.*)

After the disruption of the empire of Charlemagne, the importance of horse-soldiers in war continually increased. For this there were various reasons: among others the improvements made in armour, which required that the weight of the panoply should be borne by the horse he rode, so that the warrior might preserve freedom and celerity of movement. But the chief reason was the condition of European society, under which, in the absence of strong central authority in the various countries, power was sown broadcast over thousands of principalities, countries, and fiefs. The holders of these had no other way of deciding which should rule the other, or believed they had none, but by going to war. Horses and armour, like breech-loading rifles at the present day, gave an advantage to those using them over foot-soldiers; whoever, therefore, could afford it went into battle on horseback. The "miles Crassi" was a sturdy footman, armed with the *pilum*, the *ensis*, and the *scutum*; the "miles" of the eleventh century was a horseman cased in as much armour as he could bear the weight of, and attended by lightly-armed followers on foot. The principles of courage and fidelity may have been transmitted to the knights of the eleventh century from their Teutonic or Iberian ancestors; in these respects a Hermann or a Viriathus left little to be desired. But if ferocity and rapacity were to be indulged without check, if cruelty and injustice, availing themselves of the weakness of law, were to be, without protest, the accompaniment and the fruit of the warrior's toils, no amelioration of the general lot could be hoped for, though extraordinary villainy might be repressed by extraordinary chastisement,[1] until the expiration of the long period required to weld a loose feudal aristocracy into an orderly law-governed State. Religion here stepped in, and endeavoured to consecrate and transform that rough struggle for superiority which was everywhere going on. The cavalier was not to

[1] As in the case o Thomas de Laon, related by Guibert de Nogent.

desist from war; that was an impossible requirement, and he was generally fit for not much else; but he was to draw the sword for just causes only, to succour the oppressed, resist attack and encroachment, and support his liege lord according to his oath. He was to be immovable in his faith, obedient to the holy Church, full of respect for her ministers, and devoutly submissive to the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff. For the honour and service of the ever blessed Mother of God, whose faithful vassal he was to be, women were to find in him an honourable, fearless, and virtuous protector. A high standard of self-respect could not but accompany the consecration to these lofty ends. The word of the knight once given, whether to friend or foe, must be irrevocable; he must be no truce-breaker or snatcher of mean advantages; his *honour* must be without stain. Courtesy and humanity were to mark his bearing and his acts. In a word, the Christian soldier was to have all those perfections of character and all those *grâces d'état* which the revelation of the Gospel and the institution of the Sacraments have rendered possible; he would then be a perfect mirror of chivalry, *sans peur et sans reproche*. This was the ideal; but when we ask in what degree was it ever realized, we are forced to admit that human passion and perversity have played their part, and made chivalry by no means an unmixed blessing to the world. The reverence for woman, grounded on a just devotion to the Mother of God, was turned into an idolatry; human love (such was the baser teaching) was to fill the soul of the true knight and to predominate over all other thoughts; nay, the very forms and words of the divine office were blasphemously parodied in the service of this vicious development.[1] Again, the self-respect of the true knight was depraved into a pride of class, which looked down on the labouring non-fighting multitude as base *roturiers* and plebeians, the shedding of whose blood was a very trifling matter; his sense of honour often became an absurd punctiliousness, tyrannizing over the free speech and action of other men. Human rights and human equality were thus ignored; but this was not the doctrine of chivalry—it was the corruption of that doctrine. The true, noble, knightly spirit and its counterfeit went on side by side, energizing, founding, and destroying, for centuries. The Popes, beginning with Urban II. and ending with Pius V., preached, blessed, and aided the holy wars, by which, in the cause of justice the places made sacred by our Lord's sojourn and sufferings were to be taken out of the hands of persecuting infidels, or Christian lands to be delivered from Moslem thraldom. Numerous orders of chivalry were instituted —the Templars, the Knights Hospitallers, or of St. John of Jerusalem, the Knights of the Sword, the Teutonic Knights, those of Calatrava, Alcantara, and many more—the labours of which, speaking generally, were an honour to human nature and a benefit to mankind. The spirit of chivalry was refined and exalted by the invention of fruitful conceptions, such as that of the Saint Graal (Holy Grail), by which the whole tone of romance literature was elevated. On the other hand, in the fourteenth century, while the form and ceremonial of chivalry were greatly developed, its essence—the contention for justice —was shamefully forgotten. Our Edward III. instituted the Order of the Garter, but waged unjust wars with France, causing incredible misery; his son, the Black Prince, waited on the French king, his prisoner, at table, but ordered the indiscriminate massacre of the people of Limoges.

Burke wrote, beholding the first shameful excesses of the French Jacobins, "The age of chivalry is gone"; but the age of chivalry will never be wholly past, while faith survives and wrongs remain to be redressed. Wherever, and so far as, the true Catholic faith, and the imitation of Christ and His saints, inspire a population, a class, or an individual, there, and in that proportion, the spirit of chivalry, dormant and entranced as it seems now, will revive. That spirit is, as we have said, essentially, the readiness to contend for justice. For the present it remains passive in every part of Europe, stupefied, as it were, by the audacity of the so-called Liberals, who, having got into their hands the organizations of government in most of the States, are carrying their hostility to divine faith, the Church, and the Pope into practice, with a vigour and a malice which Christians find a difficulty in conceiving. But it will awake, and when it does it will not ask whether universal suffrage has decided *this* way or that, but whether it is *just* that this or that change should be made or unmade. Parliamentary government assisted a tyrant in England to deprive the people of their religion, and enacted that none who did not communicate with heresy should serve their country.[1] Parliamentary government in France has recently sactioned the perpetration of measures of violence against the religious orders, so flagrant in their iniquity, that the infidels of *other* countries were almost scandalized. The temper of true chivalry, when its awakening comes, will perhaps work changes which the verdict of the ballot-box would neither initiate nor ratify, yet which may be ultimately found to be beneficial and curative to European society. (See Kenelm Digby's "Broad Stone of Honour" and "Mores Catholici.")

CHOIR (*chorus*). From the "band" of singers at the divine worship, who were placed

[1] As in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, and Chaucer's *Court of Love*.

[1] Test Act of 1673.

between the clergy in the apse and the people in the body of the church, the space between the sanctuary and the nave came to be called the *choir*. In the course of time, the superior clergy of a cathedral or collegiate church found it necessary to migrate from the confined space of the apse or sanctuary, which they occupied in primitive times, and to establish themselves in seats, called *stalls*, on either side of the choir. These stalls were often ornamented in the most exquisite manner.

The recitation of the breviary for each day takes place "in choir" in cathedrals, collegiate churches, and the great majority of monasteries and convents. The recent legislation concerning choirs of singers is contained in decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Feb. 19, 1903, and Sept. 17, 1897) and the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X. (Nov. 22, 1903). They may be found in Taunton, *Choir*. (Leclercq in DACL.)

CHORAL VICARS. These were anciently clerics to whom the precentor (*i.e.* the canon who had the charge of the music), in a cathedral or collegiate church, committed the immediate superintendence of the choir. In the reconstituted chapters of France and Germany choral vicars were directly appointed to perform this duty, in concert with the canons, and received salaries accordingly.

CHORAULES (χοραύλης, lit. a flute-player in an orchestra). In the Eastern Church the name appears to have been transferred to the choir-boys of a cathedral generally.

CHOREPISCOPUS (Gr. χωρεπίσκοπος, lit. a country superintendent or bishop). Nothing is heard of such persons in the first three centuries. The first mention of them is in the canons of the Councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (314), and they probably arose in Asia Minor. A chorepiscopus was appointed and ordained by the bishop of the diocese, to whom he was answerable for the right discharge of his duties. A certain district was assigned to him to administer; he was to attend to the wants of the poor and the maintenance of all Christian institutions, and he had the power of conferring minor orders, even to the subdiaconate inclusive. It has been argued—especially by the Protestant writers Hammond, Beveridge, and others—that they were true bishops, although of inferior dignity and power to the recognized bishops of sees. The fact that fifteen "country-bishops" subscribed the Nicene canons seems to lend support to such a view. But the better opinion is that, notwithstanding the name, they were neither true bishops nor an order of clergy interposed between bishops and priests, but simply priests, invested with a jurisdiction smaller than the episcopal, but larger than the sacerdotal. Many notices of them scattered up and down in ecclesiastical history, and the consenting tradition of the Fathers, adjust themselves to this view of their office, and not to the former. Thus a canon of Neocaesarea likens them to the seventy-two disciples sent out by Christ; but these were always associated with the priesthood, not with the episcopate. The Nicene canon which authorizes a bishop to treat one who had been deposed from the see for heresy, but who desired to return to the Church, as a chorepiscopus, and give him employment and rank as such, is itself a proof that they were not bishops; for the council would not have empowered a single bishop to reinstate to his former place a deposed member of the order. Yet it might seem as if they formed something like an intermediate clerical order, for a canon of Chalcedon says, *Si quis ordinaverit per pecunias episcopum, aut chorepiscopum, aut presbyterum, aut diaconum* ("if anyone shall have ordained for money a bishop, or a chorepiscopus, or a priest, or a deacon"). It is certain, however, that in no age of the Church have the grades of *holy* (or superior) order been reckoned as more than three—bishop, priest, and deacon. A chorepiscopus, therefore, must have been either a bishop or a priest; but we have shown that he was not a true bishop; he was therefore a priest, but one who received on his appointment a spiritual jurisdiction higher than any priest could pretend to. The Council of Laodicea calls them περιόδευται, or "circuit officers," which shows that they were then expected to make visitation tours in their districts. St. Basil had no fewer than fifty chorepiscopi under him, governing districts of his extensive Cappadocian see, like the archdeacons whom Remigius appointed in the different counties when he organized his great see of Lincoln.[1]

In the Western Church we hear nothing of chorepiscopi before the Council of Riez, in the fifth century. But after 500 the notices of them become numerous, and under Charlemagne, according to Thomassin, their numbers and power were such as to be formidable even to the bishops themselves. In the later Carlovingian times unworthy persons were often foisted into the sees through lay interference, for the sake of the wealth with which they were endowed, and such bishops were glad to devolve as much of their functions as they could divest themselves of on chorepiscopi, engaged at a low rate of remuneration, and live in sloth and luxury at Court. This abuse called forth the zeal of the Roman Pontiffs, and by a series of Papal briefs and conciliar decrees, from Leo III. to the end of the ninth century, restraining the authority of the chorepiscopi, annulling many of their acts, and ordering that no more should be appointed, the endeavour was persistently made to compel the bishops to perform their own duties and not attempt to delegate them. Nothing more is heard of this class of clergy

[1] Henr. Huntend.

after the middle of the eleventh century. (Thomassin, tom. i. p. 447 *sqq.*; Soglia; Smith and Cheetham; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1197 *sqq.*, and Leclercq in DACL, *Chorévêques*; Chardon, "Hist. des Sacrements," 917 *sqq.*)

CHORISTER. A singer in a choir, whether cathedral, collegiate, or parochial. The name is usually applied to boys rather than men.

The regular singers (*κανονικοὶ ψάλται*) of a church received in early times a kind of ordination, without imposition of hands, which could be conferred by a presbyter. The form of words prescribed by the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage was: "See that thou believe in thy heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in thy works what thou believest with thy heart." (Smith and Cheetham, article *Cantor*; see CANTOR, CHOIR.)

CHRISM. (1) Olive oil mixed with balm, blessed by the bishop and used by the Church in the administration of the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Order (consecration of bishops); and also in the consecration of churches, altar-stones, chalices, patens, and in the solemn blessing of bells and baptismal water on Holy Saturday and Whitsun Eve. The oil, according to the Roman Catechism, signifies the fulness of grace, since oil is diffusion; the balm mixed with it, incorruption and the "good odour of Christ."

In itself the word chrism (*χρῖσμα*) need not mean more than "anything smeared on"; but even in classical writers it denotes especially a scented unguent, while the common oil was called *ἔλαιον*. It was this simple unperfumed oil which was used in the earliest times for sacred purposes, but from the sixth century oil mixed with balm began to be employed. This balm (*βάλσαμος*, in the classics *βάλσαμον*) is a kind of perfumed resin, produced by a tree which grows in Judaea and Arabia. This Eastern balm was always used in the West till the sixteenth century, when Paul III. and Pius IV. permitted the use of a better kind of balm, brought by the Spaniards from the West Indies. The Orientals did not content themselves with simply mixing balm. Thus the Greeks mingle forty different spices, and the Maronites, before they were reunited to the Catholic Church, prepared their chrism from oil, saffron, cinnamon, essence of roses, white incense, &c.

The consecration of the oils during the Mass goes back to the earliest times. Cyprian mentions it in Ep. 70 (ed. Hartel, 768), addressed to Januarius; and St. Basil attributes the origin of this blessing to apostolic tradition. It of course included chrism in the strict sense, when that came into use. In the West this was always reserved to bishops; in the East, as may be seen from Goar's "Euchologium," it was only given by the patriarchs. At first the but used to be blessed on any day at Mass, oils in a letter of Pope Leo to the emperor of the same name, in the Synod of Toledo (490), and in all the older Sacramentaries and ritual-books, Maundy Thursday is fixed for this blessing. It was only in France that the custom survived of blessing the oils on any day, till uniformity with the use of other churches was introduced by the Council of Meaux, in 845. The function took place in the second of the three Masses which used to be said on Maundy Thursday; whence the name "Missa Chrismatis." The blessing of the chrism was called "Benedictio chrismatis principalis." All the clergy of the diocese used to assist, till, in the eighth century, the custom altered, and only those who lived near the cathedral came, while the others had the Holy Oils sent to them. The chrism used to be kept in a vessel like a paten with a depression in the middle. A "patena chrismalis" of this kind is mentioned by Anastasius, in his Life of St. Silvester. (Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie.")

(2) The word "chrism" is also used for the sacred monogram.

(See Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; St. Thom. 3ª, q. 72, a. 3; Cabrol, *Chrême* in DThC; Leclercq, *Chrisme* in DACL; Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church"; Rock, iv. 89.)

CHRISMAL, CHRISMATORY. These words, formed from chrism, are used in a number of different senses. (1) The vessel containing the holy chrism. (2) "The vessel, which we now call a pix, employed for keeping the Eucharist, was (formerly) known under the name of Chrismal, and was often made of gold and richly jewelled." (Rock, i. 108.) (3) The corporal or pall to cover the chalice. Formerly the corporal was folded over the chalice, as still observed by the Carthusians; when this portion became distinct, it formed the pall. (4) A vessel containing relics. (5) The white covering placed on the head of a child at Baptism after it had been anointed with chrism, to keep the holy oil from being rubbed off. A similar custom is still observed in some countries after Confirmation. (Ducange, *Chrismal*; Cabrol, in DACL, *Chrismale*; Puniet, ib. *Aube baptismale*; Rock, *ubi supra.*)

CHRISOM. An old English word for chrismal (5). When Mrs. Quickly says of Falstaff: "A' made a finer end and went away an it had been any christom child," she means an innocent babe newly christened, still wearing the white garment given in Baptism. It derives its name "chrismal" from its connection with anointing, but of course it has the mystic meaning of innocence.

CHRIST, "Anointed" (Gr. *χριστός* from *χρίω*), a translation of the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ, as is expressly stated in Jn. i. 42: "We have found the Messias, which is interpreted Christ." In the Old Testament the word is

used of the high-priest, who was anointed for his office (*e.g.* in Levit. iv. 3); of kings, who were also anointed—*e.g.* 1 Kings xxiv. 7, where David calls Saul "the anointed of the Lord": in the second Psalm "against the Lord and against his anointed" (where χριστὸς is the word in the LXX); with which we may compare other places such as Dan. ix. 25, Hab. iii. 13, Ps. cxxxi. 17. The Hebrew word designates the king who was to come, the promised Messiah. In the doctrinal language of post-Biblical Judaism, this expected deliverer is called almost with the significance of a proper name, מָשִׁיחַ, of which "Messias"[1] is only another form, and "Christ," as we have seen, a translation. Hence, when our Lord came, "the Christ" (ὁ Χριστὸς)[2] was his official title, while "Jesus" was his ordinary name. When the word occurs in the Gospels, it constantly implies a reference to the Messiah as portrayed by the prophets.

The history of Christ's life belongs to a Biblical rather than a theological dictionary; it is only the teaching of the Church on his Person and office which concerns us here. We may divide the subject into two halves, treating under (*A*) of what Christ is; under (*B*) of his work.

(*A*) *Natures and Person of Christ.*—Jesus Christ, according to the Catechism familiar to English Catholics, is "God the Son made man for us." He has therefore two natures: that of God, and that of man. As God, according to the Nicene Creed, He was born of his Father, before all worlds; He is God from God—*i.e.* He, being true and perfect God, proceeds from God the Father, who is also true and perfect God—He is light from light; begotten, not made, as creatures are. He exists from all eternity. He is almighty, omniscient, incapable of error or of sin. At the moment of his Incarnation, He further became true man, without, however, in any way ceasing to be God. This truth is vigorously expressed by St. Leo in his dogmatic epistle to Flavian, which was accepted by the Fathers of the Fourth Œcumenical Council. "The Son of God," Leo says, "enters the abasement of this world (*haec mundi infima*), descending from his heavenly seat, and [yet] not receding from his Father's glory; begotten according to a new order and by a new birth. By a new order: because being invisible in his own nature (*in suis*) He became visible in ours; being incomprehensible, He willed to be comprehended; remaining before time, He began to be from a (certain) time." (PL, liv. 755; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 567.)

[1] The Greek word Messias (Μεσσίας or Μεσίας) is *immediately* derived, not from the Hebrew, but from the Chaldee מְשִׁיחָא, the ח being omitted between the two long vowels, as in μιδὰ=מחידא, Nehem. vii. 54, and the σ sometimes doubled, as in Ἀβεσσολώμ.

[2] It usually has the article in the Gospels, but occurs oftener than not without it in St. Paul's Epistles.

Moreover, He had a true body, as the Church taught from early times against the Docetæ; a true human soul, so that as man He could fear, sorrow, reason, &c., as the Church taught against the heretic Apollinaris; a human will, as distinct from his divine will, as was defined in the Sixth General Council against the Monothelites. Thus, in the words of the Fourth General Council, "Christ Jesus, [the] only begotten Son, is to be acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without change . . . since the difference of the natures is by no means annulled on account of the union, but rather the property of each nature preserved." Lastly, those two natures are united (so the Third Council [Ephesus] defined) in one Person. Our body and soul are united in one person, so—though, of course, the analogy is imperfect—the divine and human natures were united in one Divine Person, who acted and suffered in either nature. To believe otherwise, is to assert, with the Nestorians, that there are two Sons and two Christs.

Such are the chief definitions of the Church on the Natures and Person of Christ; but it is necessary to point out some important corollaries from these first principles of the faith. The following seem to be the most important:—

(1) Christ, having a human soul, had true human knowledge, as distinct from that which belonged to Him as God. His human soul did not, and could not, know God with that perfect and infinite comprehension with which God comprehends Himself. The contrary proposition, held by Augustine of Rome, was condemned by Nicholas V. Christ acquired knowledge in the same way as other men—*i.e.* experimentally; for, as we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, He "learned obedience from the things which He suffered." It is important, however, not to misunderstand Catholic doctrine on this head. Even in Christ as man, there was no ignorance which had to be removed by instruction or experience. On the contrary, as Christ's soul was hypostatically united to the Word, as He was the head from which grace and glory was to flow into the members, it was fitting that He should, from the first moment of his earthly existence, see God face to face with his human soul, as the blessed do in heaven. This beatific knowledge was always present, even when the inferior part of his soul was in agony on the cross. Again, St. Thomas argues that as the soul of Christ is the most perfect of all created things, therefore "no perfection found in creatures is to be denied to it;" and he goes on to say that, besides the knowledge of God seen in his essence, and of all things seen in God, besides the experimental knowledge common to all men, the soul of Christ had a knowledge infused or poured into it, by which He knew most fully all the mysteries of grace, and every object to

which human cognition extends or can extend (3a, qq. 9–12).

(2) Christ was absolutely sinless and incapable of sin, because his actions were the actions of God, who is holiness itself; so that in Him sin was a physical impossibility. Moreover, in Him there could be no involuntary rebellion of the flesh or lower appetites, no temptation from within, because in Him human nature was united to the Word, and it was the office of the Word to rule the human nature united to it and to hold it in absolute subjection. He could, indeed, as the statements of the Gospels prove, wonder and fear and suffer mental distress, but in Him these feelings were in perfect subjection to reason. (St. Thom. 3a, qq. 14–15.)

(3) Christ had the fullness of all grace—*i.e.* over and above the grace of the hypostatic union grace was infused into his soul so that it was most perfectly sanctified, according to the prophecy of Isaiah, "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (lxi. 1).

(4) Christ did not only take a real human body, but He took one subject to those defects which followed from the common sin of mankind, except so far as these defects were repugnant to the end of the Incarnation. The reason of His taking these defects (the capability of hunger, thirst, and the like), and no others, was that Christ became subject to infirmity, with the precise object of satisfying for the sins of human nature. Therefore He took upon Him in His own body the weaknesses caused by Adam's sin. He did not, however, assume bodily defects so far as they are incentives to sin or impediments to virtue, since this would have been inconsistent with His office as redeemer. (See St. Thomas, *supra.*) The interesting question on the personal appearance of Christ will be treated in a separate article [CHRIST, PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND REPRESENTATIONS OF].

(5) Inasmuch as the divine and human natures, although remaining each of them distinct in its own properties, were united in the Person of the Word, it follows that human attributes may be predicated of or ascribed to God the Son: and, on the other hand, that divine attributes may be predicated of the man Christ Jesus. Thus, although it was His human nature which Christ took from Mary, and although she is not the mother of the Godhead, still the Council of Ephesus defined that the Blessed Virgin is really and truly the Mother of God. So, again, we may truly say, God suffered, God died, or the man Jesus Christ is the eternal God, by whom all things were made. [See COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM.] Moreover, as Franzelin writes in his treatise on the Incarnation, "the sacred Humanity, or human nature with all its component parts, inasmuch as it is the nature of the Word," is the object of supreme adoration, though, of course, we adore the flesh not because it is flesh, but because it is united to the Word. He continues: "This is clearly and plainly taught in the definitions of councils and in the discussions of the Fathers." ("*De Verbo Incarn.*" 462–3). Thus the Fifth General Council[1] anathematizes those who "affirm that Christ is adored in two natures, in such sense that two adorations are introduced, one proper to God the Word, and one proper to the man [Christ] . . . and do not adore with one single adoration God the Word incarnate with his own flesh, as the Church of God has received from the beginning." Franzelin also quotes words of St. Athanasius against the Apollinarists (i. 6): "It [*i.e.* the body of Christ] is worshipped with due and divine adoration, for the Word, to whom the body belongs, is God"; and of St. John Damascene "Nor do we deny that the flesh [of Christ] is to be adored; nor again do we give supreme worship to a creature; for neither do we adore it as mere flesh, but as united to the Godhead." ("Fid. Orthodox." iii. 8, PG, xciv. 1013.) It will be observed that these principles formulated in the early Church contain within them a full justification of the adoration which the Church gives at this day to the Wounds, Blood, Heart, &c., of Christ. If we may, because of the hypostatic union, adore the flesh of Christ, which is a part of his Humanity, then undoubtedly we may for the same reason adore his Heart, which is a part of His sacred flesh.

(*B*) *The Work and Office of Christ.*—(1) Christ came chiefly, as the Fathers declare, *to take away sin.* This great truth is constantly asserted in Scripture. "The discipline of our peace was upon Him, and by his bruises we are healed" (Is. liii. 5). "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13). "God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, even of sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3); and thus in the Nicene Creed we confess that God was made man "for us men and for our salvation." This point is treated more fully in the article on the REDEMPTION. Here, it is enough to say that, although God might have forgiven sin without any satisfaction at all, still it was His will that a perfect satisfaction should be made, and be made by man. Accordingly, God the Son was incarnate. He was a natural mediator between God and man, since in Him the divine and human natures were united. As man, He was able to suffer and die; because He was God, His satisfaction possessed an infinite value, more than sufficient to compensate for the infinite dishonour done to God's majesty by sin. He of His free will offered Himself to endure the penalties incurred by men who were his

[1] It is the ninth of the fourteen anathemas. Hefele Leclercq, iii. 118.

brethren. He could not, of course, in the strict and proper sense, make our sins his own, nor was Christ as man punished. But He allowed wicked men to work their will upon Him, and, as the new Adam or head of the human race, took on Himself the obligation of satisfying for the offences of mankind. It was this free will with which He suffered that gave their meritorious character to the pains which He underwent. By His passion He merited every grace which has descended or ever will descend on man, for even under the old law all grace and pardon was bestowed for the merits of Christ foreseen. By the merits of His passion He on the day of his ascension opened Heaven "to all who believe." There He presents His five wounds and pleads the efficacy of the work He accomplished on Calvary; while on earth He continues and applies his sacrifice in the holy Mass, thus remaining a priest for ever.[1]

(2) Christ came to *teach*, so fulfilling the prophetic as well as the priestly office. "Behold," God says in Isaias, "I have given Him for a witness to the people, for a leader and a master to the Gentiles" (lv. 4). He Himself declared that He came "to bear witness to the truth." He revealed the nature of the Triune God, and, first to his apostles, then through them and their successors to the world, He explained the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and the way to heaven. He gave perfect instruction in morals, particularly in the sermon on the mount, in which He speaks with authority, as the giver of the new law. Lastly, He taught, as no mere man could, by example, exhibiting Himself as the model of every virtue.

(3) Christ is *the Head of the Church*, militant in this world, suffering in purgatory, and triumphant in heaven, and this headship belongs to Christ as man, for St. Paul in Ephes. i., after mentioning the fact that God raised Christ from the dead, adds that He made "Him head over all the church." This proves that the headship belongs to Christ as man, for it was in His human nature that Christ was raised from the dead. Christ is head, not only because He is supereminent in dignity as compared with the members of his mystical body, but also because grace and glory flow from Him to the members of his Church in earth and Purgatory and in heaven. Even Catholics living in mortal sin are members of Christ, connected with Christ their head by the gift of faith; and the proposition of Quesnel, that "he who does not lead a life worthy of a son of God and of a member of Christ ceases to have God within him for his Father and Christ for his head," was condemned by Pope Clement XI. Moreover, Christ is head of his Church because it receives its constitution and its doctrine from Him

(4) Christ, as man, holds a *kingly*, as well as a *priestly*, *power*. The Prophets foretold Him as king, and the "anointed king" is a recognized name of the Messiah in Jewish writers. He exercises this regal power, not only over His Church, but also over all men, so far as His law binds them all. As God, of course, Christ is supreme over all, both in temporal and spiritual matters. But it cannot be affirmed, at least for certain, that He, as man, possessed temporal dominion. "As man," Petavius says, "I consider that He was by no means a temporal, but only a spiritual, king; especially so far as He lived a man among men. For He did not answer falsely to Pilate the governor, when he inquired concerning his kingdom: 'My kingdom is not of this world.'" Whence Augustine "thus explains the place in the second Psalm where Christ says that He, after His resurrection, was constituted king: 'But I am constituted king by Him over Sion his holy mountain': viz. by pointing out that that Sion and that mountain are not of this world. 'For what is his kingdom, except those who believe in Him?' See, too, the same Father in his 12th Book against Faustus. cap. 42, where he explains more fully the kingdom of Christ from the prophecy of the Patriarch Jacob, and demonstrates that it does not belong to this world—that it is not temporal, but spiritual."[1]

(5) Closely connected with Christ's regal dignity is his office of *Judge*. This also belongs to Christ as man.[2] "He has been appointed by God," in the words of St. Peter, "judge of the living and the dead." He is eminently fitted for this office by his perfect justice and integrity, his knowledge of man's heart, and his mercy.

Other titles of Christ, such as Advocate, Shepherd, &c., have been virtually explained already. Others will be discussed in other articles. (From St. Thomas, P. iii.; Billuart, Franzelin, Scheeben, and above all, Petavius, in their treatises "De Incarnatione.")

CHRIST, PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND REPRESENTATIONS OF. Two views on Christ's personal appearance have prevailed in the Church. During the first three centuries, when Christians were persecuted and oppressed, it was generally held that our Lord assumed a bodily form without comeliness or beauty. Thus Justin, "Dial. c. Tryph.," speaks of Christ as ἄτιμος καὶ ἀειδής, "without honour and unsightly": a view which he repeats six or seven times at least, and which is also asserted by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen (against

[1] The opinion held by some of the ancients that Christ inherited the priesthood by descent from Aaron on his mother's side, is refuted by Petavius, *De Incarnat.* xii. 15.

[1] Petav. *De Incarnat.* xii. 15.

[2] The Father is said to have given all judgment to the Son. (Jn. v. 22, 27.) Petavius says that the office of judge "resides properly in the human nature, like the office of priest, mediator, &c., though its force and value comes from the Godhead."

Celsus). This view was based on the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 2-3): "There is no beauty in him nor comeliness . . . Despised and the most abject of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with infirmity; and his look was, as it were, hidden and despised; whereupon we esteemed Him not." This conception of Christ's personal appearance, joined with the danger of scandal to converts from heathenism, may account for the fact that the ante-Nicene Church was not accustomed to make a religious use of pictures and statues representing Christ in His natural form. Christians preferred to pourtray Him under symbolical forms—*e.g.* that of the Good Shepherd—or to honour Him by honouring his cross. Indeed, we find the first certain instances of statues or natural representations of Christ among heathen and heretics. Thus Lampridius, in his Life of the heathen emperor Alexander Severus (222-235), c. 29, tells us that the latter placed in his Lararium, or chapel for the protecting gods of the house, figures of Apollonius, Abraham, Orpheus, and Christ; while Irenaeus (i. 25, PG. vii. 685) relates of the Carpocratians, an early Gnostic sect, that they had paintings and other representations of Christ, and asserted that Pilate had caused Christ's portrait to be taken during his lifetime. The respect which the Carpocratians paid to these images was evidently quite unchristian, for they offered a similar veneration to likenesses of Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and others.

A second and widely different view of Christ's outward appearance began to gain ground after the triumph of the Church under Constantine. Chrysostom and Jerome [1] regard Christ as the ideal of human beauty; and the advocates of this theory also supported it by an appeal to the Old Testament, and quoted the verse of the Psalm, "Thou art beautiful above the sons of men" (xliv. 3). This naturally became the most popular view, and it is the only one that could be adopted in the religious use of art. At the same time, we may observe that this belief of Chrysostom and Jerome has not been accepted without reserve by all later theologians. Billuart, for example, denies that our Lord's body, while still passible, exhibited any extraordinary beauty; and St. Thomas was of the same opinion.[2]

Whatever we may think on this matter, in any case the divergence of opinion with regard to it in the early Church seems to create a strong presumption against the authenticity of any likeness of Christ attributed to persons who had seen Him. Indeed, St. Augustine ("De Trin." viii. 4, PL, xlii. 95) allows that there was no sure tradition in the Church on the bodily appearance of Christ. This presumption is confirmed by an investigation of the portraits of Christ for which an early origin is claimed.

The earliest witness to the existence of these ancient likenesses is Eusebius. In his "Church History," vii. 18, he tells us that he had seen a statue of Christ erected at Caesarea Philippi by the woman who was healed of an issue of blood. There was a figure also of the woman herself kneeling at Christ's feet. In the fragments of the Arian historian Philostorgius we find this same statue of Christ mentioned, with an additional remark well worthy of notice. Philostorgius says that at first it was not known to whom or by whom the statue had been erected, till, on clearing the inscription, it was found that it had been raised by the woman with an issue of blood, to Christ. Very likely the statue was erected to Hadrian, or some other heathen emperor, and the female figure, kneeling at his feet may have symbolized a suppliant province; while the inscription may have run—"To the Saviour of the World" (*σωτῆρι τοῦ κόσμου*), a title which his flatterers would readily give to the emperor, and which may have misled the Christians who read it at a later time.

Another tradition attributes portraits of our Lord to St. Luke. This tradition is never mentioned by early writers. Theodorus Lector (518) mentions a portrait of the Blessed Virgin painted by St. Luke, but he does not speak of his having painted our Lord's likeness. Portraits of our Lord from the hand of St. Luke are first mentioned by Simeon Metaphrastes, the "Menologium" of the Emperor Basil (980), and Nicephorus Callisti—manifestly authorities of too late a date to inspire much confidence in a statement which is unlikely on the face of it. Accounts which make St. Luke a sculptor (a statue of Christ said to have been executed by St. Luke is preserved at Sirolo; one "by Nicodemus," at Lucca) are of still later origin.

There is another class of likenesses, the so-called *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίηται*, images not made with hands, of which the most famous are the portrait sent to Abgarus and the "Veronica" likeness.

As to the former, Eusebius, at the beginning of his history (i. 13), mentions a correspondence between our Lord and Abgarus, king of Edessa. Moses of Chorene, an Armenian historian of the fifth century, adds that Christ sent Abgarus a portrait of Himself, wonderfully impressed on a cloth. This likeness is said to have been removed to Constantinople, and thence to the church of St. Silvester, at Rome, where it is still shown. It belongs to the Byzantine type of art, and represents our Saviour with a lofty brow, clear eyes, long, straight nose, and reddish

[1] Hefele cites Chrysost. *Opp.* t. v. p. 62, Hieron. t. ii. p. 684, both in Benedict. ed.

[2] Billuart, *De Myster.* Diss. vii. a. 11; "Humana faciei et corporis Christi forma non fuit insigniter venusta, neque insigniter deformis." He quotes St. Thomas on Ps. xliv. and on Isai. liii.

beard. Genoa also claims to possess this miraculous picture.

Veronica is said to have been one of the women who accompanied our Lord on his way to Calvary. She gave Him her veil that He might wipe away the perspiration from his face, and when our Lord had done so, the impress of his countenance was found upon the cloth. It is alleged that this likeness was brought to Rome about the year 700, and it belongs at this day to the relics of St. Peter's church at Rome, where it is only shown to persons of princely rank, who, however, must first be made titular canons of St. Peter's. Mabillon and the Bollandist Papebroch suppose that Veronica came, by mere error, to be regarded as the name of a person, the word really being a barbarous compound of *vera* and *icon* (εἰκών), and meaning "true image." As a matter of fact, mediaeval writers give the name Veronica to the image itself and not to a woman. Thus Matthew of Paris (ad ann. 1216) speaks of "the representation of our Lord's face, which is called Veronica." A recent archaeologist, William Grimm, derives the word from Βερονίκη, the name, according to John Malala, a Byzantine historian of the sixth century, which belonged to the woman with the issue of blood.

In this utter absence of any authentic likeness of Christ or account of his appearance, different types of face were assigned to our Lord in different countries. Photius (Ep. 64) testifies that this was the case in his day; and a recent traveller and Biblical scholar, Dr. Scholz, found a number of different types prevailing in different Eastern nations. Thus the Copts, Syrians, Armenians, &c., each give a special type of face to pictures of our Lord. At the same time great influence was exercised (1) by a description to be found in St. John Damascene (ed. Le Quien, t. i. p. 631), and which is as follows: "Christ was of imposing stature, with eyebrows nearly meeting, beautiful eyes, crisp hair, somewhat stooping, in the bloom of youth, with black beard and yellow complexion, like his mother"; (2) by a forged letter of "Publius Lentulus," a friend of Pilate, addressed to the Roman Senate, which contains the following description: "He is a man of slender figure, dignified, of a venerable countenance, which inspires love and fear in those who see him. His hair is curled and crisp, dark and glossy, falling over his shoulders and parted in the middle, after the fashion of the Nazarenes (? Nazarites). The brow is very clear, the face without wrinkle or spot, pleasing by its moderately red colour. Nose and mouth are faultless; the beard strong and reddish, like the colour of the hair, not long, but parted; the eyes of indistinct colour and clear." We cannot determine the date of the forgery, but in its present form it became well known about St. Anselm's time. A third description of Christ's form is found in Nicephorus Callisti. It belongs to the fourteenth century.

The famous work of Jablonski, "De Origine Imaginum Christi Domini," is a standard authority on this subject. A treatise on the Abgarus likeness appeared in 1847, by Samuelian, an Armenian Mechitarist monk at Vienna. The subject has also been treated by Glückselig, "Christusarchäologie," 1863. (Hefele, "Beiträge zur Archäologie" &c.)

CHRIST, KNIGHTS OF THE ORDER OF. A military order founded in Portugal in 1317 to replace the recently-suppressed order of Templars. Pope John XXII. gave the knights the rule of the Knights of Calatrava [*q.v.*]. They played a distinguished part in the establishment of the Portuguese empire beyond the seas. In the course of time the rule became considerably modified, until it became a merely secular and royal institution.

The papal Order of Christ is a survival of the right of the Holy See to admit members into the Portuguese Order. (Moeller in "Cath. Enc.")

CHRISTENING. [See BAPTISM.]

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS. The proper title is "Brothers of the Christian Schools." This admirable institution was founded by the Abbé Jean Baptiste de la Salle, who was canonized on May 24, 1900, by Leo XIII. Born in 1651 at Rheims, Jean Baptiste devoted his remarkable powers of mind and will at an early age to the divine service, and was nominated Canon of Rheims. The education of the poor, to promote which schools, called "little schools," had begun to be organized in the thirteenth century, after the legal establishment of the University of Paris, was checked by the Hundred Years' War which raged in France at short intervals from the middle of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century.[1] In 1570 a society of teachers was established under the title of the "master-writers" (*maîtres écrivains*) at Paris, whence it spread to other cities. Their aim was to teach writing and arithmetic, and a little Latin, so that their pupils might be qualified to assist the clergy in the church offices. They received many privileges, which they construed into a monopoly of teaching. About the year 1680, many good and earnest persons, both among the clergy and the laity, were engaged in promoting the Christian education of the people. In order to give himself to this work the Abbé de la Salle resigned his canonry, and distributed his patrimony to the poor. This was in 1684; in the same year he drew up the first rules for his teachers, and selected the name which they should bear; the origin of the brotherhood therefore

[1] In the learned work *Christian Schools and Scholars*, by Theodosia Drane, an account will be found of what the Church did for the elementary education of the poor. See also *infra* EDUCATION.

dates from this time. The teaching in all his schools was to be gratuitous for the day scholars, but boarders and day-boarders were also received. The saintly founder himself often taught in his schools, and, with his sure eye for organization, reformed the instruction in many large schools (*e.g.* in that connected with St. Sulpice at Paris) the inefficiency of which had baffled the efforts of their managers. De la Salle insisted that Latin should be no longer an obligatory subject in schools for the children of the poor, but that the basis of their teaching, after the Catechism, should be their own language: let them first learn to read and write French correctly, and then, if they had time and means, they might take up Latin. On this account the St. J. B. de la Salle is often regarded—and, it would seem, with justice—as the originator of primary schools and primary instruction, which, till his time, had been confounded with secondary. It is true that St. Joseph Calasanctius had founded at Rome long before (1597) his institution of the Scuole Pie, or Pious Schools, in which instruction was given gratuitously; but the line was not clearly drawn in these, as regards the subjects taught, between what constitutes primary and what constitutes secondary instruction. Latin was not excluded, and the teachers were encouraged to aspire to the priesthood; hence the Pious Schools passed by degrees into the rank of secondary establishments. On the other hand, the rule of St. J. B. de la Salle required that the Brothers who bound themselves by vow to devote their lives to teaching in the schools, and wore the religious habit, should be and remain laymen, equally with the professors and assistant teachers who were employed under them. And this has continued to be the practice of the congregation ever since. For the training of the Brothers the founder instituted a *noviciate*; for that of the professors, &c., a *normal school*. Founded at Rheims in 1685, this appears to have been the first training school for primary teachers in Europe. It was, and still is, a part of the rule, that the Brothers should work in pairs. They take the three religious vows, after having attained to at least twenty-three years. Their habit gives them an ecclesiastical appearance; it consists of a long black cassock, with a cloak over it fastened by iron clasps, a falling collar, and a hat with wide brims.

The founder lived to see the fruit of his labours in the establishment of his schools in many of the principal towns of France. He died in 1719, leaving his congregation firmly planted. It has, moreover, spread to many countries beyond the limits of France, and has been imitated by other teaching associations.

It should have been mentioned that a Bull of approbation in favour of the Christian Brothers was granted by Benedict XIII. in 1725, elevating them into a religious congregation.

In 1699, before Sunday Schools were thought of in England, St. J. B. de la Salle established one at St. Sulpice which was to be open from noon to three o'clock, and give secular instruction. Similar schools, open on festivals, were established by St. Charles Borromeo at Milan, about 1580; see his Life by Bascape, vii. 42.

("Vie du Vénérable J. B. de la Salle," Rouen, 1874; "Vie de S. J. B. de la Salle," par J. Guibert, Paris, 1900; "Annales de l'Institut des Frères," Paris, 1883.)

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS, IRISH. A religious congregation founded in 1802 in the city of Waterford by Edmond Ignatius Rice, of Callan, in the county Kilkenny.

He adopted the rules and general system of the institute founded by St. J. B. de la Salle, conceiving that he could find no better model. His first school was opened at Mount Sion in the city of Waterford, on May 1, 1804, and was eminently successful; so much so, that in a short time the altered habits and demeanour of the children in the streets became a common topic of remark. The bishop of Waterford was a warm admirer and supporter of Mr. Rice, and he was soon invited by other bishops to open similar schools in their dioceses. In the course of a few years houses of the institute were established in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, and other centres of population; and the result appeared so satisfactory that the bishops, in 1818, memorialized the Holy See to approve the congregation, and grant it a constitution. On September 5, 1820, the Apostolic Brief of Pius VII. (*Ad Pastoralis*) granted the prayer of the memorial and confirmed the institute. The members bind themselves by the usual religious vows, and are subject to a Superior-General, who has four Assistants to aid him in the government of the body. Houses of the order are now found not only in Ireland, but in England, Rome, and in several of the British colonies. Their system of teaching has met with the warm approval of successive Royal Commissions, appointed to inquire into the state of education in Ireland. (See "Testimonies in favour of the Christian Brothers and their Schools," Dublin, 1877.) The Brothers, after the establishment of the Irish system of national education in 1831, placed their schools for a time in connection with the Board, and accepted the grant; but finding that the rules of the Board as to the absolute division of secular from religious teaching were gradually leading them into concessions alien from the spirit of their founder and the Church, they withdrew from all connection with Government, and have since carried on their schools independently. Nor have they seen any cause to repent of having thus thrown themselves boldly on the generous Catholic sympathies of the Irish people,

Besides their work in elementary schools they have established many secondary schools which have achieved remarkable success in public examinations. (From information supplied by the Rev. Superior of Belvidere House, Drumcondra.)

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE: FATHERS AND CONFRATERNITY OF THE. Ignorance of their religion being seen to be one of the chief causes of the terrible instability which caused whole populations in the sixteenth century, confounded by the harangues of Protestant preachers which they knew not how to answer, to lapse into heresy, earnest efforts were made by many good men to procure that the teaching of the true doctrine of Christ should be more general and systematic. To this end a number of priests and laymen, with Marco Cusani, a gentleman of Milan, for their head, formed themselves into a society, about 1560, for the purpose of teaching the catechism to children on Sundays, and to the ignorant generally, in the country districts, on Church holidays. Cusani came to Rome in the year above named, and found there many supporters and associates, among whom were Caesar Baronius, and Francis Maria Tarugi, two of the most prominent among the companions of St. Philip Neri. The Popes strongly encouraged the pious enterprise, which was exactly in accordance with the spirit which the Council of Trent laboured to revive in every part of the Catholic world. The priests belonging to the institute were the "Fathers"—the laymen the "Confraternity"—of the Christian doctrine; but the whole society was often spoken of by the name of confraternity. St. Pius V., by a bull in 1571, ordered that such associations should be established by parish priests generally, accorded special indulgences to their members, and gave to the Fathers the church of St. Agatha. This being found too small for them, Clement VIII., in 1596, granted them the fine church of St. Martin dei Monti. This Pope also directed Cardinal Bellarmine to compose a short catechism for use in the schools of the confraternity. In process of time the name of provost was given to the chief among the Fathers, and that of president to the head of the confraternity. Four definitors, two chosen by the clerical, two by the lay members, decided any difficult or disputed question that might arise. Although they wore the dress, slightly modified, of the secular clergy, and were not bound to any office in common, the Holy See did not view any light treatment of their obligations with indifference, and Urban VIII. (1627) ordered that members leaving the community should incur the penalties of apostasy as if they were monks. [APOSTASY.] Paul V. raised them to the rank of an archconfraternity. In later times the Fathers, taking the name of Congregation, appear to have been entirely separated from the archconfraternity. From the continuation of Hélyot by Badiche, it would appear that the head of this congregation is at present styled vicar-general. (Hélyot, "Ordres Monastiques.") The First Provincial Council of Westminster decreed that "the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine should be established in every congregation prior to all others." And in 1905 Pius X. strictly ordered that "in each and every parish the society commonly called the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine shall be canonically erected. Through this the parish priests, especially in places where there is a scarcity of priests, will have lay-helpers for the catechetical instruction in pious laypersons who will devote themselves to this office of teaching." (Encyc. "On the Teaching of Christian Doctrine"; Mangenot, *Catéchisme* in DThC; Scannell in "Cath. Enc." *Doctrine, Christian*; Taunton.)

CHRISTIAN NAME. [See BAPTISMAL NAME.]

CHRISTIANS (Χριστιανοί). A name first given at Antioch to the followers of Christ about the year 43, as we learn from Acts xi. 26. The name can scarcely have arisen from the disciples themselves, for it seems at first to have been used contemptuously—at least this seems a fair inference from Acts xxvi. 28, 1 Pet. iv. 14–16 (the only other places of the New Testament where the word occurs), as well as from Tacitus, "Annal." xv. 44. Still less could it have come from the Jews, who would never have admitted that the adherents of a sect which they hated and despised could rightly claim so honourable a title as "disciples of the Messiah." On the contrary, they called Christ's disciples "Nazarenes," "Galileans." Probably, the heathen at Antioch mistook "Christus" for a proper name, and called the disciples "Christiani," just as they called those who adhered to Pompey's party "Pompeiani." It was at Antioch that the first church of converts from heathenism was formed, and no doubt it then became plain to the heathen that the doctrine of the disciples was distinct from Judaism, and this led to the imposition of a special name. Besides the form "Christiani," we also find that of "Chrestiani," many heathen, in their ignorance of the Messianic doctrine, deriving Christ's name from χρηστός, "good," instead of from χρίω, "to anoint."[1]

In later times the word has been used (1) for those who imitate the life as well as hold the faith of Christ[2]; (2) for Catholics; (3) for baptized persons who believe in Christ; (4) for all baptized persons.

CHRISTMAS DAY. The 25th of December, on which the Church celebrates Christ's birth. Whether or not the birth of our Lord really occurred on this day, ancient authorities are not agreed. Clement of Alexandria mentions the opinion of some who placed it on

[1] Tertull. *Apolog.* 3, *PL*, 2 1.
[2] St. Thomas, 2ª 2æ, q. 124, a. 5.

the 20th of April, and of others, who thought it took place on the 20th of May,[1] while St. Epiphanius and Cassian state that in Egypt Christ was believed to have been born on the 6th of January. For a long time the Greeks had no special feast corresponding to Christmas Day, and merely commemorated our Lord's birth on the Epiphany. St. Chrysostom in a Christmas sermon, delivered at Antioch in the year 386, says, "it is not ten years since this day [Christmas Day on December 25] was clearly known to us, but it has been familiar from the beginning to those who dwell in the West." "The Romans, who have celebrated it for a long time, and from ancient tradition, have transmitted the knowledge of it to us." St. Augustine gives similar testimony as to the custom of the Latin Church. We may therefore conclude that in the fourth century Christmas Day had been celebrated from time immemorial in the West, and about Chrysostom's day it began to be observed in the East; and it seems to have spread rapidly there, as appears from the writings of the two Gregories (of Nazianzum and of Nyssa).

Two or three points in the celebration of the Christmas festival, as at present practised, deserve special notice. It is well known that in ancient times the greater feasts were preceded by vigils, which the faithful kept in the church, spending the night in fasting and prayer. For grave reasons, the Church abolished this custom, among the faithful generally, and restricted the observance of vigils in the proper sense to the religious orders, who say the night office, while to the lay people a vigil is merely an ordinary fasting-day. But when other vigils were abolished, that of Christmas was still preserved, and to this day, according to ancient custom, the people meet in the church to assist at the singing of the divine office, and at the sacrifice of the Mass, which is offered after midnight.

Next, on Christmas Day (as on All Souls' Day), priests are allowed to celebrate three Masses. In ancient times, however, the custom of allowing a single priest to celebrate more than one Mass was not limited to Christmas Day and Nov. 2. Masses for the Dead, for instance, were usually said by priests in addition to that of the day previously celebrated. Nor indeed, until comparatively late in the Middle Ages, was there any law forbidding priests to say Mass more than once. Two Masses used to be said on January 1—one Mass of the octave of the Nativity, another of the Blessed Virgin. Three Masses were said on Holy Thursday—one for the reconciliation of penitents, another for the consecration of the holy chrism, a third to commemorate the solemnity of the day. Two Masses were said on the Ascension—one of the vigil, and another of the feast. A Roman Ordo mentions the custom of saying three Masses on the feast of St. John Baptist, while it appears from Prudentius that the Popes used to celebrate two Masses on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul—one in the Vatican basilica, another in the church of St. Paul. At the present time three Masses of Requiem may be said on All Souls' Day (Nov. 2). To return to Christmas Day; the Roman Ordines prove that the Popes used on that feast to say three Masses—the first in the Liberian basilica; the second in the church of St. Anastasia, whose memory is celebrated on the same day, December 25; the third in the Vatican church. In other places, particularly in France, the same priest used to say two Masses on Christmas Day. When the Roman Ordo was received in France by the command of Charlemagne, the Roman custom of saying three Masses was introduced in France also, the privilege being given first of all to bishops only, and then to priests also. To sum up: throughout the Church, or at least in a great part of it, there were two Masses—one for the vigil of Christmas, another for the feast itself. At Rome there were three, because the feast of St. Anastasia fell on the same day; and the Roman custom spread throughout the West. Those three Masses, however, were always said, not together, but at considerable intervals—viz. at midnight, dawn, and in the day time—a custom still observed in cathedral and collegiate churches. A mystical explanation of the three Masses is given, and they are supposed to figure the three births of our Lord—viz. of His Father before all ages, of the Blessed Virgin, and in the hearts of the faithful.

An old chronicler (Albertus Argentinensis) relates that during the Christmas Mass celebrated at "cock-crow," Charlemagne stood with drawn sword and read the gospel, "A decree went forth from Caesar Augustus." Martène mentions the ancient custom, according to which the emperor, or, failing him, any sovereign who was present in the Papal chapel on Christmas night, used to read the fifth lesson in the office, with his sword in his hand. "At present," says Benedict XIV., "on Christmas night the Pope blesses a ducal cap and sword, which he either gives to some prince who is there, or else sends it as a present." (Benedict XIV. "De Festis"; Grisar, "Anal. Rom." i. 595; Martindale, "Cath. Enc."; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," c. viii. sect. 5.)

CHURCH BOOKS OR REGISTERS. The Roman Ritual in the English edition enumerates the following books or registers to be kept by every parish priest (a name which here no doubt is meant to include priests in charge of a mission)—viz. the register

[1] This statement is given on the authority of Benedict XIV. It is clear from Clement's words (*Strom.* i. c. 145) that he knew of no certain tradition as to the date of Christ's birth.

of Baptisms, Confirmations, marriages, and deaths (" libri baptizatorum, confirmatorum, matrimoniorum, defunctorum "). [1]

The origin of the baptismal register is very ancient. The catechumens were accustomed some time before baptism, and usually in the fourth week of Lent, to give their names to the bishop, that he might enter them in a list known as the " book of life," or " roll of catechumens " (" catalogus catechumenorum "). The Council of Trent (sess. xxix. De. Reform. Matrim. c. 2) orders parish priests to write down in a book the names of the god-parents at baptism.

The " book of the dead " may be connected in origin with the diptychs of the ancient Church, in which the names of benefactors, &c., were enrolled, in order that they might be prayed for specially in the commemoration of the dead; but it is not till the end of the sixteenth century that we find the names of the dead registered in the present manner. The keeping of a register of marriages was introduced (or rather made of universal obligation) by the Council of Trent, sess. xxiv. De Reform. Matrim. c. 1, in these words: " Let the parish priest have a book, in which he is to enter the names of the persons married and of the witnesses, the day on which the marriage was contracted, and the place at which it was celebrated, which book he is to keep carefully under his charge." The register of persons confirmed, like that of deaths, was prescribed by various provincial councils.

CHURCH HISTORY. It is the object of the following article to give some account of the chief histories of the Church. We confine ourselves, with regard to Church histories written in modern times, to such as have come from Catholics, and we shall speak only of histories which deal with the fortunes of the whole Catholic Church, as distinct from the particular branches of it which have flourished in this or that nation. We divide the literature of the subject into three epochs. The first period (*A*) comprises the ancient Church historians down to the time of Charlemagne, crowned Roman Emperor in 800. During this period the Greeks and Romans were the chief representatives of civilization and Catholic Christianity. The second period (*B*), from Charlemagne to the rise of the Protestant religion, embraces the whole of the Middle Ages, during which the German and Romance nations were united in one Church and under one head, viz. the Pope. The third period (*C*) extends from the sixteenth century to the present day. Under the first period we shall begin with the Greek and then pass on to the Latin historians.

(*A*) The first Church historian of whom any memorial has been preserved was Hegesippus, a Jewish convert, who lived about the middle of the second century. He wrote a work in five books called *ὑπομνήματα*, or Memoirs. Great use of it was made by Eusebius, to whom we are indebted for the eight fragments which remain; the work itself is lost. These fragments have been edited and illustrated with learned notes by the great Protestant scholar, Dr. Routh, in his " Reliquiae Sacrae." Hegesippus also drew up a catalogue of the Roman bishops down to Anicetus, and this may have been a separate work.

(1) The real Father of Church history is Eusebius, who was bishop of Caesarea in the earlier half of the fourth century. His " Ecclesiastical History " in ten books begins with Christ and ends with the victory of Constantine over Licinius, in 324. He used a number of old documents, which have perished long since, such as writings of early Fathers, letters, and particularly documents taken from the archives of the empire and placed at his disposal by Constantine. This history was translated into Latin by Rufinus. In spite of the roughness of his style, the credulity which made him accept unhistorical matter (*e.g.* the correspondence between Christ and Abgarus), and the fact that his narrative is often incomplete, the documents which Eusebius used, and which have perished since, give a value altogether singular to his " Church History." His Life of Constantine in four books also contains, although it is written in the tone of a panegyric, information of the first importance. The " Chronicle " of Eusebius belongs rather to profane than to ecclesiastical history, and is besides more useful for the history of the Old than of the New Testament. The first book seems to have contained a brief sketch of the history of the world, from the establishment of the first of the great empires down to his own day. The second book (*χρονικὸς κανών*) contained chronological and synchronistic tables from the time of Abraham to that of Constantine. It was founded on a similar work of Julius Africanus (third century). The Greek original perished in the ninth century, and we were left with nothing except fragments and a Latin reproduction of the second book by Jerome, who allowed himself to add and to alter freely. However, an early Armenian version of the entire Chronicle (with, however, some gaps) was printed at Venice towards the end of last century, and edited by the Mechitarist monk Aucher, with a Latin version and with the Greek fragments (Venice, 1818).

(2) Socrates, a lawyer, or, as he calls himself, *σχολαστικὸς*, at Constantinople, wrote a history of the Church from 305 to 439—*i.e.* to his own time. His history is in seven books, and deserves high

[1] The Ritual also mentions the " Liber status animarum," which contains tabulated reports of the baptisms, marriages, and number of children who have made their first communion, &c.

praise for the diligent use of the sources (particularly of the works of St. Athanasius), for the exactness of the chronological data, for the agreeable style, and, on the whole, for impartiality. He was clearly a Catholic, although inclined to regard the rigorist views of Novatian with favour, and although, as Photius remarks, he was "not over-accurate" in his account of dogmatic matters.

(3) Sozomen, like Socrates, a lawyer at Constantinople, but originally from Palestine, wrote in nine books the history of the Church from 324 to 432. He does not seem to have known the work of Socrates, to which his own is in most respects decidedly inferior.

(4) Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus in Syria, and perhaps the most learned theologian of his age, wrote, about 450, the history of the Church from 320 to 428. It is the briefest but the best continuation of Eusebius. Its chief fault lies in the almost entire omission of dates.

(5) Theodore Lector lived at the beginning of the sixth century, and was attached as lector to the church of Constantinople. He wrote a history made up of extracts from the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, and this book still exists in MS. He also continued the history of Socrates down to 527, but of this original history only fragments remain.

(6) The last Greek Church-historian of this period is Evagrius, a Syrian, born at Epiphania about 536. He was a lawyer, high in office at Antioch. He wrote in six books the history of the Church from the Council of Ephesus in 431 to 594, so that his work is of special importance for the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies. He is learned, orthodox, and writes in a cultivated style, but is credulous and fond of marvels.

The Greek text of Eusebius (Church History), Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius, with fragments of Theodorus Lector, was edited for the first time by Robert Stephens (Paris, 1544). An edition incomparably superior was issued under the care of Henri de Valois (Valesius), a lawyer, who was entrusted with this work by the French bishops. He corrected the text by collation of MSS., and enriched his editions by notes and dissertations of profound learning, which can never lose their value. The work appeared at Paris, 1659–73, in three folios—the first containing the works of Eusebius relating to Church history except the Chronicle; the second, Socrates and Sozomen; the third, Theodoret, Evagrius, and the fragments of Theodorus Lector and of the Arian historian, Philostorgius, who in the interest of his party wrote a Church history in twelve books, from the rise of Arianism to the year 423. A new and convenient edition of the ancient Church historians was edited by Reading and published at Cambridge, 1720. Since then Eusebius has been edited by several critics, among whom we may mention Stroth (Halae ad Salam. 1779), Heinichen, Burton (Oxford, 1838, an edition of inferior merit). Heinichen's last edition (Leipzig, 1868) contains a good text and valuable notes, excursus, &c., taken from many sources. Schwartz's edition (Leipzig, 1903) has, however, superseded all others. A cheap edition in three volumes, with French translation, is published in the "Textes et Documents" of Hemmer and Lejay.

In the first period the Latins did much less than the Greeks for Church history. Rufinus, about 400, made a free translation of Eusebius, compressing the work of the latter into nine books and adding two of his own, which gave the history of the Church from 318 to 395. Rufinus is an inaccurate and sometimes a partial writer. The best edition is by Cacciari (Romae, 1740). Sulpitius Severus, a contemporary of Rufinus, wrote a "Sacred History" ("Historia Sacra," also "Chronica Sacra") from the beginning of the world to 400. The style is justly celebrated, but the work is too meagre to be of much value, though it gives some details on the history of the Priscillianists. The best editions are by Hieron. de Prato (Verona, 1741), and by the Oratorian Gallandi in vol. viii. of his "Bibliotheca Patrum." Orosius, a Spanish priest, at the request of St. Augustine, wrote his "Seven Books of Histories against the Pagans," which is really a profane history, written, however, in the Christian interest, with the special intention of showing that the calamities of the empire were not caused by the triumph of the Christian religion. St. Prosper of Aquitaine (d. 456) summed up the history of the world from the Creation to the middle of the fifth century A.D., in a Chronicle, of which much use was afterwards made by the Venerable Bede. Lastly, Cassiodorus, after he had retired from his high civil offices and had become superior of the monastery he founded, abbreviated and harmonized the histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. This "Historia Tripartita," as it was called, consisted of twelve books, and was, with the works of Rufinus, the great authority during the Middle Ages on the history of the early Church.

(*B*) In the second period, the relative merits of Greeks and Latins with regard to Church history were reversed. Among the former, literature of this kind almost died out; among the latter it began to flourish vigorously when the storm of the barbarian invasion was past. Indeed, between 600 and 1500, the East boasts only one famous Church historian, viz.: Nicephorus Callisti, a cleric at Constantinople about the middle of the fourteenth century. He wrote the history of the Church down to 610—in which year the Emperor Phocas died—using very diligently the authors (many of them lost to

us) in the library of St. Sophia, but without the critical spirit or the power to distinguish history from legend. His work has been edited by the Jesuit Fronton le Duc (Paris, 1630).

As we have already said, the richness of historical literature in the West offers a striking contrast to the poverty of the East in this respect. However, the most valuable historical literature of the Middle Ages does not fall under review here. It is composed of annals and chronicles without number, and also of the histories, civil and ecclesiastical, of particular races and nations. To the latter class belong a history of the Franks by St. Gregory of Tours (†595); the "Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation" (gentis Anglorum) by Venerable Bede (†735); of the Lombards by Paulus Diaconus (†799); of the Scandinavian North by Adam of Bremen (canon of Bremen from 1067); of Bremen, Hamburg, Lower Saxony, and Westphalia, by Kranz, a canon of Hamburg (†1517). To these we may add a history of the church of Rheims by Flodoard (†966). Of general histories, the following are extant:—(1) Ten books of Church history, by Haymo, from 840 bishop of Halberstadt. This work, mostly compiled from Rufinus, gives the Church history of the first four centuries. (2) About the same time lived Anastasius, librarian of the Roman Church, and appointed by Nicholas I. abbot of a monastery on the further side of the Tiber. He wrote an "Historia Ecclesiastica seu Chronographia Tripartita," which is translated and compiled from three Byzantine historians, and goes as far as the ninth century. Commonly, too, the famous "Liber Pontificalis," also called "De Vitis Romanorum Pontificum," is ascribed to him. But the learned authors of the "Origines de l'Eglise de Rome" (Paris, 1826), followed by Hefele, have proved that the book is much older, and that Anastasius cannot have written more than the lives of some of the last Popes in the series. The best edition is by Duchesne. (3) About 1142, Ordericus Vitalis, an Englishman and Abbot of St. Evroul, in Normandy, wrote thirteen books of ecclesiastical history from the time of Christ to the twelfth century. (4) Some 150 years later, the Dominican Bartholomew of Lucca wrote a Church history in twenty-four books, from Christ till 1312. (5) The great Church history of the middle ages came from Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence in the fifteenth century. He relates the history of the world, secular and profane, from the beginning to 1459. Here we see the first dawn of historical criticism. Laurentius Valla and Nicolas of Cusa had already pointed out the spurious character of the so-called "Donation of Constantine," and of other documents accepted in the Middle Ages, and the new epoch of historical literature was soon to begin.

(*C*) Many causes conspired at the time of the Reformation to awaken a new interest in Church history and to introduce a new method of studying it. The fall of the Eastern empire brought Greek literature and a knowledge of the Greek language to Western Europe, so that it became possible to consult the sources. The invention of printing made these sources widely accessible, while the fact that the Protestants represented their religion as a revival of primitive Christianity impelled Catholics to study with exactness the history of the early Church. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the famous work of the Magdeburg Centuriators began to be written and published. It was a history of the Church, written in an intensely Lutheran spirit, divided into centuries, of which the first five were prepared at Magdeburg, whence the name, though the whole work was printed at Basle in 1599 in thirteen folios. The director of the work was Matthias Flacius, who had a number of learned men working under him, collecting materials &c., while the Protestant princes supported him with money. To meet the impression the "Centuries" were likely to make, Caesar Baronius, afterwards Cardinal, began his "Ecclesiastical Annals," a work of stupendous learning, and a treasure-house of valuable documents, so that at this day, as Hefele says, Protestants use it a hundred times for once that they have recourse to the forgotten "Magdeburg Centuries." The first edition, ending with 1198, was published at Rome in twelve folios (1588–1607). It was continued by the Polish Dominican Bzovius, in eight folios, reaching to 1564 (Rome 1672); by Spondanus (Spondé), Bishop of Pamiers, in two folios (Paris, 1659), reaching to 1647. The best continuation, rich in documents, is by the Oratorian Raynaldus, in nine folios (Rome 1646–77). Laderchius, also an Oratorian, added three folios (Rome, 1728–37), which however only contain the history of seven years. The two Pagi, uncle and nephew, both Franciscans, gave to the world learned and valuable notes on Baronius, entitled "Critica Historico-Chronologica in Universos Annales, etc., Baronii" (Antw. 1705). They were published complete by the younger Pagi after his uncle's death. Mansi's edition of Baronius is the most esteemed; it contains, besides the text of Baronius, the notes of the Pagi and the continuation of Raynaldus, in thirty-eight folios (Lucca, 1738–59). This costly edition is unhappily disfigured by errors in printing. Recently, a continuation by the Oratorian Theiner in three folios coming down to 1583 has been printed at Rome and Paris (1856 *seq.*), while the whole work has been reprinted at Bar-le-Duc (1864 *seq.*)

The great work of Petavius on the history of dogma, the admirable editions of the Fathers by the Benedictines of St. Maur, and

many other works of a critical nature, prepared the way for the labours of the French Church historians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The greatest names in this golden age of ecclesiastical learning are:

(1) Natalis Alexander. His great work in thirty octavo volumes, containing the history of the Jewish Church, and of the Christian to the end of the sixteenth century (Paris, 1676 *sqq.*), was placed, because of its Gallican views, on the Index by Innocent XI. An edition by Roncaglia, with the entire text of Alexander, but with the addition of notes correcting his Gallican utterances, appeared at Lucca in 1734. There have been many subsequent editions.

(2) Fleury, *sous-précepteur* of the French Princes, and Prior of Argenteuil, wrote the history of the Church down to 1414, in twenty quarto volumes (1691–1720). Unlike Baronius and Natalis, who wrote in Latin, Fleury wrote in French. The strength of Natalis Alexander lay in learned and minute discussion; Fleury contents himself with giving the results of criticism, and tells the history of the Church in a manner attractive to the educated public, and in language clear, dignified, and simple. Nothing can be more charming than the skill with which he introduces extracts from ancient authorities, or the exquisite tact with which he catches the spirit and portrays the manners of the early Christians. In spite of his Gallicanism, Fleury has been commended in the highest terms by Cardinal Newman and Hefele. Indeed, no competent judge would question his extraordinary merits, and to this day his work is unsurpassed. Fleury found several continuators, of whom Faber, a bitter and exaggerated Gallican, is the best known, but none of them were in any way worthy to compare with him.

(3) Le Nain Tillemont, perhaps the most learned and accurate of all Church historians. He was a priest entirely devoted to prayer and study, connected with the solitaries of Port Royal, though not himself a Jansenist. His famous "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique" furnishes materials for the history of the Church, mostly in biographical form, down to the year 513, in sixteen quarto volumes (Paris, 1693). The history is given almost entirely in the words of the ancient documents, but these extracts from ancient authorities are united with an art which gives to the whole the smoothness and finish of a mosaic. Tillemont's accuracy would of itself entitle him to rank as an historical genius. It never fails him, notwithstanding the vast amount of details with which he deals. The notes at the end of each volume are models of critical acumen. The readers of Gibbon are aware how highly he valued Tillemont, and how greatly he is indebted to him. The French Church historians soon after this date show a marked falling off. They are many of them agreeable writers, but without depth of learning. Among them we may name Choisy ("Histoire de l'Église," Paris, 1706–23), the Jansenist Racine Ducreux, Berault Bercastel, popular writer whose history, published at the close of the eighteenth century, has been re-edited and continued down to our own time by Henrion (Paris, 1841). Histories on a larger scale have been written by Rohrbacher "Histoire Universelle de l'Église," Paris, 1842–48) and Darras ("Histoire de l'Église depuis la Création," Paris, 1875–77); neither of which is trustworthy (see a severe criticism on the latter by De Smedt, "Principes de la Critique Historique," 137).

The Italians, since Baronius, have done much less for the history of the Church than the French. The best Italian Church histories are those of Cardinal Orsi, whose "Storia Eccl." (Rome, 1748) gives the history of the Church in the first six centuries; and of Saccarelli ("Historia Ecclesiastica," down to 1185). The work of Graveson, a Frenchman settled in Italy, is now almost forgotten. Berti's compendium has little worth. Works of moderate compass have been written by Delsignore ("Institutiones Historicae," Romae, 1837), and by Palma ("Praelectiones Hist. Eccles.," Romae, 1838).

Much labour has been devoted to Church history in Germany, but the most complete and popular of German Church histories is the Protestant work of Neander. For a long time German Catholics did little or nothing for this study, till a new era was opened by Stolberg. The first fifteen volumes, containing the "History of the Religion of Jesus Christ," from the creation to A.D. 430, were published at Vienna and Hamburg, in 1806 *sqq.* This work, with its continuation by Kerz and Brischar, is very voluminous. A popular history going down to 1153 was written by Katerkamp (Münster, 1819–34), and a useful compendium by Hortig in 1826. Döllinger, about ten years later, published a compendium which carries the history of the Church down to the sixteenth century. He also began a Church history on a larger scale, but unhappily only two volumes of this excellent and learned work appeared. The first volume ends with Constantine; the second gives the external history of the Church down to 680. An English version by Dr. Cox is taken partly from the compendium, partly from the larger history, but the translation is far from accurate. Möhler's lectures on Church history were edited and published long after his death by Gams from the notes of students. The compendium of Alzog (eighth edition, 1867) is a most useful work; it has been translated into English. A Church history of great learning but heavy in style, is that of Cardinal Hergenröther (Freiburg, 1876–1880; fourth edition, revised by Kirsch). The manual of Kraus (Treves, 4th ed. 1896) can scarcely be

called a Church history in the proper sense. It is a most useful analysis of the facts, with a list of the original sources, and of the whole literature down to modern times, while synchronistic tables are given in an appendix. An improved edition has been published in French. It is not permitted in Italian seminaries. Funk, the famous patristic scholar, has written an excellent manual, which has been translated into English. Duchesne's "Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise" has been placed on the Index. Hefele's "History of the Councils" is the best book on the subject, and is of European reputation. A greatly improved and enlarged edition is in course of publication by Dom Leclercq, "Histoire des Conciles" (Paris, 1907–1916; seven double volumes have appeared). Grisar's "History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages" (Eng. tr.), Mann's "Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages," and Pastor's "History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages" (Eng. tr.) have thrown great light on the much misrepresented story of the Papacy, and have commanded the respect of non-Catholics by their impartial and outspoken treatment of their subject. Janssen's "History of the German People" (Eng. tr.) has had a remarkable success in reversing the popular Protestant judgments on the persons and incidents of the Protestant Reformation. We have no great Church history by any English-speaking writer. Two useful works by Dr. MacCaffrey, "Hist. of the Cath. Church from the Renaissance to the Revolution (1400–1789)," and "Hist. of the Cath. Church in the Nineteenth Century" should be mentioned. Particular portions of the subject have been treated of with great success by Dodd, Challoner, Butler, Lingard, Oliver, Tierney, Rock, Northcote, Gasquet, Bridgett, Brownlow, Moyes, B. Ward, and H. Mann.

CHURCH OF CHRIST: CATHOLIC CHURCH. The Roman Catechism, in expounding the ninth article of the Creed, urges priests to explain the nature and authority of the Catholic Church to their flocks with special frequency and earnestness, because of the supreme importance which belongs to this point of Christian doctrine. All heresy involves a rejection of the Church's authority; and, on the other hand, it is impossible to accept the true doctrine concerning the Church and at the same time to be a heretic. Hence in all ages and against all forms of error the Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church have appealed to her teaching as the infallible rule of faith. If such an appeal was necessary at every time, there is a more than ordinary need at the present day for insisting upon this article of the Creed, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church." It is misunderstood by Protestants more utterly than by most at least of their predecessors in separation, and the true sense of the ninth article in the Apostles' Creed is the hinge on which all our controversy with Protestants turns. We propose to consider (*A*) the Church of Christ as described in the New Testament; (*B*) this Church as it existed in the ages which came immediately after that of the Apostles; (*C*) to show that the present Catholic Roman Church is the Church founded by Christ and attested by Scripture and tradition; that she, and she alone, is the heir to the promises of Christ and the ark of salvation; (*D*) having discussed the general characteristics, we shall conclude with a more detailed account of its component parts and constitution.

(*A*) *The Church as set forth in the New Testament.*—It is well known that the Protestant Reformers made the Bible, and the Bible only, the rule of faith. With them the Bible came first, the Church came second, and occupied a very subordinate position.[1] The individual, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, read the Bible and received the true faith from its pages. A number of these individuals, gathered together, formed a church. This idea of the Church, it may be safely said, is still held by the great mass of Protestants, though it has lost ground, no doubt, among the learned. Now, the first thing which ought to strike an intelligent reader of the New Testament is, that there is an importance attached to the Church which, from the Protestant point of view, is exaggerated and out of all due proportion, while, on the contrary, no adequate provision is made for furnishing mankind with the one and only means of attaining the truth—viz. the Bible. There is no means of evading this plain and evident fact. Christ never once told His disciples to write books, or promised them His help in doing so. Books indeed were written, describing the life of our Lord, and the Apostles wrote various epistles, as occasion served; but, so far as we can learn from the pages of the New Testament, the Apostles did not leave any list of inspired writings, and, except in one solitary instance, they never once even allude to the fact that there were any inspired writings at all, except those of the old law.[2] Surely this is very strange, on the Protestant theory. It cannot be affirmed that these writings bore the marks of inspiration on the surface, for the Fathers of the Church (till the Church decided) were not agreed about the number and titles of the Biblical books; and those who do not care much for the Fathers may be reminded that the Reformers themselves were at variance with one another on the same question. But this becomes stranger still, on the Protestant theory, when we find that, while our Lord and His Apostles preserve a silence which is

[1] See for the Protestant doctrine of the Church Möhler's admirable account, *Symbolism*, part i. ch. 5, where abundant references are given.

[2] See St. Peter 2 Ep. iii. 16, where St. Paul's epistles are, by implication, called Scripture.

scarcely broken, on the New Testament, they speak frequently and in most exalted terms of the Church. We find Christ telling His disciples to hear the Church (Mt. xviii. 17). St. Paul speaks of the Church of God, of the Church which Christ has purchased with His blood, of the Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth, of the Church as "the house of God." This is very intelligible to Catholics, who hold that the Church has infallible authority in all controversies of faith, so that, given the authority of the Church, the inspiration of Scripture would be accepted, and the decision of questions as to the books which composed it would follow as a matter of course; on the Protestant hypothesis, the phenomenon is inexplicable.

Great importance, then, was given by the Apostles to "the Church."[1] Let us see what they understood by this Church.

The Church which they recognized was, first of all, a visible body. No other kind of Church would have answered to the intention of Christ in founding it. His disciples were to be like "a city that is set on a mountain" (Mt. v. 14), "a candle put on a candlestick" (*ib.* 15). Christ's Church was not to consist merely in the invisible union of pious believers in Him. Far from this, in a series of parables our Lord warns His followers that the "kingdom of heaven"[1]—*i.e.* the Church which He was to establish (since none but the good can enter heaven in the literal sense)—was to consist of good and bad. He compares His church to a field in which good grain and weeds grow together till the day of judgment; to a net which takes good and bad fish; to a wedding-feast where all the guests are not clothed in the wedding-garment of charity; to virgins, some of whom are wise, some foolish.[2] The same characteristic of the Church follows by a necessary consequence from the duties of mankind with regard to her, which will be presently explained. There would be no meaning in the admonition to "hear the Church" if she were invisible. We could not accept her as our infallible guide, as the unfailing oracle of truth, if she consisted only of pious people who are known and can be known, as such, to God alone. It is true that there is an invisible Church, or, rather, that the visible Church has an invisible side. The Church is invisible so far as she has an invisible Head, Jesus Christ; so far as she is united by prayer and union under the same Head, Christ, to the souls in Purgatory, and to the "Church of the first-born who are written in heaven."[3] It is true also that the Church to a great extent works invisibly. She is compared, not only to a spreading tree in which the birds of the air lodge, but also to the hidden leaven, the working of which is concealed from the eye of the observer. The Church gives visible sacraments, but God alone can distinguish with absolute certainty the souls on which the invisible grace of the sacraments produces its due effect. So much every Catholic will gladly allow. But it is one thing to make this admission, quite another and a very different thing, to contend, with Luther, that God first of all enlightens the individual on the nature of the Gospel, and that the individual so enlightened, and already a member of the invisible Church, pronounces the body or bodies in which this true Gospel is taught to be the true visible Church. According to Catholics, the recognition of and submission to the visible Church is the ordained means of sharing in the invisible treasures of grace. The visible Church precedes the invisible. The Lutheran reverses this order, and thereby separates himself from the teaching, not only of the Catholic Church, but also of the New Testament. The Lutheran doctrine moreover contradicts, the Catholic is in perfect harmony with, the whole purpose of the Incarnation. The Son of God did not content Himself with working invisibly on the hearts. He assumed a visible body, went about teaching and doing good, and at the same time added to His words and works the invisible agency of His divine Spirit. Therefore He left visible representatives, who were to be known and seen by all, and at the same time took care that this outward Church should be quickened by the invisible presence of the Holy Ghost, which rules and quickens the Church, as the soul rules and quickens the body.

The Church, then, of the New Testament was a visible body, and it was further invested with authority. A visible body differs from a mere mob or accidental gathering of individual units, because the former has, while the latter has not, a regularly appointed government. We have seen already that the Church was to be clothed with power, from the fact that all men were to hear her. This power was to be wielded by the officers and rulers of the Church. Our Lord chose and trained His Apostles. As He was leaving the earth, He declared, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye *therefore*, teach all nations."[1] How great the power was which had been given to our Lord and which He committed to the twelve appears from His own words to them, "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven";[2] and again, "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose you shall retain, they are retained."[3]

The consideration of the Church as a

[1] This title, peculiar to Matthew, exactly answers to the old מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם of the Synagogue. The other Gospels say "Kingdom of God." See Delitzsch, *History of Redemption*, p. 185.

[2] Mt. xiii. 24–30, 47–50; xxii. 2 *seq.*; xxv. 1 *seq.*

[3] Heb. xii. 23.

[1] Mt. xxviii. 19.

[2] Mt. xviii. 18.

[3] Jn. xx. 23.

visible body naturally leads us to speak of her *unity*. We can see that our Lord meant to found one Church, because He compares His Church to a house, the keys of which He put into Peter's hands; and again, He likens His Church, in pointed and emphatic words, to one single flock under one single shepherd. The Church, then, is one, because she is a single body constituted under one invisible Head, Jesus Christ, and also under one earthly head, our Lord's representative upon earth—viz. St. Peter. Christ did not permit His followers to form themselves into voluntary and independent societies, united by individual inclinations, or for purposes of convenience. He built His house upon a rock, and He gave St. Peter power to open and to shut the doors—*i.e.* to admit some to membership and to exclude others, according to the statutes which Christ Himself had framed. St. Paul develops the idea of this unity, and shows exactly in what it consisted, in the maxim, "One body and one Spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism."[1] In other words, the unity of the Church is assured by the unity of God Himself, who founded one Church and continues to rule it by His earthly representatives. This unity manifests itself in a double way. First, it implies unity of faith—"One faith." Among the members of merely human institutions opinions must needs vary. Not so with the members of the Church, who are united in the one invariable truth, proclaimed by the incarnate God. Accordingly, St. Paul beseeches his converts to persevere in this unity of belief, in which they had been established by the grace of God. "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment."[2] Far from tolerating various ways of thinking, far from allowing scope for private judgment on articles of faith, or admitting that men were free to indulge in great latitude of belief, provided that they were sincere and attentive to the natural precepts of morality, St. Paul exclaims, "If any one preach to you a gospel beside that which you have received, let him be anathema."[3] The word "heresy," which is used at first without any bad meaning in the sense of "party" or "school," occurs in the later writings as a term of reproach, used to mark those who chose for themselves instead of submitting to the faith of the Church, as if that fact alone were sufficient to brand those who presumed to exercise this choice. We are not left to guess how the Apostles judged of such a course. "A man that is a heretic," St. Paul writes, "after the first and second admonition, avoid: knowing that he that is such an one is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment."[1] St. Peter describes heretical parties or schools as "sects of perdition,"[2] and St. John, with all his gentleness, is no less stringent. "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house or say to him, God save you[3] (*Ave*)." Next, the unity of the Church, as St. Paul conceives it, implies that the faithful are not only one because they hold the same faith, but also because they participate in the same sacraments—"One baptism." In baptism all are born again; they become children of the same Father in heaven, and for that very reason are united as brethren to each other. "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus."[4] Moreover, St. Paul only names baptism as one of the sacraments by which the unity of the Church is secured, and in which this unity displays itself, for he attributes the same unifying influence, and that in a higher degree, to the Eucharist. "The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? For we being many are one bread, one body all who partake of one bread."[5]

The unity of the Church, then, depends on the unity of her organization, her common faith and teaching, the discipline to which all are subject, the life of prayer and of sacramental grace to which all her members are called. But this sacramental life makes the Church holy, just as it makes her one. There is, indeed, a marked difference in our Lord's teaching on the sanctity as contrasted with His statements on the unity of the Church. As has been already proved, Christ warns us that all the members of His Church would not be holy, while He never gives the slightest hint that this Church could by any possibility be split into opposing sects. But in spite of sins and defects in her members, the Church was to be in a true and real sense holy. She deserves to be so called because in Christ her Head she possesses the source of all sanctity; because by true doctrine on morals, as well as on faith, she teaches the way to heaven; while by prayer and the sacraments she puts into men's hands the weapons of this spiritual warfare, by which they can overcome evil and fight the good fight of faith. Christ "loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life."[6] He loves the Church as husbands ought to love their wives; so that the marriage bond is a type of the union

[1] Ephes. iv. 4. [2] 1 Cor. i. 10. [3] Gal. i. 9.

[1] Titus iii. 11. [2] 2 Pet. ii. 7.
[3] 2 Jn. 10. [4] Gal. iii. 27-29.
[5] 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. A more accurate translation would be "It is one bread, we the many are one body, for all of us," &c. [6] Ephes. v. 25.

between Christ and His mystical body.[1] Moreover, in spite of scandals, which were by no means lacking in Apostolic times and were often of the grossest character, the sanctity of the Church shone forth in the lives of her children. St. Paul appeals in all humility to his own work, to his self-denial, his arduous toils, his charity and gift of sympathy, to the fruitfulness of his Apostolic teaching. For the first time Jews and heathen saw men give up their goods and hold all things in common; they beheld not only men who were pure and faithful to their wives, but also others who embraced a perfection unknown even to the great saints of the old law—men who embraced the celibate life, making themselves, in Christ's words, "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." St. Paul specially commends the unmarried state, and that not simply "on account of the present necessity," but further, on general grounds, because "he that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, that he may please God. But he that has a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided."[2] Thus, while the heathen rulers were actually trying to force their subjects into marriage, in order to deliver them from the evils of profligacy, the members of the Christian commonwealth exhibited to the world a new order of things, in which, on the one hand, the holy marriage tie became indissoluble, and was rendered holier still by a great sacrament, while, on the other, many pressed on to a higher state and even on earth led an angelic life. On this supernatural sanctity of the Church, flowing from union with Christ, developing itself in charity, zeal, benevolence, virginity, and a thousand other ways, Christ promised to set His seal by miracles. "These signs shall follow them that believe. In My name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick and they shall recover."[3] This sanctity of the Church, begun and really energizing upon earth, was to be perfected in heaven. At the day of judgment, the wheat was to be separated from the weeds, the good fish from the bad. Then the prophet's words were to be fulfilled: "Arise, arise, put on thy strength, O Sion; put on the garments of thy glory, O Jerusalem, the city of the holy one: for henceforth the uncircumcised and unclean shall no more pass through thee."[4] The marriage of the Lamb, of which St. John speaks in the Apocalypse, will be solemnized, and the bride of Christ will take her proper place in His glory.

The Catholic and Apostolic character of the Church in the New Testament need not detain us long; we have only to point out that these marks are included in the picture already drawn. The Jewish Church was national and therefore particular. The Church of Christ received a commission to teach all nations; the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile was broken down; the Church was to be Catholic or universal. To this Catholic Church the Apostles gave laws. When questions and disputes arose as to the obligation of the Jewish law, the Apostles with the "ancients" gave a decisive judgment, accompanying it with the words, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[1] On the foundation of prophets and apostles "the Church was built," "Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."[2] The influence of the Apostles was felt in every part of the Church, because all doctrine and all authority to teach descended from them. It was to the Apostles Christ had entrusted the commission of teaching and baptizing all nations. They in turn ordained others and gave them power to hand on like authority to "faithful men" who were to represent Christ in future generations. "For this cause," St. Paul writes to Titus, "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain presbyters in every city, as I also appointed thee."[3] Thus, the orders and mission of the whole Church were to be apostolic, and the teaching or doctrine of the Church was to be apostolic also. What St. Paul said to the Thessalonians he said virtually to all Christians with whom he was connected, directly or indirectly. "Stand firm: and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle."[4] One word more is needed before we quit this part of our subject. It is sometimes objected that, after all, the Roman Catholic Church is not really Catholic, because it does not, in matter of fact, include within its pale all mankind, or even all who profess themselves Christians. The fact is indisputable, but no inference against the Roman Catholic Church can be deduced from it. The Church of the Apostles was not Catholic in this sense. It was Catholic, not because it embraced all mankind, but because it claimed universal jurisdiction; because it asserted its right to control the hearts and consciences of all the children of Adam; because it claimed to speak in the name of Him who had received the nations for His inheritance. No obduracy on the part of the heathen, no apostasy on the part of Christians, could alter the character of the Catholic Apostolic Church. Let sects increase ever so much, and spread and flourish in human estimation, still the Church remained the bride of Christ and the sole heir to

[1] Ephes. v. 28.
[2] 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.
[3] Mk. xvi. 17, 18. The authenticity of this section of St. Mark is disputed, but in any case it is very early, for Irenæus quotes it.
[4] Is. lii. 1.

[1] Acts xv.
[2] Ephes. ii. 20.
[3] Tit. i. 5.
[4] 2 Thes. ii. 14.

His promises. To each new sect the Church could say, "*Prior veni:* I was here before you: I, not you, have received the commission to teach and rule the nations."

Another gift was necessary, without which the Church's unity could not have continued, and even if it could have been maintained, would have been an evil rather than a blessing. There is no real advantage in an iron constraint which forces men to repeat the same formulas and acquiesce in the same decisions; there is no advantage in unity, unless it be unity in the truth. Accordingly, our Lord made His Church infallible. Against her He promised that "the gates of hell"—*i.e.* the powers of evil and of error issuing forth from the gates of the infernal city—would never prevail. He was the truth itself, the uncreated Wisdom, and to Him His disciples could boldly go, because He "had the words of eternal life." But they were not to be worse off when His visible presence left them. "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." [1] The Holy Ghost was to teach them "all things." [2] Hence St. Paul speaks, in a passage already quoted, of "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth." [3] No error could ever darken the Church: no persecution could ever destroy her. Those who revolted from her were self-condemned; and those who listened to her could never be led astray by doubt or misbelief. What the Scriptures were, what the Scriptures meant—all was to be settled for them by the Church. They were favoured with a full perception of the truth and with an abundance of grace impossible under the Jewish dispensation. Just as our Lord impressed His hearers by the very fact that He spoke as one having authority and not as the Scribes, so the Church, by her lofty prerogatives as the Bride of Christ and organ of the Holy Ghost, was to win the hearts of men to love and reverence. "Thy teacher shall not flee away from thee any more, and thine eyes shall see thy teacher. And thine ears shall hear the word of one admonishing thee behind thy back: This is the way, walk ye in it; and go not aside neither to the right hand nor to the left." [4]

(*B*) *The Church of the first Ages after the Apostles.*—We have been trying to show that the Church of the New Testament was One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, the indefectible and infallible organ of the truth, from which, and not from their private study of Biblical records, all nations were to learn the truth. Did any change occur in the rule of faith when the Apostles were no longer upon earth? When the Apostles were gone, did the Protestant religion begin to be, so that Christians went for their faith, not to the Church, but to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments? Now, on the face of it, it is unlikely that our Lord ordained an elaborate system which was to continue for a brief space and then give place to one radically different. But this improbability rises to sheer impossibility when we reflect that our Lord, far from preparing His disciples for such a change, distinctly promised that He was to be with His Church "all days"; that the gates of hell were not to prevail against it; and so clearly implied that the Apostles were to have successors, endowed with the same powers and with the same infallibility. If we turn from the New Testament to the writings of the first Christians, we find everything in exact correspondence with the Catholic theory of the Church. When St. John, the last of the Apostles, died, there is no trace of any revolution which occurred in the system of Christian government. We find the bishops ruling just as the Apostles had done, and making the same claims to speak in the name of Christ. St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, proclaims the Church's unity, and the necessity of union with and submission to her. "Do nothing," he writes, "without the bishop . . . Jesus Christ is one. . . . Therefore, let all of you meet together, as in one temple, as at one altar, as in one Jesus Christ." [1] We are to receive one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, one altar, one chalice, as there is one bishop. [2] Our Lord breathed "incorruption into His Church." [3] In his epistles the term "Catholic Church" appears for the first time in Christian literature, [4] and it embodies the same idea which he expresses elsewhere, when he tells the Ephesians to be "united *in* the mind of God"; and goes on to say that the bishops established throughout the world (*κατὰ τὰ πέρατα*) "are in the mind of Jesus Christ." [5] In this Church he recognised a visible head, the Church which "presides (*προκάθηται*) in the region of the Romans." [6]

St. Ignatius is the only disciple of the Apostles who speaks *ex professo* on doctrinal matters in documents which still survive. St. Irenaeus belongs to the second stage of the Church's history. He was the faithful disciple of St. Polycarp, who was, like St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John. St. Irenaeus wrote, not later than 190, a treatise "against heresies," the earliest dogmatic treatise which has been preserved to us. He stood face to face with developed systems of heresy, and this forced him to state at length and with precision the Catholic rule of faith.

[1] Mt. xxviii. 20.
[2] 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[3] Jn. xiv. 26.
[4] Is. xxx. 20, 21.

[1] *Ad Magnes.* 7, *PG*, v. 765.
[2] *Ad Philadelph.* 4, *PG*, v. 700.
[3] *Ad Ephes.* 17, *PG*, v. 657.
[4] *Ad Smyrn.* 8, *PG*, v. 713.
[5] *Ad Ephes.* 3, *PG*, v. 648.
[6] *Rom., ad init.*, *PG*, v. 685. "Le sens le plus naturel de ce langage, c'est que l'église romaine préside à l'ensemble des églises. Comme l'évêque préside dans son église aux œuvres de charité, ainsi l'église romaine préside à ces mêmes œuvres dans la Chrétienté tout entière" (Duchesne, *Eglises séparées*, p. 128).

This rule in his estimation certainly was not "the Bible and the Bible only." "We must not," he says, "seek from others the truths which it is easy to obtain from the Church, since into her, as into a rich treasury, the Apostles poured, as into a full stream, all which pertains to the truth; so that all who will may drink at her hands the water of life. She is the gate of life; as for all the rest, they are thieves and robbers."[1] He even puts to himself the imaginary case that "the Apostles had left no Scriptures," an hypothesis which on the Protestant theory would have made true Christianity impossible. Irenaeus judged differently. "Suppose," he says, "the Apostles had left us no Scriptures, should we not follow the order of tradition which they handed down to those into whose hands they entrusted the churches?"[2] "The true knowledge is the teaching of the Apostles and the ancient constitution of the Church over the whole world (*τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου*)."[3] This Church, "planted even to the ends of the world by the Apostles and their disciples, inherits [their] faith."[4] He regards the character of the Church's tradition as in itself the witness to its truth. Each heretic in turn "wished to set up for a teacher, and seceded from the sect in which he found himself at first. . . . No man could tell the number of those who, each on a different plan, separated from the truth."[5] "But the Church, dwelling, so to speak, in one house, as with one soul and one heart, constantly teaches, preaches, delivers this [Apostolical tradition] as with one mouth. There are divers languages in the world, but still the force of tradition is one and the same." In Germany, in Gaul and Spain, in the East, and in Africa, the Church holds the same faith.[6] God Himself has bestowed the faith upon her, and with it the "Holy Spirit, the pledge of incorruption and confirmation of our faith. . . . Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace; and the Spirit is truth."[7] Hence to be outside of the Church is the same thing as to be outside of the truth. The quotations given abundantly prove that Irenaeus believed the Church to be one, Catholic, infallible in her teaching, and the source of sanctity. He is no less explicit in laying down her Apostolic character. Indeed, he makes this last the foundation of all the Church's prerogatives. "We must obey those who have the succession from the Apostles." It is from those "who have this succession from the Apostles, soundness of doctrine, conversation without reproach, speech pure and incorruptible, that we must learn the truth." "They are the men who expound the Scriptures for us without danger" of error. And, if we ask how we are to know that the bishops have retained sound doctrine and the true tradition, the answer is that with the succession of the episcopate they have received a sure *gift of truth* (*charisma veritatis*) according to the good will of the Father."[1] We cannot put the belief of St. Irenaeus better than in the words of a learned Protestant far removed from any sympathy with it. "Irenaeus[2] makes the preservation of sound doctrine and the presence of the Holy Ghost dependent upon the bishops who in legitimate succession represent the Apostles, and . . . this manifestly because he wants at any price to have a security for the unity of the visible Church." St. Irenaeus finds the centre of this unity in the Roman Church, "with which, because of its more powerful principality, every Church must agree—that is, the faithful everywhere—in which the tradition of the Apostles has ever been preserved by those on every side." But the interpretation of these words belongs to the article on the Pope.

Other testimonies may be added from the same period. Clement of Alexandria tells us that "the true Church is one, the Church which is really ancient."[3] It is one, he says, because God is one, though men try to split it up into many heresies. He speaks of heresies "which abandon the Church which is from the beginning," and avers that "he who falls into heresy goes through a desert without water."[4] Tertullian holds similar language in controversy with heretics. Over and over again he appeals to the Apostolic foundation of the Catholic Church. "We communicate with the Apostolic Church, because there is no difference of doctrine between us; this is an evidence of truth"—*i.e.* a proof that what we teach is true.[5] The Apostles knew all truth,[6] and taught it to the churches.[7] He proves the truth of Catholic doctrine from the fact that the Church is preserved from error by the Holy Ghost, whose office it is so to preserve her; from the very fact that all Catholics hold the same doctrine, arguing that if the churches had fallen into error they would not all have fallen into the same error, since "that which is found one [and the same] among many is not an error, but a tradition."[8] Finally, to return to Tertullian's teaching on the Apostolicity of the Church, with which we began, he urges that Catholics can, heretics cannot, claim communion with any Church of Apostolic origin.[9]

We have said enough, perhaps, on this division of the subject; but from Tertullian

[1] Iren. iii. 4, 1, *PG*, vii. 856, 1077, 549.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* iv. 33, 8, *PG*, vii. 1077.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 10, 1, *PG*, vii. 549.
[5] Iren. i. 28, 1, 2, *PG*, vii. 690.
[6] *Ibid.* i. 10, 2, *PG*, vii. 552.
[7] *Ibid.* iii. 24, 1, *PG*, vii. 966.

[1] *Ibid.* iv. 26, 2 and 5, *PG*, vii. 1053.
[2] Ziegler, *Irenäus*, p. 150.
[3] Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. 17, *PG*, ix. 552.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 19, *PG*, viii. 813
[5] *Praeser.* 21, 32, *PL*, ii. 35. [6] *Ibid.* 22.
[7] *Ibid.* 25. [8] *Ibid.* 28.
[9] *Adv. Marc.* i. 21, *PL*, ii. 270.

we may fitly pass to him who used to call Tertullian his master, the great St. Cyprian. He defines the Church as "the laity united to their bishop (*sacerdoti*) and pastor." The Church is one and undivided, "being bound in one by the adhesion of bishops in mutual communion."[1] The saying which is regarded as expressing the very essence of Popish bigotry, and which has ever been specially offensive to Protestants, viz. "no salvation outside the Church" ("extra ecclesiam nulla salus") is found word for word in Cyprian.[2] Heresy is a stain which even blood shed for the truth of Christ cannot wash away.[3]

(*C*) *The Catholic Roman Church, the Church of the New Testament and of the Fathers.*—The real difficulty in the controversy with all who are not Catholics is to prove that the four notes of the Church given in the Constantinopolitan Creed, "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church," are the true marks by which the Church of Christ may be distinguished from the sects. When that is done, the question between Catholics and their opponents is almost at an end, for a Protestant body can scarcely pretend with seriousness to be the "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." In fact, no single Protestant body, so far as we are aware, professes to be the one Church. But neither can it be maintained that Protestant bodies taken together, or Protestants and Catholics together, or Anglicans, Greeks, and Roman Catholics together, form the one Church. These different bodies are not one in doctrine; they hold no visible communion with each other; much less are they ruled by one visible government; they cannot, therefore, form one visible body. Just as little can any of the bodies which are severed from the unity of the faith claim the title of Catholic. No Protestant sect asserts its right to universal dominion; such sects are essentially national or local in their character, and exhibit a certain amount of toleration to each other. The Scotch Presbyterian Church is not aggressive in England: the English Episcopalian Church makes no attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the French or Italian nations. No Protestant body dares to say "I am the Catholic Church; out of my pale there is no salvation; all men must hear me and submit to me: if they refuse, it is at their peril." Even the Greek schismatical Church does not seriously attempt to convert the French or even the English to its special form of Christianity. Similarly it might be shown that no separated body can rightly call itself holy or Apostolic; but we need not enter at length on the treatment of these points, because we shall have to point out presently that the Catholic Roman Church is in exclusive possession of these marks, which serve with the other two to distinguish the true Church. Suffice it to say that no single Protestant body, no schismatical body of any kind, can by any possibility have received its mission from the Apostles. At some time or other, each separated itself from the unity of the Church and started a new and independent life, so that its present doctrine and its present independent state cannot have come down to it in unbroken succession from the Apostles of Christ. Indeed, no Protestant Church professes to have received its doctrine in unbroken succession from the Apostles. The Anglican body, for example, declares expressly that Christianity was grossly corrupted; that this corruption affected the English church among others, and that she at the time of the Reformation reverted to the simplicity of primitive doctrine. The mark of sanctity was conspicuously absent in the founders of the Greek schism and of the Protestant churches. Nor can any body which is not Catholic possess the means of holiness. Even if the true sacraments are given, they are given and taken against Christ's will, for the simple reason that they are given outside of the Church which He founded and by those who hold no commission to administer them. They are therefore given and received sacrilegiously and cannot profit the recipient, unless he is excused by invincible ignorance.

The Catholic Roman Church, on the other hand, claims with good right to be "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic." She is one because all her members are united under one visible head, the Bishop of Rome, who is the centre of unity, and who has received supreme power to rule and govern the Church of God. He does so along with the bishops whom the Holy Ghost has appointed also "to rule the Church of God" (Acts xx. 28), an office which they exercise in union with, and in subordination to, the successor of St. Peter. The Church, then, if we look at its constitution, is one, as truly as, indeed far more truly than, any nation can be one. Some years ago a great deal was said about the unity of Germany, which w[illegible] eagerly desired by many. Germans [illegible] many points in common: they all spo[illegible] same language; the same blood flo[illegible] their veins; they were proud of [illegible] literature; they were bound t[illegible] many ennobling recollections, [illegible] measure, by common aspirat[illegible] German States were not [illegible] were not under one go[illegible] military struggle, the u[illegible] at least to a great ext[illegible] great majority of G[illegible] one single rule. [illegible] for His Church [illegible] his successor

[1] Cyprian, Ep. lxvi., *PL*, iv. 406. The numbering of the epistles here follows the recent critical edition by Hartel.

[2] Ep. lxxiii., *PL*, iii. 1123, Hartel, 791.

[3] *De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate*, 14, *PL*, iv. 511, Hartel, 222.

ments cease to be, and nations may be severed and divided, Christ took care that the government of His Church should never fail—that it should continue to the end of time, one and indivisible. He made Peter the rock, and promised that the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church built upon it. That this unity of government is possessed by the Catholic Roman Church at this day is an unquestioned and unquestionable fact. No less clear is the Church's unity in faith. All Roman Catholics believe the Church in communion with the Pope to be infallible in faith and morals. The freest discussion is permitted on matters of opinion—even of theological opinion, as may be seen in the present work. But all the faithful, by the very fact that they are Catholics, admit that they are bound to hear the voice of the Church, and when the Pope solemnly issues a definition of faith, when the pastors united teach a truth as of faith, then all controversy is at an end. The Protestant principle of private judgment is, from the very necessity of the case, a principle of division. A belief in the gift of infallibility which our Saviour has bestowed on His Church is in its own nature a principle of unity. This unity of government and belief is perfected by unity of worship. The Catholic Church all over the world offers to God the one worship really worthy of Him—viz. the sacrifice of the Mass. Everywhere she administers the same sacraments with the same essential rites.

The Catholic Roman Church is also holy. She gives the true sacraments, and it is in the unity of the Church, and there only, that these sacraments are means of grace. Because of her infallibility she teaches, and is sure to teach, a holy doctrine, thereby differing from the Protestant Reformers, who taught that man is justified by mere faith without good works; that man's will is not free; that God has predestined some to eternal ruin without any fault of theirs. It may be safely said that if a Protestant is virtuous, it is not because, but in spite of, the heresy taught by those who founded the Protestant religion, while a bad Catholic is bad because he does not practise the faith which he holds. Further, the holiness of the Church is seen in the sanctity of Christ and the apostles who founded her; in the constancy of the martyrs who sealed her faith with their blood; in the lives of the great saints who have adorned her in all ages; in the vocation to which her priests and religious are called. The Reformers ought to [illegible] ring the exalted mission [illegible] to have received direct [illegible] manifest and heroic [illegible] study the character [illegible] earned Protestants [illegible] Hamilton in his [illegible] he defence of [illegible] ailants, by Archdeacon Hare; and he will see how far Luther fell short of the ordinary moral standard, let alone heroic sanctity. Is it credible that God used such a man as the great instrument for reintroducing the gospel into Europe? Then let the reader turn to the lives of the great Catholic saints—St. Ignatius, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis Xavier, St. Theresa, and many others—whom God raised up at the very time when so many were deserting the Church of Christ and stigmatising her as apostate and corrupt. Or, again, let anyone impartially consider the state to which a priest is called, and compare it with that of a Protestant clergyman. The former is forbidden the enjoyment of domestic life, that he may give himself entirely to the service of God and his brethren. Day by day he must recite the Divine Office; practically he is obliged to offer frequently the holy sacrifice, so that he has the most powerful motive for keeping his conscience pure. The life of a priest is utterly unlike that of other men. A Protestant minister, on the other hand, scarcely differs, so far as his state goes, from the laymen around him, and if, as is often the case, he is a man of exemplary zeal and self-denial, it is not his Church which makes him so. Lastly, the Catholic Church at all times produces eminent servants of God, who, according to Christ's promise, perform works of wonder, like His own. So confident is the Catholic Church that she possesses a succession of saints whose sanctity is evidenced by miracles, that she actually possesses a regular tribunal for the investigation of their heroic virtues and the miracles which attested it. It is certain that no heretical sect, no church except the Catholic Roman Church, would venture, in the broad light of civilisation, to set up such a court.

The Church is continually aggressive, and she will acknowledge no rival. Wherever it is possible she sends her missionaries and plants churches. She claims universal jurisdiction. The common sense of mankind acknowledges her Catholic character. Various sects claim the name of Catholic, but they never succeed in persuading others to acknowledge this claim, and they scarcely seem to believe in it themselves. They are known as the Church of a particular country, as the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, &c.; by the name of some heretical founder, Calvinists, Lutherans, &c.; never as Catholics. Even separatists who have maintained the priesthood and the Catholic rites are not known to the world generally as Catholics, but as Jansenists, "Old Catholics," &c. The argument of St. Augustine holds as good now as in his own day. He says he was kept in the Church by the "very name of Catholic, which not without cause among so many heresies that Church alone has obtained; so that, although all heretics wish

to be called Catholic, no heretic, if a stranger asks the way to the Catholic Church, dares to point out his own basilica or house." [1]

The Church in no way remits her claim to be Catholic when she also speaks of herself as Roman. It is the distinctive mark of Catholics to be in communion with the Roman see. And this use of Roman as equivalent to Catholic is not of recent date. "The Catholics," Cardinal Newman writes, "during this period [viz. that of the Arian Goths] were denoted by the additional title of Romans. Of this there are many proofs in the histories of St. Gregory of Tours, Victor of Vite, and the Spanish councils." . . . After giving one accidental reason for which the Catholics at that time were called Romans, Cardinal Newman proceeds: "The word certainly contains also an allusion to the faith and communion of the Roman See. In this sense the Emperor Theodosius, in his letter to Acasius of Beroea, contrasts it with Nestorianism, which was within the empire as well as Catholicism; during the controversy raised by that heresy, he exhorts him and others to show themselves 'approved priests of the Roman religion.'" Later on similar passages are adduced from the Emperor Gratian and St. Jerome.[2]

The Roman Church is Apostolic, because her doctrine is the faith once revealed to the Apostles, which faith she guards and explains, without adding to it or taking from it; because the orders of her clergy come by unbroken succession from the Apostles; because she is in communion with Rome, the Apostolic see by pre-eminence, for the Roman bishop is the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ entrusted His flock, to whom He gave the keys of His house, so that communion with Rome makes the Church's mission—that is, her authority to teach—Apostolic. Other sees of Apostolic foundation have fallen away into heresy; but in the Catholic Roman Church the See of Peter remains the unfailing centre of unity. Sects may preserve the Apostolic succession of bishops, and so may have true orders; but no sect can have Apostolic mission and so be Apostolic, because all mission is lost the moment that a separation from the Roman See is effected.

(*D*) *The Constitution of the Church.*—We may now dismiss controversy, and attempt a concise account of the militant Church and the belief of Catholics regarding it. It may be defined as "the society of the faithful who are baptized, and united to each other by the profession of the same faith, participation in the same sacraments and the same worship, and who are under one head in heaven, viz. Christ, one head on earth, viz. the Pope, His Vicar." Thus the Church consists of those who "are baptized," because baptism makes us members of the Church; who are united in faith, sacraments and worship, because, since the Church is intended to put men in possession of heaven, her members must be united in the means necessary for the attainment of this end—viz. faith, sacraments, and worship; her members are all under one head, otherwise the Church would not be one body; lastly, the Church, being a visible body, must have a visible head and centre of unity.

The Church then, though it consists of good and bad members, does not include heretics, schismatics, or (at least in the strict and full sense of membership) persons severed from her unity by the greater excommunication.[1] This Church is divided into the *ecclesia docens* (*i.e.* the body of the pastors who teach the faith) and the *ecclesia discens* (*i.e.* the faithful who are taught the faith and who accept it). The teaching or ruling body of the Church is composed (1) of the Pope, who is the vicar of Christ and successor of Peter; who is the centre of unity, so that none who are not in communion with him are Catholics at all; and who possesses immediate and ordinary jurisdiction over all the faithful—*i.e.* not only over all the laity, but over all other pastors, whatever their dignity may be.[2] (2) Of the bishops, who rule separate portions of Christ's flock which have been committed to their charge, with ordinary jurisdiction and in virtue of divine appointment, but still in union with and in subordination to the Pope. The inferior clergy, who are subordinate to the bishops and represent them, but who are not necessary to the Church in the same sense as that in which the bishops are, since bishops, governing their flocks with ordinary jurisdiction, belong to the divine and unalterable constitution of the Church; not so vicars-general, parish-priests, &c. The Pope, indeed, may remove bishops, may alter the boundaries of dioceses, suppress them or unite them; a country may lose its hierarchy and become subject to Vicars Apostolic, who are mere delegates of the Pope. But there always has been and there always will be an episcopate, presiding over dioceses and ruling them, in subjection, of course, to the Pope, but still with ordinary jurisdiction.

The *ecclesia discens*, or body of the faithful, is infallible in its belief concerning faith and morals: *i.e.*, in theological language, the Church has a passive infallibility; but, as the faithful are bound to learn the faith from their pastors, it follows that the Church has an active as well as a passive infallibility: *i.e.* the faithful cannot err in what they believe, because the same Holy Spirit which enables them to believe what their pastors

[1] August. *Ep. Fundam.* c. 4, quoted by Billuart.
[2] *Development*, p. 280, *seq.*

[1] Certain questions agitated in the theological schools are passed over here: *e.g.* whether "pure schismatics" (*i.e.* persons holding the full faith of the Church, but separated by schism) may still be called members of the Church.
[2] Concil. Vatican. "Past. astern." cap. 3.

teach provides that these pastors shall teach the truth with unerring voice. The pastors of the Church may exercise this divine gift in several ways. The Pope, in his supreme office of universal teacher, may define a doctrine on faith and morals, to be held by the whole Church; in which case, according to the decision of the Vatican Council, he is infallible. Again, the Pope may convoke a particular synod and in union with it define a doctrine of faith, which he afterwards promulgates to the whole Church. Once more, the Pope may convoke a general council and confirm its decisions on matters of faith. Lastly, the Church dispersed may exercise her infallibility: *i.e.* the Pope and the bishops throughout the world, in the ordinary performance of their duty, and without formally concerting together, may teach certain truths to the body of the Church as of divine faith. In all these cases, Catholics without exception maintain, and are bound to maintain, that the teaching given is infallible.

It only remains to determine the subject-matter to which this infallibility extends. Clearly, neither Pope nor Church can put forth new dogmas for acceptance. The faith has been "once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). The Vatican Council lays down this point with great lucidity. "The Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter in order that, through his revelation, they might manifest new doctrine, but in order that through His assistance [the successors of Peter] might religiously guard, and faithfully expound, the revelation handed down by the Apostles, or the deposit of the faith." The Church, then, has no inspiration: she cannot receive fresh revelations, to be imposed on the belief of the faithful. Her office is confined to expounding the original revelation, to the condemnation of new error and the drawing out of ancient truth, which may not, as yet, have been perfectly understood by the faithful. Hence when the Church defines an article of faith—such, for example, as the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin—there is a double obligation of belief. First, we are bound to confess that the doctrine is true and to be accepted without doubt; next, that this doctrine was revealed of to the Apostles and preserved in the deposit tion. faith, as contained in Scripture and tradi- in the It need scarcely be said that this belief of revea permanent and inalterable character the theor led truth is perfectly consistent with Cardinal N y of development as maintained by divines. [S ewman and other eminent Catholic

It is one thi g to hold that the deposit of faith was gi ven in its fullness to the Apostles; quite an ther to assert that every article of this faith h as been apprehended fully and clearly by the faithful generally in all parts of the Church.

On certain great and central truths—*e.g.* th Divinity of Christ; His presence in the Eucharist; the forgiveness of sin through baptism and penance; the unity and infallibility of the Church—the faith of Catholics has been clear from the first. On other questions a certain obscurity prevailed, and the Catholic dogmas were developed by the slow action of time and controversy. Consequences had to be drawn from principles, and only by degrees did it appear how much these principles involved. Individual Fathers might fall into exaggeration or commit themselves to incomplete and one-sided statements. They might fix their attention on the truths which it was their business at the moment to defend against the heresy of the day, and fall into inaccurate language, which could be used—unjustly, indeed, but not without a show of plausibility—by heretics who fell into error at the opposite extreme from the errors which these Fathers opposed. It may be freely admitted, then, that the definitions of councils have gone beyond the teaching of individual Fathers, but then this is precisely because these Fathers had fallen short to some extent of the original teaching of the Apostles. In the course of years heresy was met by new and adequate expression of truth, delivered from the first; but, after all, the stream of doctrine rose no higher than its source.

Thus the Church's infallibility in defining articles of faith is limited to the definition of truths already contained in Scripture and tradition. But within this province her word, and her word alone, is decisive. To her, and not to private individuals, it belongs authoritatively to interpret Scripture. She has determined the books of which Scripture is made up; it is hers to judge of their meaning. So, too, she is the guardian of tradition, and no one can appeal either to Scripture or to history against her definition without making shipwreck of the faith and forfeiting the name of Catholic by the very act. Individuals may of course devote themselves to the study of Scriptural exegesis and of history, and the Church in all ages has encouraged these studies and commended those who have pursued them. Moreover, few studies, if pursued in a really scientific and impartial spirit, tend more to strengthen belief in the Church's claim. But to say that a private person may on the strength of his investigations set at defiance the Church's definition is tantamount to a denial of the Church's infallibility.

We have just said that the Church's infallibility in articles of faith does not extend beyond the truths contained in the original revelation. But almost all theologians are agreed that the Church is endowed with a further infallibility, on matters which are so closely connected with revealed truth that, unless the Church were infallible in pronouncing upon them, her infallibility, in

defining the faith itself, would come to nothing, or at least fail to effect the ends for which it was bestowed upon her. [See DOGMATIC FACT.] Thus the Church is infallible in deciding that a book contains heretical doctrine: in affirming, for example, that false and heretical propositions are to be found in the work of Jansenius on grace. Otherwise the Church's condemnation of false doctrine would be almost useless, since the faithful would be free to maintain that the Church had misunderstood the meaning of the supposed heretic, and thus they might continue to feed on poisonous pastures. So, again, the Church is infallible in the canonization of saints: *i.e.* in deciding that a particular individual practised virtue in an heroic degree and now reigns with Christ in heaven; else she would be proposing false models to her children, and encouraging a veneration completely misplaced: to do which would amount to nothing less than forfeiting, or at least obscuring, her note of sanctity. Similar cases in which the Church's infallibility extends beyond the deposit of faith might be mentioned. But it must be remembered that the Church is not infallible in such facts as are merely personal and historical. She may err in her judgment on the guilt or innocence of individuals who come before her tribunal; documents may be accepted as genuine in her councils which are really spurious; historical errors may exist in the offices of the Breviary, approved as it is by the judgment of the Pope and the Church. Error on such matters is possible, because they form no part of the faith, nor does error in regard to them detract from the perfection with which the Church guards that faith.

(For the Church of the New Testament, see the admirable account in Döllinger's "First Age of the Church." Möhler's "Symbolism" ("Symbolik") contains a masterly exposition of the differences between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of the Church. Cardinal Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine" abounds with valuable matter on this subject. The many treatises "De Ecclesia" need not be specially mentioned.)

CHURCH: PLACE OF CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY. Churches may, in one sense, be said to be as old as Christianity itself, for places of Christian meeting are frequently mentioned in the New Testament—*e.g.* in 1 Cor. xxiv. 34. At first no doubt private houses were used for this purpose, and thus St. Paul, Coloss. iv. 15, writes: "Salute the brethren who are at Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church that is in his house." The same expression is used of Prisca and Aquila, both at Rome, in Rom. xvi. 5; and at Ephesus, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; and also of Philemon either at Colossae or Laodicea (Philemon, 2). This state of things continued after the Apostolic age, though it is impossible to determine exactly when the gatherings in the houses of private Christians gave way to assemblies held in buildings erected for the purpose. Justin gives a famous description of the celebration of the Eucharist among Christians of his time, but he does not make any mention of churches in the later sense. Some light is thrown on the early Christian assemblies by the words quoted by De Rossi, "collegium quod est in domo Sergiae Paulinae"[1] ("the club which is in the house of Sergia Paulina"); for the Christians were first recognized by the Roman government as "Collegia" or burial clubs, and protected by this legal toleration they no doubt held their first assemblies for public worship. However, at the beginning of the third century, we find clear proof that churches properly so called began to be erected. Thus Aelius Lampridius in his Life of Alexander Severus (222–235) relates that this Emperor confirmed the Christians in possession of a place of worship. St. Gregory the wonder-worker is said by his namesake of Nyssa to have built several churches; and when the persecution of Diocletian broke out, the sight of Christian churches was familiar to all. The edict of that Emperor, usually assigned to the year 302, ordered their destruction. As soon as this last persecution was over, and the peace of the Church secured by Constantine, Christians began to erect churches on a magnificent scale, and thus seized the first opportunity of manifesting that outward respect to God and His house which is characteristic of Catholics. Eusebius has left an elaborate description of the church built at Tyre between 313 and 322. He tells us of its great wall of enclosure, which has left its traces to this day; of its portico opening into the atrium, in the centre of which there was a fountain for the purification of the worshippers as they entered; of the great doors, the nave, the aisles with galleries above them; of the "thrones" for the clergy, and of "the most holy altar" surrounded with railings of exquisite work.[2] In short, the Church exhibited the pomp of Catholic worship as soon as it was possible to do so.

The changes of style in church-building at different epochs do not concern us here; but it is worth while to note the arrangements of the earliest Christian churches.

According to the rule laid down in the Apostolic Constitutions,[3] the church was to have the sanctuary at the east end, the reason being that by this means the Christians in church were enabled to pray as they were used to pray in private, *i.e.* facing the east.[4] However, this rule was by no means universally observed. The church at Tyre, of which we have already spoken, had the

[1] *Roma Sotterranea*, i. p. 209, quoted by Lightfoot, Comment. on Colossians.
[2] Euseb. *H. E.* x. 4, § 37 *sqq.*
[3] *Apost. Constit.* ii. 57. [4] Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. 7.

entrance at the east and the sanctuary of course at the west; and ancient churches in Rome (*e.g.* St. John Lateran) are preserved, that are arranged in this manner. The fact is that, as we shall presently see, it was impossible, according to the position which the bishop occupied, that both he and his flock should pray facing in the same direction. If the rule in the Apostolic Constitutions was followed, the people faced east, the bishop west; if the church was placed like that built at Tyre, or like those said to have been erected by Constantine at Rome, then the people had to face westwards, but the celebrant looked towards the east. The form of the church described in the Apostolic Constitutions was an oblong, terminating at the inner end in a semicircular projection, called *concha* or apse. In this apse the altar was placed; behind the altar the bishop's throne was placed; the priests occupied seats which formed a semicircle, the bishop's seat being in the midst, and the bishop and the priests being so placed as to look towards the people. Origen calls this place, in which the seats of the bishops and priests were set round the altar, *presbyterium*. It corresponds to what we now call the sanctuary (chancel, choir), a name which was not introduced till the Middle Ages. Of the deacons, some stood in the presbyterium, others were stationed in the body of the church to keep order among the people. In the church of St. Agnes in the Roman Catacombs, we can still discover this ancient arrangement of the presbyterium. At each side of the apse—*i.e.* at the north and south corners, if the apse looked east—there were παστοφόρια or cells for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament and for keeping the sacred vessels.

The laity were placed in the nave, a name which has arisen from the comparison of the Church to a ship, which we meet with even in the Apostolic Constitutions. "In the middle stood the reader on a raised place." Since the bishop also is said to have sat in the middle, although his throne really stood at the east end, we are justified in supposing that the reader's pulpit was between the north and south sides of the nave—in other words, at the east of the nave, and so, close to the presbyterium. St. Cyprian [1] describes the conspicuous position of the reader, as he stood on the pulpit (*pulpitum*) in the sight of the congregation.

Nearest to the presbyterium, places were reserved for the virgins, widows, and aged women.[2] The next part of the nave was parted off into two spaces, each with separate doors: one of these portions was for men, the doors being guarded by *ostiarii*; the other for women, the doors being placed in charge of deaconesses. We learn from the direct testimony of Origen that the last place, *i.e.* the most remote from the altar—was given to the catechumens. No doubt, however, the catechumens were placed nearer to the altar than the penitents, though it is difficult to determine the position occupied by the different classes of penitents. Tertullian [1] speaks of criminals, who were driven not only from the threshold, but from any place under the roof of the church; and Cyprian says of penitents, "Let them come to the threshold of the church, but by no means pass over it." [2] We may perhaps conclude that the more advanced class of penitents (the "hearers") were placed in the porch (νάρθηξ), while persons under excommunication were put outside of the church altogether. The buildings attached from ancient times to the church, such as the sacristy, baptistery, &c., are described in separate articles.

As has been already said, we are considering the church from the theological or ecclesiastical, not from the architectural point of view, so that we say nothing of the different styles which have prevailed in the East and West. Accordingly, having described the arrangements of a Christian church in primitive ages, we may now pass on to speak of the modern regulations on the subject of church-building. We shall follow as our guide Mgr. de Montault, in his "Traité pratique de la Construction des Églises," Paris, 1878.

A church is a building intended for the general use of the faithful, and is for this reason distinct from a chapel, which is intended for the convenience of some family, college, &c.; or from an oratory, which is essentially domestic or private. The principal churches are called basilicas, and these again are subdivided into greater and patriarchal, and into minor basilicas. The chief church of a diocese is called a cathedral (from being the place where the Ordinary had his throne or chair), and a cathedral may be patriarchal, primatial, metropolitan, according to the dignity of the prelate who holds it. An abbatial church is the seat of an abbot; if served by a chapter, a church is called collegiate. The title parish-church explains itself. The greater basilicas are called "most holy," while "most illustrious" and "illustrious" (*perinsigne* and *insigne*) are names of honour given respectively to lesser basilicas and collegiate churches, by favour of the Holy See.

The place on which a church is to be built is to be designated by the bishop, as is expressly ordered both by the Pontifical and canon law. There must be an open space all round the church, but this prescription of the Pontifical does not forbid the placing of houses for the bishop or clergy at the side. There should be no window or door opening into a private house, unless permission to that

[1] Cyprian, Ep. xxxviii., ed. Hartel, 580.

[2] Πρεσβύτιδες, in the Apostolic Constitutions. There is some dispute as to the meaning of the word. (See Ducange, *Presbytera*.)

[1] Tertull. *De Pudicit.* c. 4, *PL*, ii. 987.

[2] Cyprian (ed. Hartel), Ep. xxx. § 6, 554.

effect has been obtained from Rome. There is no rule which requires the sanctuary to be placed at the east end, though Ferraris considers this arrangement more suitable. In the Middle Ages, pains were taken to place the sanctuary so that it looked towards the point at which the sun rose when the foundations were traced. During the last three centuries this orientation, as it is called, has been much neglected. Nor, again, need the church be of any particular style, since the Church has sanctioned by use all kinds of ecclesiastical architecture. Moreover, churches are built in all forms and shapes: that of a Latin cross, of a Greek cross (which is a cross with four equal branches), of a rectangle, circle, &c. The plans when completed must be submitted to the bishop and approved by him.

The laity are placed in the nave of the church. The separation of the sexes, which, as we have seen above, dates from the infancy of the Church, continued during the Middle Ages. It was the custom to place the women on the north, the men on the south side of the nave. This separation of men from women in church is now very generally neglected, but it is required by the Roman Ritual and the "Ceremonial of Bishops," when it can be managed without inconvenience.

Catholics are of course bound to show respect to the church as the house of God. Men must uncover their heads; women, according to St. Paul's rule (1 Cor. xi. 5 *sqq.*), must have their heads covered. Ecclesiastical authority from time to time has intervened to suppress abuses contrary to this respect, and has severely interdicted unnecessary talking, the sale of pious objects, begging, &c., in the church. It is, however, to be observed that ecclesiastical authority permits certain reunions which are not of a strictly religious character to take place in church. Thus in 1669 the Sacred Congregation of Rites "declared that it was not contrary to the ecclesiastical rite, nay, that it was praiseworthy," for the medical college of Salerno to "confer the Doctor's degree in the church."

With regard to the *repair of churches*, the expense must be met, according to Benedict XIV. and other canonists, (1) from the revenues of the church, if sufficient for the purpose; (2) by those who are obliged, whether by custom or particular statute, to do so; (3) by the parish priest if his professional income allows of it, the assistant clergy being also bound to contribute on the same condition; (4) by the patron; (5) failing all these, a tax must be imposed on the parishioners. For the rebuilding of churches, the Congregation of Rites sometimes permits the people of the place to work on holidays of obligation according to the discretion of the Ordinary, provided that the work on these days is done gratuitously. In order to change the site of a church, very grave reasons are required, and often, particularly if a cathedral church is in question, leave must be obtained from Rome.

The particular parts of the church, choir, nave, &c., and the furniture, altars, images, &c., are treated of in separate articles. Of the early history of churches a good account will be found in the recent work of Probst, "Kirchliche Disciplin in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten." (See BASILICA; Ferraris *Ecclesia, materialis*; Kraus, "Geschichte der Christl. Kunst," i. 265; Grisar, "History of Rome and the Popes," § 249; Lanciani, "Pagan and Christian Rome," p. 108.)

CHURCH PROPERTY (*bona ecclesiastica*). The right of the Catholic Church, equally with any other corporation or moral person, to acquire and possess property, seems obvious to common sense; but since this right is often contested in theory and withheld in practice in our own day, it may be desirable to go into the matter in some detail to examine the principle in human nature on which the temporal endowments of the Church are founded: to distinguish the various kinds of ecclesiastical property, and the purposes for which such property is required; then, after sketching the history of Church endowments in Europe, to give some account of the efforts which mediaeval and modern legislation has made to arrest their increase and oust their possessors.

How the Church came to possess property any person who is a Catholic in more than name can discover by merely analysing the feelings which spontaneously arise in his own mind when he is invited, or has the opportunity, to make an offering for some religious object. In making it he feels that it is not he who lays the Church, but the Church that lays him, under an obligation; enabling him by such acts to unite himself to her glorious cause, assist her in fulfilling her divine mission, help to have the divine praises celebrated with greater frequency and splendour, minister to the poor and suffering, and participate in the merits of her missioners labouring amongst the heathen. "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts xx. 35). Such being the natural sentiments of everyone who knows what being a Catholic means, there is no reason to fear that temporal possessions will ever be wanting to the Church, although the spoliations which she has had to endure, and is still enduring, in every part of Europe, cannot but cause great local embarrassment and temporary arrest of her activity. Wherever there are Catholics deserving the name, there the Church will have property, whatever infidel legislation may contrive. The real danger is, lest the persevering efforts of the modern State to shut out religion from education should succeed in training up a generation of men and women to whom the genuine spirit of Catholicism would be unknown, and

who would consequently starve the Church by their own illiberality, and observe her persecution by their rulers with complacency. On this subject some remarks will be found under EDUCATION and SCHOOLS.

Property is of two kinds, moveable and immoveable. The so-called Liberals of our day cannot deny that the Church must possess some amount of the former at least, if her functions are to be performed at all. Christ's kingdom, though not "*of* this world," is *in* this world; its ministers and subjects are human beings, its medium is social life, its local habitation is the world of sense; it therefore, while its end is heavenly, needs external and material resources. Money, if not exceeding the limits of "evangelical poverty," and church requisites of all kinds, it is admitted even by her enemies that the Church must possess. But they draw a line between moveable and immoveable property —between money and land; pretending that it is the duty and interest of the State to debar her from the enjoyment of real property, lest, we suppose, she should become too powerful, or lest wealth should corrupt her ministers and divert them from their true vocation. This last plea, of course, is hypocritical. On the other side, we shall quote an admirable passage from Cardinal Soglia, in which he has shown for what purposes the Church requires property, and by what an indisputable right she acquires and enjoys it. "It is asked," he says, "whence does the Church derive the right of acquiring and possessing real or landed property (*bona stabilia et frugifera*)? Is it from the civil law, or from some other system of law, human or divine? Unless I am much mistaken, a terse and solid answer to this question can be drawn from a consideration of the divine constitution of the Church. We know for certain, from sacred literature and tradition, that there is in the Church a supreme power of administering religion and society, peculiar to it, instituted by Christ, and entirely distinct from the civil power. It is also a certain and established truth that she possesses an inherent right to provide herself with all those apt and suitable means which may be necessary for the preservation of religion itself and of Christian society. But, in order to the worship of God and the salvation of souls in the Christian society, churches and altars must be built; sacred vessels, ornaments, and other things subsidiary to the Divine worship must be provided; the bishops, priests, and ministers who serve the Church and apply all their energies to the promotion of the eternal salvation of men, must be supported; clerks must be trained in letters and ecclesiastical discipline; the poor, the sick, widows and orphans must be taken care of; hospitality must be practised towards the faithful; captives must be redeemed, and many similar works carried on: all which things cannot be done without buildings, revenues, abundant resources, and large expenses. It follows that the Church possesses by her very constitution, and by the will of her divine Founder, the right of procuring, acquiring, and possessing property, whether personal or real, in order that she may have at hand what is necessary in order to defray the expenditure above mentioned; just as civil society has the right of demanding taxes and levying imposts, or even of possessing landed property, if public necessity and utility require it."[1] The Cardinal goes on to maintain that the Church has at all times exercised this right, even in the teeth of the prohibition of the civil power; and as a case in point, he cites her acquisition of property during the third century, when, as a "collegium illicitum," she could not, according to the Roman jurisprudence, legally hold it. That the Church acted wrongly in making these acquisitions it would be absurd and impious to maintain; but the rightfulness of her action can be vindicated on no other principle than one which asserts her right to hold property to be *jure divino*, and independent of the consent of the civil power.

The historical aspect of the subject must now be briefly treated. It is the remark of St. Augustine, that when our Lord, who could have provided for Himself and the Apostles in other ways, sanctioned the use of a bag or purse, in which the offerings of His followers were kept, and from which money was taken for the poor and the requirements of festivals, He desired to teach His Church that she had the right of possessing property. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles that they received, dating from the day of Pentecost, large sums of money which the new believers poured into their hands; that in those first days of fervour private property passed temporarily into abeyance, and the Apostles distributed to "every one according as he had need";[2] moreover, that when the "serving of tables" threatened to become so onerous as to divert the Apostles from their proper work, they appointed deacons[3] to receive and administer under their direction the Church funds. It is also explicitly stated in the New Testament that "the labourer is worthy of his hire";[4] that if the clergy sow to the laity spiritual things, it is no great matter if they reap their carnal things,[5] and that "the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel."[6] The principle of Church endowment and Church property is thus seen to have full, explicit, and undeniable Scriptural warrant.

Space does not admit of our showing in detail the manner in which this principle was applied from age to age: how Church funds, from being in the beginning purely diocesan,

[1] *Institutiones Canonicae*, iii. 1, § 8.
[2] Acts iv. 35.
[3] Acts vi. 2.
[4] Lk. x. 7.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 11, cf. Gal. v. 6.
[6] 1 Cor. ix. 14,

came to be also capitular, parochial, and monastic; and how the admission of the feudal customs endowed—if we might not say burdened—the Church, not only with broad lands, but with a vast temporal jurisdiction in the shape of lordships and principalities. It may be interesting, however, to note the position in which the question stood at the time when peace was restored to the Church by Constantine. In the imperial ordinances preserved by Eusebius, it is commanded that the sites of all their churches shall be restored to the Christians; and this is followed by the significant proviso that "since the Christians are known to have had not only those places where they were accustomed to meet, but other places also, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the right of the whole body of Christians, you [the praetors, procurators, &c.] will also command all these, by virtue of the law before mentioned, without any hesitancy, to be restored to these same Christians: that is, to their body, and to each conventicle respectively." In another ordinance, addressed to Anulius, the Emperor intimates that this restitution is to be made in favour of "the Catholic Church of the Christians in the several cities or other places," and that Anulius is to "make all haste to restore, as soon as possible, all that belongs to the churches, whether gardens or houses, or anything else." [1] We here see the civil power recognising the legality of those acquisitions which, as mentioned in a previous paragraph, had been made in contravention of the civil law.

The unrestricted right to enjoy property thus recognized in the Church opened the way to abuses, as was only natural; these abuses were restrained by edicts of the Emperors Valentinian and Theodosius. An edict of Marcian (†457) removed many of these restrictions, and allowed all persons ample facilities for endowing the Church with any description of property, whether by will or disposition *inter vivos*. In the West, as each nation was converted, it voluntarily and joyfully enriched with lands and goods the Church which had brought to it the message of salvation. In the ninth and tenth centuries the incursion of Pagan Danes, Normans, and Hungarians, and the confusions thence arising, caused great havoc and waste of the Church's patrimony; but the unity of the ecclesiastical organization being preserved, and heresy kept at bay, the damage done was speedily repaired on the return of peace. From the eleventh century to the fifteenth extended that marvellous period of European development in which the Church, pouring out her treasures with a free hand,[2] covered the face of the Continent and of our own island with a network of cathedrals, convents, colleges, and parish churches, the beauty and majesty of which later and colder ages admire but cannot emulate. The inroads made upon the Church's fortune by the Reformation and modern revolutions can only be indicated in general terms. In England the Church was deprived of the cathedrals, parish churches, universities, hospitals, see-lands, glebes, and a variety of other property, moveable and immoveable; all which were transferred to the new church founded by Elizabeth. With regard to the monasteries, their lands passed chiefly into the hands of private persons, their personal property to the Crown. In France, the enormous landed possessions of the Church were confiscated at the Revolution, and the Catholic religion for a time suppressed. By the Concordat which the First Consul concluded with the Holy See in 1802, the latter agreed to recognize the title of the holders of all Church lands alienated up to that time, and the French State on the other hand undertook to pay an annual grant from the public revenue for the support of the clergy. This grant amounted, until 1905, to about £2,000,000, a sum bearing but a small proportion to the rental of the property seized. By the law of the separation of Church and State all assistance from the State came to an end; and furthermore all the property of the Church was confiscated. Religious worship is tolerated in the churches at present—the time not being considered ripe for the complete enforcement of the law. The property of the religious congregations had already been taken in 1901. [See FRANCE, CHURCH OF.] In Spain, the tithe has been abolished in recent times, and the greater part of the lands belonging to the clergy, both secular and regular, sold. But the position was somewhat ameliorated by the Concordat of 1851, which, while providing a new "dotation" for the clergy by means of a special tax, leaves the Church free to administer the property still remaining to her, and to make fresh acquisitions. In Portugal, the new Republican government, following in the footsteps of France, declared all churches, church lands, and chattels to be the property of the State (April 20, 1911). In Italy, the tithe, or a portion of it, is still payable to the clergy; this is also the case in Austria and Bavaria. In Prussia the ancient patrimony of the Church was all lost during the wars of the French Revolution, and was replaced by an annual grant of very moderate dimensions. The practical effect of the May laws of 1877, which imposed upon the bishops and clergy conditions which it was impossible for them to comply with and remain at the same time faithful to Christ and His Vicar, was to retrench this moderate endowment very seriously, and to leave several sees and hundreds of cures destitute of occupants. Happily they are now, for the most part, repealed. In Ireland, the Protestant Church, which it

[1] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* x. 5 (Bohn's translation).

[2] "Aurum Ecclesia habet, non ut servet, sed ut eroget et subveniat in necessitatibus." St. Ambr. quoted by Soglia, *l.c.*

was the policy of the statesmen of Elizabeth to force upon the people, and to endow with the tithes and lands of the ancient Church, has been disestablished (1869). No part of the recovered fund has been returned to the Catholics; but indirectly, from the appropriation of a considerable portion of it to the encouragement of intermediate schools, which are to a large extent Catholic, some advantage has accrued from disestablishment to the cause of religion.

Laws of mortmain, having for their object either to restrict or entirely prohibit the acquisition of landed property by the Church, have formed a prominent feature in secular legislation in most countries of Europe, from the thirteenth century down to the present day. But it will be convenient to treat of such legislation under the Art. WILL (2). (See Thomassin, "Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina circa Beneficia et Beneficiarios"; Wernz, "Jus Decretalium," iii.; Fourneret, *Biens Ecclésiastiques*, in DThC; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Taunton.)

CHURCHING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILDBIRTH. A blessing which the priest gives to women after childbirth according to a form prescribed in the Roman Ritual. He sprinkles the woman, who kneels at the door of the church holding a lighted candle, with holy water, and having recited the 23rd Psalm, he puts the end of his stole into her hand, and leads her into the church, saying, "Come into the temple of God. Adore the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who has given thee fruitfulness in childbearing." The woman then advances to the altar and kneels before it, while the priest, having said a prayer of thanksgiving, blesses her, and again sprinkles her with holy water in the form of a cross. The rubric in the Ritual reserves this rite for women who have borne children in wedlock. Women are under no strict obligation of presenting themselves to be churched, though it is the "pious and laudable custom," as the Ritual says, that they should do so. Properly speaking, the churching of women is not counted among strictly parochial rights; still it ought to be performed by the parish priest, as appears from a decision of the S. Congregation of Rites, December 10, 1703.

This rite was suggested probably by the prescriptions of the old law in Levit. xii. In the Christian Church, the first mention of the rite is said to be found in the so-called Arabic canons of the Nicene Council. Among the Greeks, the blessing after childbirth is given on the fortieth day after the birth of the child, and the child must be brought with the mother to the church. [See PURIFICATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.]

CHURCH-YARD. [See CEMETERY.]

CIBORIUM. The use of the ciborium, or canopy over the altar, has been already described in the article BALDACCHINO. In England ciborium is the name commonly given to the vessel in which the Blessed Sacrament is kept. *Pyx* (also *Vas*) was formerly used for any vessel, of whatever size, for this purpose. At the present time, it is used for the smaller vessel in which the Eucharist is carried to the sick and also for the vessel in which it is reserved for transference to the monstrance at Benediction. The name "Ciborium minus" is first used for the receptacle of the Blessed Sacrament in the Middle Ages. It is found in an Ordo Romanus printed in the "Bibliotheca Patr." Lugdun. vol. xiii. 724. (Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; Thurston in "Cath. Enc." *Pyx*.)

CIRCUMCELLIONES. A name given to certain Donatist fanatics [see DONATISTS]. These heretics were naturally enraged and embittered when Constantine deprived them of their churches and banished the most distinguished among their bishops. Their fury increased when Constans renewed his father's laws in their full severity; and hence crowds of Donatists, belonging to the lower classes, gathered together under the leadership of some cleric or layman, made open war on the Catholics, and brought immense suffering upon them. These Donatists called themselves Agonistici, "men eager for the fight"; their adversaries called them Circumcelliones, because they wandered "round the country huts" ("circa cellas rusticas") to do all the mischief they could. They exacted provisions by force, put out the eyes of Catholic clerics, possessed themselves of their churches, &c., &c. They themselves were actuated by a morbid craving for martyrdom; so much so that they not unfrequently inflicted death on themselves. This fanaticism lasted beyond the middle of the fourth century. Mention is made of it by Optatus, "De Schism. Donat." ii. c. 18 *seq.*, iii. c. 4, and by Augustine in his works against the Donatists. Besides Circumcelliones, we also find the forms Circelliones and Circuitores. (Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 838; Matroye in DACL, *Circoncellions*, where the bibliography is given.)

CIRCUMCISION, FEAST OF. The connection of circumcision with grace and the removal of original sin will be discussed in the article on the SACRAMENTS OF THE JEWISH CHURCH. Here it is enough to say that circumcision was the rite by which every male Jew entered into the covenant of God with Abraham, and became a partaker in its privileges and blessings; and that it was also instituted as a remedy for original sin. The law of circumcision was imposed on the Jews under the penalty of excision from the people of God. This law could not in any way bind our Lord. He was absolutely sinless, and therefore stood in no need of any remedy for original sin. He was the Son of God by nature, and therefore did not require adoption into the number of God's children. Still,

as St. Luke relates (ii. 21), our Saviour was circumcised eight days after His birth, according to the precept in Levit. xii. 3, and then He received the holy name of Jesus. The rite no doubt was performed at home, probably in the cave at Bethlehem, and Benedict XIV. remarks that painters err in representing the scene as taking place in the Temple. Circumcision was sometimes performed by the father of the family: Abraham, for example, in Gen. xvii. 23, is said to have circumcised "Ishmael his son and all that were born in his house"; sometimes by the mother, as appears from Exod. iv. 25, and 1 Mach. i. 63; so that Christ may have received the rite either from His Blessed Mother or St. Joseph.

Various reasons are given by theologians and spiritual writers which made it fitting for our Lord to be circumcised. As it pleased God to send His Son, "made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law," so it became Christ to submit to the yoke of the law by receiving circumcision, that He might free His brethren from subjection to that law. Moreover, He came "in the likeness of flesh of sin," and therefore He allowed Himself from the first to be numbered in appearance with sinners, and thus to afford a perfect model of obedience and humility. Lastly, although in His circumcision Christ did not actually redeem us by the blood which He shed, still the drops which then flowed were a pledge of all the blood which was to follow, when He hung upon the cross. Thus, in the beautiful language of a *mediaeval* writer, Peter of Blois, once Archdeacon of London, "He who for thirty years was to work salvation in the midst of the earth, from His very cradle and from the breasts of His Mother, began the business of our salvation, and tasted the first-fruits of His Passion."

We find the first mention of the feast by its present name in Canon 17 of a council which met at Tours in 567. "In order," so the canon runs, "to tread under foot the custom of the heathen, our fathers ordained that private litanies should be held (*fieri*) at the beginning of January (*in Kalendis*), psalms sung in the churches, and at the eighth hour on the first of the month (*in ipsis Kalendis*) the Mass of the Circumcision, pleasing to God, should be said." It is clear from this canon that the feast was already ancient in the sixth century. In the "Codex Sacramentorum Ecclesiae Romanae," which Benedict XIV. attributes to St. Leo and to his predecessors, and in a Roman Calendar not later than the middle of the ninth century, the feast is named the "Octave of our Lord," and this name is used along with that of the Circumcision in the "Corpus Juris." But it is evident from the prayers, gospel, &c. appointed for this "Octave of the Lord" that the Circumcision was commemorated on that day. In the Martyrology of Usuard, the feast is mentioned by its present name. In the Roman Martyrology the double title is used, "the Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Octave of His Nativity."

In some ancient Missals we find two Masses appointed for January 1: a Mass of the Blessed Virgin, and another for the Circumcision of our Lord. Durandus, writing in the thirteenth century, speaks of this custom as still continuing in his time. Connected with it is a name given to the feast, or rather to the day, in an ancient Roman Calendar, viz. Natale S. Mariae, "the feast of Holy Mary." The origin both of the name and of the custom of saying the Mass de Beata Virgine are thus explained in the Micrologus: "Lately, when we celebrated our Lord's Nativity, we could not give any special office to His Mother. Therefore not unsuitably do we venerate her more specially on the Octave of our Lord [*i.e.* on Jan. 1]; lest she should seem to have no share in the solemnity of her Son, though we do not doubt that in that same solemnity she deserves the chief honour after our Lord." A curious and interesting relic of this ancient usage still survives. The Mass of the Blessed Virgin, indeed, can no longer be said on that day, but there is, both in the Mass and Office of the Circumcision, a marked and repeated reference to the Blessed Virgin, which seems strange and almost inexplicable till we see how it arose.

The Circumcision used to be kept as a fast, though probably the fast was not prolonged beyond three in the afternoon. St. Augustine in his second sermon for Jan. 1, St. Peter Chrysologus, and other Fathers, inveigh against the heathen revelry on this day, connected as it was with the idolatrous worship of Janus and Strenia and with immoral excesses. This no doubt occasioned the institution of the fast. Certain Sacramentaries contain a Mass for Jan. 1 "ad prohibendum ab idolis." (Benedict XIV. "De Festis.")

CIRCUMINCESSION. [See Trinity, p. 829.]

CISALPINE CLUB. An association of Catholic laymen formed in England in 1791 for the purpose of helping the cause of Emancipation by minimizing the authority of Rome. They accepted, and indeed encouraged, the Protestation drawn up by Lord Stanhope (an Anglican) in 1788, disclaiming Ultramontane principles. There was naturally a good deal of friction between the association and the bishops, though in private the members led most exemplary lives. In the course of time their opposition to Rome died out, and the club changed its name to that of "Emancipation Club" after the passing of Catholic Emancipation. (See C. Butler, "Hist. Mem. of English Catholics"; Amherst, "Cath. Emancipation"; Ward, "Dawn of the Cath. Revival in England"; "Eve of Cath. Emancipation.")

CISTERCIANS. Of the ancient and illus-

trious order of Cîteaux, the most flourishing and prolific of all the offshoots from the great Benedictine trunk, there are now but scanty traces remaining.

St. Robert, the son of a gentleman of Champagne, devoted himself at an early age with all his heart to the service of God. He took the Benedictine habit, and studied carefully the rule of the great founder, from many things in which he found that the majority of the French monks deviated considerably. In several monasteries over which he presided St. Robert and the monks could not agree, on account of the strict observance of the rule which he desired to introduce. In 1075 he founded a monastery consisting of a group of cells, in the forest of Molesme, near Châtillon. Here he and other fervent hermits lived many years; but his thoughts still ran on the necessity of closer conformity to the rule, and as most of his followers saw things differently,[1] he at last quitted Molesme, and, followed by twenty zealous adherents, formed a new monastery in a desert then covered with forest and thickets, at a place called Cistercium (Cîteaux), five leagues from Dijon. This was in 1098, which is regarded as the date of the foundation of the order. St. Robert was not to water the shoot which he had planted, for in the following year, the monks of Molesme having applied to Rome and represented the forlorn condition in which his departure had left them, the Pope directed St. Robert to appoint his successor at Cîteaux, and return to his former charge. St. Robert obeyed, and for the rest of his life remained at Molesme, where he died in 1110. Alberic, his successor at Cîteaux, drew up the first code of Cistercian statutes; it was he who changed the habit from brown to white; and in his time the order took the Blessed Virgin for their special patroness, and the first Cistercian nunnery was founded. Alberic, dying in 1109, was succeeded by Stephen Harding, an Englishman from the monastery of Sherborne, a man of great energy, wisdom, and virtue, who in his twenty-five years of office governed Cîteaux with so much ability and success that he is usually regarded as the second founder of the order. Stephen, who is honoured among the saints on April 17, had been prior under Alberic. In his time, and in great part by his exertions, were founded the four famous monasteries of La Ferté (1113), Pontigny (1114), Clairvaux (1115) and Morimond (1115), which maintained, after Cîteaux, a kind of superiority in the order down to the time of its destruction. St. Stephen, in whom the instinct of government was strong, took care that all the new abbeys, wherever founded, should be subordinate to the mother house, and that the abbots should often confer together on common affairs; he is said to have first instituted "general chapters." He wrote the account of Cistercian observances called the "Charte de Charité," and caused the "Usages" and the "Exordium" of Cîteaux to be compiled. The Usages, according to Alban Butler, "have always made the code of this order." A touching story is told about the arrival of St. Bernard at Cîteaux in 1113. The sturdy English abbot had given offence at the Burgundian Court by objecting to its too frequent visits to the monastery; the monks were left in extreme poverty; sickness laid many of them prostrate; no new subjects presented themselves; and it seemed as if the order, too austere for the weakness of human nature, must speedily perish. Stephen betook himself to prayer, and soon afterwards the youthful Bernard, with some thirty of his kinsmen and friends, presented himself at the gate of Cîteaux and requested admission, the attraction of the place to these high-minded men having been that very austerity which appalled souls less firm. The accession of such a novice was in itself an invigoration of the order; and the abbot, who soon discovered his merit, sent Bernard two years later, at the head of a colony of twelve monks, to found a new monastery at Clairvaux. By the middle of the twelfth century there were five hundred abbeys of the filiation of Cîteaux; soon after 1200 the number had increased to eighteen hundred. In England the order soon took deep root; the first abbey founded here seems to have been that of Furness in Lancashire, which the united exertions of Stephen of Blois and the abbot his namesake erected in 1127. Several military orders—*e.g.* those of Calatrava, Alcantara, and Avis—were subject to the jurisdiction of the abbot of Cîteaux. For two hundred years, says Alban Butler, the order admitted no relaxation of its observances. The rule of St. Benedict was followed in all its rigour; there was little sleep to be had, much hard labour to be done; fasting was observed from Sept. 14 to Easter; meat, fish, eggs, and grease were never touched, and even milk but rarely. Their churches, instead of being profusely adorned with sculpture and painting according to the fashion of the times, were distinguished by a bare simplicity, as may be seen at Pontigny to this day.

In the fourteenth century the prevalence of wars in Europe caused many abbeys to be disturbed, plundered, and impoverished. Discipline suffered, for under such circumstances the rule could not possibly be observed. Long controversies arose in the order as to the lawfulness or the expediency of dispensing with the rule, especially as to eating meat. The Papal decrees called the *Clementine* (1265) and the *Benedictine* (1333), while changing several matters of jurisdiction confirmed the observances, which cer-

[1] See their arguments in the eighth book of Orderious Vitalis.

tain abbots had even then begun to infringe. But the tendency to relaxation gradually became too strong to be resisted, and in 1475, a brief of Sixtus IV. authorized the general chapter and the abbot of Cîteaux to permit to any monks who applied for it the use of meat. The variety of practice which ensued was so embarrassing that in 1485 the general chapter decreed that meat should be used in all the convents on three days in the week. Meanwhile a counter-current of austerity exhibited itself in many places, and a reformation, reviving the primitive Cistercian rigour, was introduced by Martin de Vargas in Spain (1430), and spread towards the end of the same century through the provinces of Tuscany and Lombardy. In later times there were three or four celebrated reforms of this order; on one of which—instituted at La Trappe by the Abbé de Rancé—see the article TRAPPISTS. The reformed congregation of Feuillants was founded in 1577 by Dom Jean de la Barrière; that at Sept Fonds, in the following century, by the abbot Eustache de Beaufort. The convents generally, including those of the English province, followed what was called the "common observance" according to the dispense of Sixtus IV.

At the Dissolution there were upwards of a hundred Cistercian houses in England; the names are given below.[1] Unlike the Friars who planted themselves in the towns, the Cistercians, whose original aim was personal sanctification in solitude through prayer and penance, usually built their houses by preference in lonely valleys and sequestered nooks.[1]

In 1892 Pope Leo XIII., in accordance with his desire to unite the branches of the great Orders of the Church, invited the members of the strict and common observance to form one body; but as the Pope left them free, the branches remain distinct.

Cistercian convents of women were established soon after the foundation of the order for men, the first being at Tart in the diocese of Langres (1125). They have gone through the same vicissitudes as the brethren of the order, branching into reformed and non-reformed. The most famous of the convents have been Las Huelgas at Burgos and Port-Royal des Champs. They have an important abbey at Stapehill (Dorset). (See Hélyot; Alban Butler, "Lives of the Saints," April 17 and 24; Gildas in "Cath. Enc."; "Kirchenlex.," *Cîteaux*; Tanner, "Notitia"; Dugdale.)

CITATION. A summons, *i.e.* a judicial act whereby a person is called to appear for judgment at a certain time and place. This may be done by word or by letter. A citation is peremptory when the person is warned that he will incur contumacy unless he appears; it is simple when no such threat is mentioned. The procedure is governed by an instruction issued by the Cong. of Bishops and Regulars (1880) and in England by the first Westminster Council (Append. 10 X.). (See Taunton.)

CIVIL LAW. The law of Rome, beginning with the Twelve Tables, and ending with the Code and Pandects of Justinian, is so called. Immense powers of mind were employed during many centuries in harmonizing, rationalizing, and completely adapting to the wants of social life, the laws of Rome. On this see Savigny, Walter, Phillips, &c. After the inroad of the Lombards into Italy, the increase of anarchy and barbarism in every part of Europe caused the authority of the civil law to decline. The *customs* of the Franks, the Burgundians, the Angles, or the Visigoths, were of more account with the conquerors of Europe than all the wisdom of Ulpian or Papinian; and out of these

[1] This list of Cistercian houses existing at the date of suppression is extracted from the materials provided by Tanner and Dugdale. Nunneries are distinguished by an asterisk,* cells by the letter C.

Alba Landa (Caer.)
Appleton, Nun * (York.)
Basedale (York.)
Basingwerk (Flint.)
Beaulieu (Hants)
Biddlesden (Bucks)
Bildwas (Salop)
Bindon (Dors.)
Blea Tarn, C. (West.)
10. Bordesley (Worc.)
Boxley (Kent)
Brewood * "White-ladies" (Salop)
Bruerne (Oxf.)
Buckfastleigh (Dev.)
Buckland (Dev.)
Byland (York.)
Calder (Cumb.)
Cleeve (Som.)
Coggeshall (Essex)
20. Cokehill * (Worc.)
Combe (Glouc.) C.
Combe (Warw.)
Combermere (Ches.)
Cotton * (Linc.)
Croxden (Staff.)
Cwmhyr (Radn.)
Cymmer (Merion.)
Dieulacres (Staff.)
Dunkeswell (Dev.)
30. Dunscroft (York.), C.
Ellerton * (York.)
Esholt * (York.)
Farringdon (Berks), C.
Flaxley (Glouc.)
Ford (Dev.)
Fountains (York.)
Furness (Lanc.)
Garendon (Leic.)
Goxhill * (Linc.)
40. Grace Dieu (Monm.)
Greenfield * (Linc.)
Hales (Glouc.)
Hampole * (York.)
Heyninges * (Linc.)
Holm Cultram (Cum.)
Jervaulx (York.)
Keldon * (York.)
Kingswood (Glouc.)
Kirklees * (York.)
[50. Kirkstall (York.)
Kirkstead (Linc.)
Legborne * (Linc.)
Leighton Buzzard, C.
Llanleir * (Card.)
Llanlugan * (Montg.)
Llantarnam, near Caerleon (Mon.)
London: Tower Hill
" St. James's, C.
Louth (Linc.)
Maenan (Caern.)
60. Margan (Glam.)
Marham * (Norf.)
Medmenham (Bucks)
Melsa, or Meaux, in Holderness (York.)
Merevale (Warw.)
Neath (Glam.)
Netley (Hants)
Newenham (Dev.)
Newminster (Northumberland)
Pindley * (Warw.)
70. Pipewell (Northants)
Quarr, or Arreton (Isle of Wight)
Revesby (Linc.)
Rewley (Oxf.)
Rievaulx (York.)
Robertsbridge (Suss.)
Roche (York.)
Rosedale (York.)
Rufford (Notts)
Rushin (Man.)
80. Sawley (York.)
Sawtry (Hunts)
Sewesley,* near Towcester (Northants)
Sibton (Suff.)
Sinningthwaite,* near Wetherby (York.)
Stanlegh, near Chippenham (Wilts)
Stixwould* (Linc.)
Stoneleigh (Warw.)
Strata Florida (Caern.)
Stratford Langthorne (Essex)
90. Swine,* near Hull (York.)
Swineshed (Linc.)
Tarrant Kaines* (Dorset)
Thame (Oxf.)
Tiltey (Essex)
Tintern (Monm.)
Vale Royal (Ches.)
Valle Crucis (Denb.)
Vaudey (Linc.)
Wardon (Beds)
100. Waverley (Surrey)
Whalley (York.)
Wintney * (Hants)
Woburn (Beds.)
Worcester *
Wyckham,* near Pickering (York.)
106. Ystrat Marchel, near Welshpool (Montg.)

[1] "Bernardus valles, montes Benedictus amabat, Oppida Franciscus."

customs the *lex loci*, or common law of each country, gradually arose. In the twelfth century, society being now in a more stable condition, the study of the civil law was revived at the University of Bologna, whence it spread to other countries. The rulers of the Church have observed no uniform attitude towards this study, because, as circumstances varied, so did the duty of the Church vary. St. Chrysostom, when he was converted to God, abandoned for ever, as he tells us, the study of the Roman law. Yet St. Gregory the Great often made use of the imperial laws himself, and advised the bishops of several countries, when these laws did not conflict with the canons, to promote their observance. After the twelfth century the civil and canon law [CANON LAW] were studied *pari passu*; the Roman Pontiff admitted that "the laws were a support to the canons"; and Honorius III., early in the thirteenth century, ordered that there should always be a school of *both* laws, "utriusque juris," in the Roman Curia. On the other hand, the German and imperial legists, who were possessed by the idea of "the Holy Roman Empire" and all that the phrase involved, strove to give to the civil a universality equal to that of the canon law, and to make all national codes give way to it. As mankind, religiously, were gathered into one Church, so, civilly, according to these dreamers, they were or ought to be members of but one State, the Empire, the head of which delegated more or less of his power to the kings and princes of other lands. With such theories of the civilians the Church could have nothing to do; and there was some danger, if she should show unmixed favour and countenance to the study of the civil law, lest the Governments outside the Empire, which maintained their absolute independence, and did not mean to supersede their own codes by the Roman Law, should take umbrage at her procedure, and curtail her liberty of action within their borders. Hence we meet with various Papal briefs and orders tending to discourage or at least to place under restraint, the study of the civil law. Pope Innocent IV., in a letter addressed to the bishops of all European countries except Germany, deplored the extravagant addiction of the clergy to this study ("tota clericorum multitudo ad audiendas seculares leges concurrit") and forbade the civil law to be publicly taught, unless by the desire of the local sovereign. Nevertheless, the intrinsic excellences of the Roman Law are so great that recourse to it could but be moderated; the Pontiffs neither could nor wished to supersede it by any other. In all countries it was introduced along with the canon law into Church courts; and the rule which the canonists still observe[1] gradually arose—namely, that where the canons are silent or obscure, if the matter under adjudication be of a spiritual nature, reference shall be made to the writings of the Fathers; but if it be of a secular nature, to the civil law. In England a line of great lawyers, commencing with Glanvile in the twelfth century, and including the names of Britton, Bracton, and Littleton, laboured to refine and harmonize the common law; and no other code was recognised in the King's courts. But in the Church courts the civil law, as already stated, was in use; and it was carefully studied, and degrees were given in it, at the two Universities.[1] At the Reformation the study of the canon law was abandoned at Oxford; the law of the land did not even yet appear to have been rationalized sufficiently for the purposes of academical study; and hence to this day the only legal degrees conferred by Oxford are in civil law (Bachelor and Doctor), a branch of learning the importance of which in legal education is, indeed, now fully recognized amongst us, but of which the actual authority and practical application are, we suppose, more limited in England than in any other European country. (Ortolan, "Hist. of Roman Law"; Hunter, "Roman Law"; Maine, "Ancient Law.")

CIVIL MARRIAGE. [SEE MARRIAGE.]

CLANDESTINE. [See IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE.]

CLARES. [See POOR CLARES.]

CLASSICS. The word is used here to denote the great writers of Greece and Rome whose works have survived, and it is the object of this article to sketch the opinion held by Catholics concerning them as a means of Christian education.

I. *The Patristic Period.*—In the early days of the Church the pagan literature of Greece and Rome was, apart from the Bible, the one and only means of liberal instruction, and to renounce the study of the classics would have meant renouncing all culture and forfeiting every natural means of influencing the educated world. Christians showed no disposition to adopt such a course. St. Paul himself quotes Menander (1 Cor. xv. 33); in the Acts of the Apostles a line from Aratus and Cleanthes is cited, as part of St. Paul's speech at Athens (Acts xvii. 28); and in the Epistle to Titus (i. 12) the evil character of the Cretans is given in the words of "their own prophet," Epimenides, or perhaps Callimachus. Irenaeus, though bred a Christian, was thoroughly familiar with Homer; and Tertullian ("De Idol." 10, PL. i. 675), fanatic though he was, admits that it is absolutely necessary for Christian children to attend the heathen schools of grammar. Clement of Alexandria recognized the high

[1] Soglia, lib. i. cap. 3.

[1] Among those present at the Convocation which condemned Wyclif, in 1382, were "doctores legum" (or "utriusque juris," or "juris canonici et civilis"), a bishop "vocatus incipiendum in jure civili," and "doctores decretorum" (or "in decretis") whose degree was in canon law alone. See *Fascic. Zizan.* p. 286.

importance, even from a theological point of view, of a classical education. He lays down the principle ("Strom." i. 5, PG, viii. 717) that philosophy is useful for piety, and adds that the ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα, *i.e.* liberal education, of which classical study was a chief part, were the proper introduction to philosophy. His extant works abundantly testify to his high appreciation of the classics. Origen taught the classics personally at Alexandria (Euseb. "H.E." vi. 2). He himself had acquired this literary knowledge under his father, a zealous Christian, and afterwards a martyr.

The zeal with which classical literature was studied in the Church after Constantine's time is apparent from the fact that Julian the Apostate (361–363) thought it worth while, as a means of annoying the Christians, to forbid the study of the classics in the schools of the religion which he hated. The Church was determined not to allow classical study to fall into disuse. The Christian literature, called into existence as a makeshift, was soon forgotten after freedom of instruction was restored (Socrates, "H. E." iii. 16). In the East, Gregory Nazianzen ("Or." 43, i. p. 777 in the Benedictine edition) and Basil ("De Leg. Libr. Gent." ed. Bened. ii. 173), in the West, Jerome ("Ep." 59[1] ad Paulin.) and Augustine ("Doctrin. Christ." ii. 29 *seq.*), vindicated the claims of classical learning. There is abundant evidence that these enlightened theories were carried out in practice. For example, St. Fulgentius, when a boy, by the desire of his pious mother, learnt Homer and selections from Menander by heart (Bolland. Jan. i. 33), and at an earlier date St. Augustine ("Civ. Dei" i. 3) takes for granted that boys at school learn Virgil. At the same time there were persons, some even high in authority, who showed a jealousy of classical learning, especially when cultivated by the clergy. Gregory Nazianzen, in the passage quoted above, admits that most Christians had an unjust prejudice (οἱ πολλοὶ Χριστιανῶν . . . κακῶς εἰδότες) against pagan learning (τὴν ἔξωθεν παίδευσιν), and St. Gregory the Great, in a letter to Desiderius, bishop in Gaul ("Ep." lib. xi. 54), says he has heard with horror that the bishop teaches literature ("grammaticam exponere"). Clearly, the Pope's objection was not merely to a bishop's employing himself in this way. "It cannot be," he says, "that the praises of Jupiter and Christ should proceed from the same mouth. Consider yourself how grievous and criminal a thing it is for a bishop to sing what would be unfit for a religious layman."[2]

[1] At least Jerome does so practically. He extols the classics as models of style, and quotes Cicero with high praise, besides Persius and Lucan.

[2] See, however, Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, v. p. 192 *seq.*, who shows that there are reasons for believing that Gregory's fixed judgment on classical literature was not so adverse as might appear from the quotation in the text. The story of his having the Palatine library "burnt" is an idle legend.

II. *The Monastic Schools.*—In two ways the position of learning underwent a change after the fall of the Roman empire. During the Patristic period the whole of ancient literature was comprised in the classics, whereas the monks of the great Benedictine period were able to look back on a long line of Christian Fathers, on a literature represented by such names as Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great. The pagan element had vanished from the face of Europe, or, where it remained, lingered only as a remnant, not of civilization, but of barbarism. Hence the classics were no longer the one and only means of literary cultivation outside of the Bible; there were other writers whom the educated world was content to revere. Again, education was now in the hands of the monks, and there was a natural feeling that devotion to classical studies might interfere with their religious engagements. Certainly Maitland, in his fascinating work on the "Dark Ages," has collected a number of passages from monastic writers which depreciate classical study. Thus Alcuin, when a boy, is said to have vowed that he would no longer prefer Virgil to the melody of the Psalms ("Dark Ages," p. 181). About the middle of the eleventh century the rigid St. Peter Damian blames monks who "go after the common herd of grammarians" and prefer the rule of Donatus to that of St. Benedict (*ib.* p. 184). "It grieves me," says the author of the famous "Gemma Animae," perhaps about 1120, "when I consider in my mind the number of persons who, having lost their senses, are not ashamed to give their utmost labour to the abominable figments of the poets and the captious arguments of the philosophers. . . . Moreover," so this charitable and enlightened author proceeds, "how is the soul profited by the strife of Hector, or the argumentation of Plato, or the poems of Virgil, or the elegies of Ovid, who now, with their like, are gnashing their teeth in the prison of the infernal Babylon under the cruel tyranny of Pluto?" (*ib.* 185). It is plain, however, that these very denunciations witness to the zeal for classical study in the monastic period. Long before, Origen ("In Levit." Hom. VII. tom. ii. p. 227, PG, xii. 490) had compared heathen literature to the beautiful captive whom the Hebrew might espouse after her head had been shaved and her nails pared; and this allegorical fancy, as Maitland himself allows, was the standing excuse among mediaeval monks for indulgence in secular literature, and he gives an extract from the letter of an abbot, written about 1150, which treats the matter in a more reasonable and manly tone. "Nor can I bear," he writes, "that that noble genius, those splendid imaginations, such great beauties both of style and language, should be lost in oblivion" (*ib.* p. 175). But we can learn more from inquiring what the actual

curriculum of the Benedictine schools really was, and to this question Cardinal Newman has furnished a full answer: "In the monastic school the language, of course, was Latin; and in Latin literature first came Virgil; next, Lucan and Statius; Terence, Sallust, Cicero; Horace, Persius, Juvenal. . . . Thus we find that the monks of St. Alban's, near Mayence, had standing lectures in Cicero, Virgil, and other authors. In the school of Paderborn there were lectures in Horace, Virgil, Statius, and Sallust. . . . Gerbert, afterwards Sylvester the Second, after lecturing his class in logic, brought it back again to Virgil, Statius, Terence, Juvenal, Persius, Horace, and Lucan. A work is extant of St. Hildebert's, supposed to be a school exercise; it is scarcely more than a cento of Cicero, Seneca, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Terence, and other writers. Horace he must have known by heart" (Newman's "Historical Sketches," ii. p. 460). Nor were the lessons forgotten in maturer age. "Let us turn," says Newman, "to the familiar correspondence of some of those most famous Benedictines, and we shall see what were the pursuits of their leisure and the indulgences of their recreation. Alcuin, in his letters to his friends, quotes Virgil again and again; he also quotes Horace, Terence, Pliny. . . . Lupus quotes Horace, Cicero, Suetonius, Virgil, and Martial. Gerbert quotes Virgil, Cicero, Horace, Terence, and Sallust. Petrus Cellensis quotes Horace, Seneca, and Terence. Hildebert quotes Virgil and Cicero. . . . Hincmar of Rheims quotes Horace. Paschasius Radbert's favourite authors were Cicero and Terence. Abbo of Fleury was especially familiar with Terence, Sallust, Virgil, and Horace; Peter the Venerable with Virgil and Horace. Hepidann of St. Gall took Sallust as a model of style" (*ib.* p. 464 *seq.*). In their correspondence the monks of that age were constantly begging the loan of classical manuscripts; they raise questions of grammar, and show "a loving curiosity about the niceties of language." Their ignorance of Greek was their misfortune and not their fault, for they eagerly seized the rare opportunities of learning it. Thus Theodore of Tarsus became Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century, and taught it to the Anglo-Saxon youth (Bede, "H.E." iv. 2), while Rabanus Maurus is said to have learned it from Theophilus of Ephesus. As to Latin style of that period, it falls far short of the strict classical standard, but "it is good Latin both in structure and in idiom. At any rate, the change is wonderful when we pass from the Benedictine centuries to the Dominican which followed" (Newman, p. 470).

III. *The Period of the Mediaeval Universities.*—In the later Middle Ages, the period of the universities, 1150–1350, it seems to be admitted on all hands that classical study, though it did not wholly perish, languished and decayed. The old tradition was maintained by John of Salisbury and his disciple Peter of Blois (died about 1200). In the college of Navarre, founded at Paris in 1304, the classics, according to the testimony of Peter d'Ailly, were studied, and Gerson, educated there, shows a considerable acquaintance with the ancients. But the ruling passion was for dialectic or philosophy, not for grammar—*i.e.* literature. The ancients were valued for their matter, not for their style; and Aristotle, read in barbarous translations, ruled the schools. The faculty of arts was separated from that of grammar, and in 1456 the "grammarians" were excluded from the privileges of universities and the title of "regents."

Everyone knows the triumph which the scholars of the Renaissance obtained over the old Scholasticism; how the Greek Muses, driven from their ancient homes, found refuge in Italy; how the "new learning" brought new insight into antiquity, with a marvellous mastery of the Latin tongue, and how powerful it was for good and evil. All this does not concern us here, except so far as these new influences affected the Church. "In itself," says Hergenröther ("Kirchengeschichte," ii. p. 172), "the new tendency was not hurtful to the Church or theology, but, on the contrary, beneficial. For that reason it was encouraged by Popes, bishops, and theologians." After the strife between the Humanists and theologians had broken out, the Church maintained the classical discipline in her schools; nay, the seventh rule of the Index promulgated by Pius IV. in 1564, after prohibiting licentious books, says of classical authors, even if of immoral character, "propter sermonis elegantiam et proprietatem permittuntur, nulla tamen ratione pueris praelegendi sunt." This implies *a fortiori* that these writings, when free from moral stain or when objectionable passages have been removed, are a valuable instrument of education. The Jesuits, in their "Ratio Studiorum," adopted this principle, and attained brilliant success as teachers of the classics. The "Delphin Classics" and the "Gradus ad Parnassum" may be mentioned among books familiar to the Protestant schoolboy forty years ago which were due to the Society. Among works of a higher class we may mention the famous book of the Jesuit Viger, "De Praecipuis Graecae Dictionis Idiotismis" (Paris, 1628). It appeared in numerous editions, it was perfected by the care of Dutch scholars, and the great Hermann edited it with annotations of his own. The study of the classics is still pursued at all the higher Catholic schools. In France, various provincial councils (*e.g.* that of Lyons in 1850) have recommended that the students for the priesthood in seminaries should read treatises of the Fathers as well as

the heathen classics. The Abbé Gaume and Veuillot, then editor of the Paris "Univers," wished to exclude the study of the classics altogether. The cause of humane letters was defended by the celebrated Bishop Dupanloup; and when Veuillot, whose journal had been prohibited by the Archbishop of Paris, appealed to Rome, Pius IX., in an encyclical of 1853 to the French episcopate, expressed his wish that the youth should be trained in the knowledge of the best heathen as well as of the best Christian authors; the former, however, were to be expurgated, if necessary, for moral reasons. Some zealots, such as Father Ventura in his Lent discourses at the Tuileries for 1857, tried to maintain the war against the classics without contradicting the encyclical, but the controversy was virtually ended.[1]

(On the whole history, Daniel, "Etudes Classiques"; Pohle in the "Kirchenlexikon"; Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars." For the Patristic period, Petavius "Dogm. Theol. Prolegom." vii.; Stephensky, in Kraus' "Real-Encyklop." For the Benedictine period, Newman, "Hist. Sketches." ii.; Guizot, "Hist. Civil." vol. ii. For the Renaissance, Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes"; Guiraud, "L'Eglise Romaine et les Origines de la Renaissance." For the modern controversy, Hergenröther. Neander treats of the subject incidentally, but always with learning, and in that Christian and kindly spirit which is peculiarly his own.)

CLAUSURA. [See ENCLOSURE.]

CLEMENTINES. The seventh and last of the sections into which the old canon law or Decretals of mediaeval Popes is divided. It follows the five sections known as the Decretals of Gregory IX. and the additional one added by Boniface VIII. The Clementines (so styled because issued by Clement V., 1305–1316) are divided into five books. They are notable because embodying the enactments of the great Oecumenical Council of Vienne (A.D. 1311). See "Corpus Juris Canonici" (best edition, by Friedberg, Leipzig, 1881).

CLEMENTINES, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE. Certain apocryphal writings attributed to St. Clement of Rome, of which the chief are: (1) the "Homilies"; (2) the "Recognitions" (*ἀναγνώσεις*); and (3) the "Epitome." The last-named is an abridgment of the Homilies, with some additions from other sources. We shall here confine our attention to the Homilies (H.) and the Recognitions (R.).

The history of St. Clement of Rome, his conversion by St. Peter, his travels with that Apostle, and his successive "recognitions" of the different members of his family, have formed the subject of various writings, or rather of various editions (revised, enlarged, or abridged) of one work. The story itself would take too much of our space; but we may note that a large part of it is occupied with the contest between St. Peter and Simon Magus. The doctrine is mainly Judaeo-Christian: the unity of God is insisted on, but He is endowed with anthropomorphic attributes; He is the parent rather than the creator of the world; the Son is not God, nor is He almighty. The hierarchy is in full being, for St. Peter ordains bishops, priests, and deacons, in each city. Nothing is said of the Holy Ghost. No mention is made of St. Paul, though his Epistles are freely used. In like manner no book of the New Testament is named; but all four Gospels are quoted, especially St. Matthew.

In the last century Baur and the Tübingen school based their theory of the origin of Christianity on the view that the Clementines represented the Christianity of the Twelve Apostles, and was opposed to the "Paulinist" (Simon Magus) heresy. Without going as far as this, some Anglican scholars (Lightfoot, Salmon, Bright, F. W. Puller) maintain that the Clementines are the origin of the notion that St. Peter was the first bishop of Rome. We need not here enter into the refutation of these views; the earliest dates now assigned to the writings are opposed to them. "It is now almost universally held (after Hort, Harnack, Waitz) that H. and R. are two versions of an original Clementine romance, which was longer than either, and embraced most of the contents of both" (Dom Chapman). This original writing was formerly held to belong to the Apostolic age. "At the present time the tendency is to place the first sources in the second century; the fundamental writing to have been drawn up towards the middle of the third century; and the final writings (H. and R.) at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. These different dates are more or less probable, but all are hypothetical and depend upon postulates or precedent conclusions which are themselves hypothetical" (Nau). Dom Chapman, who has made a special study of the subject, holds much later dates. "The date of the original [not the sources ?] is fixed as after Nicaea, 325, probably *c.* 330; that of H. may be anywhere in the second half of the fourth century. The Eunomian interpolator is about 365–70, and the compilation of R. about 370–80." He is also of opinion that the author of the original, though really an Arian, was probably a Catholic in name. (For the literature of the subject see Harnack, "Chronologie," ii., and Bardenhewer, "Les Pères de l'Eglise" (Fr. tr.), i. 436; Nau in DThC; Dom Chapman, "Origen and Pseudo-Clement" in "Journal of Theol. Studies"; "The Date of the Clementines" in "Zeitschr. für Neu-Test. Wiss."; and art. in "Cath. Enc."; Salmon, in "Dict. Chr. Biog."; Bigg, "The Clementine Homilies";

[1] The facts in the last paragraph are from Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. p. 989.

Witz, whose writings have had great influence in postponing the dates of the Clementines, "Die Pseudoclementinen" in "Text. und Untersuch.")

CLERGY, BENEFIT OF. [See BENEFIT OF CLERGY.]

CLERGY, CLERICAL STATE, CLERIC, CLERK, &c. The clerical state is the rank or condition of those who are separated from the mass of the faithful, attached in a special manner to the divine service, and made capable of administering the powers of the Church.

The word is of course derived from the Greek κλῆρος, a lot, a word which frequently occurs in its literal sense in the LXX and New Testament. But how did the word "lot" come to denote "the clergy"? The answer to this question is very far from easy. St. Jerome's beautiful explanation, that the clergy are so called because the Lord himself is the lot, *i.e.* the portion, of clerics, does not seem to be borne out by the history of the word. The Pontifical, it is true, evidently alludes to this mystical signification, and no one will deny that such an application may most fitly and naturally be made; but it is quite another thing to maintain that the name was first given among Christians for the reason assigned by Jerome. The following seems to us on the whole the way in which the term "clergy" gradually assumed a technical and restricted sense. The notion of lot easily led to the sense of office allotted. Thus St. Peter says of Judas,[1] "he received the lot of this ministry" (τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης), and Irenaeus says of Pope Hyginus that he held "the ninth lot of episcopal succession from the Apostles" (ἔνατον κλῆρον); of Eleutherus that he obtained "the lot of the episcopate."[2] A little later than Irenaeus—viz. in Clement of Alexandria[3] and Tertullian[4]—we meet with the word in its modern sense. The former relates of St. John that he travelled from Ephesus through the surrounding country, "in some places to establish bishops, in others to set up entire churches, in others to admit some one individual to the ranks of the clergy (κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων) of those who were signified to him by the Spirit": *i.e.* when a college of presbyters, &c., already existed, St. John admitted a fresh member. Tertullian speaks of those who are puffed up "adversus clerum"—*i.e.*, as is clear from the context, "against the clergy." Thus the word appears to have meant (1) a lot; (2) an office allotted; (3) as early at least as the close of the second century, those who held the office, or perhaps to whom the office was allotted—viz. the clergy. It may be objected that the technical use of the word is much earlier, and that we find an example in 1 Pet. v. 3, where we read in the advice given to the "ancients," "neither as domineering over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart." But "dominantes in cleris" (κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων) cannot have the meaning given to it in the Rheims version. This is shewn both by the connection and by the fact that the word is in the plural. Estius calls attention to each of these points and interprets the passage as a prohibition forbidding the "ancients" to domineer over the "lots," or congregations placed under their care. The word "cleris" is parallel and equivalent to the "gregis" or "flock" which occurs in the latter half of the verse.[1]

While, however, the name is wanting in the New Testament, the thing intended by the name is there. The very fact that the epistles of St. Paul mention bishops who "are to rule the Church of God," and prelates whom the faithful are to "obey" and to whom they are to "be subject," is proof conclusive that the distinction between clergy and laity was fully recognized by the Apostles. The Church did but act in accordance with the revelation entrusted to her, when she separated the clergy from the laity by outward marks, and gave certain privileges to the former. [For the privileges, decorum, &c., see CLERK.]

CLERICI VAGANTES. Ecclesiastical law has required from the earliest times that before admission to holy orders a cleric shall possess a title—[see TITLE]: that is, a benefice sufficient for his subsistence, or else a patrimony, belonging to him in his own right, and competent to support him. But this requirement was often waived in particular cases, especially when a bishop wished to send priests to a remote and unsettled part of his diocese, or to preach to the heathen in a neighbouring country. Such priests would, in the majority of cases, obtain settled cures in the districts whither they went; but those who did not succeed in doing so had no choice but to return home and put themselves at the disposal of their bishops. Thus a class of "roving" or unattached priests was gradually formed, the members of which as a general rule could be usefully employed in supplementing the regular diocesan work. But it was inevitable that abuses should arise out of such a state of things; and to put an end to these the Council of Trent decreed that "no one should in future be ordained who was not attached to that church or pious institution for the needs or convenience of which he was selected, so that he might discharge his functions there, and not wander about having no fixed abode."[2] (Ferraris, *Clericus, Ordo, Titulus.*)

[1] Acts i. 17.
[2] Iren. i. 27, 1; iii. 3, 3, *PG*, vii. 687, 851.
[3] Clem. Al. *De Divit. Servando*, c. 42. *PG*, ix. 648.
[4] Tertull. *De Monog.* c. 12, *PL*, ii. 947.

[1] This explanation agrees on the whole with that given by Lightfoot, *Commentary on Philippians*. Baur (*Kirchengesch. der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 266) makes the word mean (1) lot or order; (2) rank or station—in 1 Pet. v. 3, "not domineering over the different ranks"; (3) the rank *par excellence*, *i.e.* the clergy.
[2] Sess. xxiii. c. 16, De Ref.

CLERK. In a general sense, and when we are considering who are entitled to enjoy clerical privileges, the name of cleric or clerk is applicable to the whole body of the secular clergy, including persons in minor orders (Council of Trent, sess. xxiii. c. 6, De Ref.); also to monks and nuns, to lay institutes following a religious rule, to hermits leading their life under authority, to the Knights of Malta, &c. In the stricter sense, and when penalties are under consideration, the name is only applicable to the inferior ranks of the secular clergy, and does not include bishops, canons, or any ecclesiastical dignitary.

In the Middle Ages "clerk" was used loosely for "man of learning," the latter class being almost wholly comprised within the former. Thus Henry I. of England was called Beauclerk, and Chaucer writes—

> "Fraunceys Petrark, the laureate poete,
> Highte[1] this *clerk*";

and Wyclif, or some other,[2] says, "Lincolne [Robert Grossetête] and other *clerkis* proven," where all that is meant is "learned men."

Till recent times, secular rulers and legislators recognized the fundamental character of this distinction, as investing the Catholic clergy with certain immunities, and furnishing a sufficient ground for a separate system of ecclesiastical law, to which clerical things and persons should be subject. [See PRIVILEGE, IMMUNITY.] The tribunals in which this law was administered were the *forum externum* of the Church, and all clerics, high and low, enjoyed the *privilegium fori*—that is, the right of trial according to the canon law. The various national codes having, through the constant pressure of Christianity and the action of the canon law, become in most things rational and humane, modern statesmen tend to the doctrine that all subjects of the State should be treated alike—that the law should be the same for all, and civil burdens be borne by all indiscriminately. Yet the failure to recognize a distinction of status which is real and fundamental, and rests on divine institution, can but lead, wherever found, to trouble, confusion, and the depravation of morals. If, in every Catholic country having the conscription, the so-called Liberals succeeded in destroying the clerical immunity from military service, a great decrease would thin the ranks of the clergy, accompanied by unspeakable distress and damage to Christian souls. The Church in Europe has lost the tithe, the greater portion of her property, and much of the consideration which she formerly received from society; the mixed motives which once tended to fill the ranks of the clergy no longer operate; the labourers are few, and their fair hire is withheld from them.

According to the canon law, the dress of the cleric must be sober in form and colour. Trade and secular business are forbidden to him. He is required to use great caution in frequenting the company of the other sex, and must not be present at public balls or masquerades. In the Decretum there is a prohibition against the attendance of clerics at stage plays of every description. But in the course of ages a contrary custom has arisen, which causes this prohibition no longer to bind under mortal sin, unless enforced by some diocesan or provincial law. Gambling and games of hazard are forbidden to clerics, though some modification has been introduced in later times, and an approved canonist quoted by Ferraris[1] says that "clerics who play seldom and moderately, for amusement's sake, are altogether excused from sin if the diocesan law does not prohibit to them games of chance, and local custom sanctions it." Clerics must not carry arms without just and necessary cause; hence shooting, unless for the sake of procuring food, would seem not to be allowed; but a moderate indulgence in hunting and fishing is not forbidden.

Till quite lately, the server at Mass used to be called the "clerk," even though a layman, by English and Irish Catholics, because he did clerk's work; just as the boys at Mass are called "acolytes," though not really so, because they do acolytes' work. (Ferraris, *Clericus*; Taunton, *Cleric.*)

CLERKS, REGULAR. The idea of a Regular Clerk is that of a combination of functions: that a man, while as clerk he converses with the world, should by obeying a rule of life attain to the virtues of a monk. This combination is generally ascribed to St. Augustine. The history of St. Laurence shows us that great and saintly characters could arise among the clergy of the Roman Church in the third century; but we hear of no definite rule of life to which they all conformed. In the fourth century the life of cities, especially in the eastern portions of the empire, seems to have been so turbulent, so full of distractions and alarms, that it would have been difficult to introduce in any urban clergy a peaceful methodical plan for the distribution of their hours. About the end of the fourth age Roman Africa was very peaceful and prosperous; and when St. Augustine, in 395, was elected to the bishopric of Hippo, it seemed to him that the religious interests of the city would best be promoted if all its clergy were to live under the same roof with himself; minister, each in his own place and station, to the spiritual needs of the population; and observe a common way of life, so far as was compatible with his ministration, in what regarded prayer, diet, sleep, and other matters. The saint, with that force of character and intelligence which distinguished him in all things, soon carried out

[1] Was called.
[2] *Unprinted English Works, &c.*, Matthew, 1880.

[1] Layman.

his purpose; see his "De Moribus Eccl. Cath.," and the Life by Possidius. "He harmonized," says Thomassin,[1] "in a wonderful union the functions of clerics with the virtues of monks." This is considered to have been the first original and pattern of all bodies of regular clerks and canons that have since existed in the Church [AUGUSTINIAN CANONS, PREMONSTRATENSIANS, &c.]. Under the former designation fall the Regular Clerks of Somascha, founded by St. Jerome Aemiliani, the Barnabites (see that article), and other communities.

CLINICAL BAPTISM. A name given in the early Church to baptism received on the bed of sickness, those who received it being called *clinici* or κλινικοί. The first notice which we have of baptism so conferred is contained in a letter of Pope Cornelius written about the middle of the third century to Fabius of Antioch. The subject is important from two distinct points of view, for it throws light both on the doctrine and the discipline of the early Church.

With regard to the former, the custom of conferring clinical baptism proves that baptism given, not by immersion, but by sprinkling the recipient, or by pouring water over him (by aspersion or perfusion), although unusual, was still considered valid. This validity is clearly laid down by Cyprian, in Ep. lxix. 12, ed. Hartel, p. 762, when he answers the question whether those who had not been "washed with the water of salvation, but had had it poured over them," were "Christians in the strict sense" (*legitimi Christiani*). He replies that we need not be concerned because the baptized person in case of sickness has been sprinkled or had water poured over him (instead of being immersed), since in any case he receives the "grace of the Lord."

However, the discipline of the Church made a difference between *clinici* and other Christians, and did not allow the former to be ordained, on the ground that they probably had received the sacrament rather from fear than from a higher motive. In the letter already mentioned Cornelius states that it was against the law for one who had received clinical baptism to enter the ranks of the clergy.[2] The Council of Neocaesarea (can. 12), in the early part of the fourth century, renews this ancient prohibition, making, however, an exception in the case of *clinici* who signalized themselves by zeal, and for times when there was great want of clergy. This canon was received into the "Corpus Juris," c. 1. Dist. 57.[3]

CLOISTER, CLOSE. An enclosed space, usually square, surrounded by covered passages, which have continuous walls on the outer side, and rows of pillars on the inner side facing the square, in connection with monastic, cathedral, or collegiate buildings. We do not possess any in this country of earlier date than the thirteenth century. They doubtless first appeared in monasteries, furnishing monks with the means of exercise under cover in wet weather. The interior space was sometimes used for a cemetery, as at Salisbury. Schools are said to have been held in them, though they can scarcely, at any rate in this climate, have been very suitable for the purpose. In no country in Europe have so many fine specimens of Gothic cloisters been preserved as in England. That at Gloucester is of remarkable beauty; the cathedrals of Durham, York, and Lincoln, and New College, Oxford, furnish fine examples. The Carthusian Monastery at Parkminster (Sussex) possesses a splendid modern cloister. [See ENCLOSURE.]

CLOSE. [See CLOISTER.]

CLUNY, CONGREGATION OF. This branch of the Benedictine order attained in the Middle Ages to a pitch of greatness and influence which entitle it to a separate article. It was founded by Berno, abbot of Gigny, in 912, with the assistance of William, Duke of Aquitaine, who endowed the new monastery with his whole domains, forests, meadows, vineyards, &c., at Cluny, fifteen miles from Macon-sur-Saône. A succession of great and saintly abbots—St. Odo, Aymard, St. Mayeul, St. Odilo, and St. Hugh—procured for the Abbey of Cluny a world-wide reputation, great wealth and political influence, and a filiation of many hundred monasteries. The bond of dependence was strictly maintained in all the houses founded from or connected with Cluny; in nearly every instance they were governed by priors, not abbots. Urban II., the Pope who preached the first crusade, had been educated at Cluny under St. Hugh. The great Earl of Warenne, the friend and companion in arms of the Conqueror, founded the first Cluniac house in England, at Lewes, in 1077, dedicating the church in honour of St. Pancras. Under Peter the Venerable, the ninth abbot, the contemporary and friend of St. Bernard, Cluny reached its apogee. Peter drew up a reformed rule; two thousand convents recognized him as their superior; and in 1131 the Pope himself, Innocent II., came to Cluny and consecrated the new church, the masterpiece of Gothic architecture and one of the wonders of the world. At the Revolution, the town of Cluny bought the church from the Republican Government, and pulled it down; nothing but the two towers and a few other fragments were left standing. Some time afterwards the people of Cluny invited Napoleon to visit their town; the emperor replied, "No, no, you are Vandals."

There were thirty-nine Cluniac houses in

[1] *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina*, i. 3, 2.
[2] Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43, 17.
[3] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 332.

England at the time of the suppression;[1] the list is given below.[2] Only one was an abbey—Bermondsey; the rest were priories or cells. (Hélyot; Hefele in "Kirchenlex."; Tanner's "Notitia.")

COADJUTOR. One who helps a prelate, or a priest holding a benefice in discharging the duties of his bishopric or benefice. Coadjutorship may be of two kinds: one temporary and revocable, allowed on account of sickness or other incapacity, and implying no right of succession; the other perpetual and irrevocable, and carrying with it the right to succeed the person coadjuted. In this latter sense it is expressly forbidden by the Council of Trent[3]; nevertheless the Pope, for special causes, sometimes concedes it, the plenitude of his apostolic power enabling him legally to dispense with the law. If a coadjutor is required for a parish priest, it is for the bishop of the diocese to nominate one; if for a bishop, the nomination belongs to the Pope, any usage to the contrary notwithstanding. In the case of a priest, if the incapacity is temporary or curable, the bishop must appoint a vicar or substitute, not a coadjutor. The various infirmities which justify coadjutorship—serious and incurable illness, leprosy, loss of speech, &c.—are specified in the canon law. In the case of a bishop, the term "administrator" is applied to a prelate empowered to replace him in the government of his diocese, his own jurisdiction being, by authority of the Holy See, wholly or partially suspended. A "Suffragan," or more correctly "Auxiliary," on the other hand merely assists the Bishop in things appertaining to his ministry (as Confirmations, Ordinations, &c.). He has no jurisdiction. At the present time, the term "coadjutor" is generally restricted to an "auxiliary" having right of succession. Various points affecting the precedence, dignity, and ceremonial attaching to a coadjutor bishop have been settled from time to time by the Congregation of Rites. (Ferraris, *Coadjutor*; Taunton.)

[1] The Cluniac houses in England were originally subject to the abbot of Cluny, on which account many of them were suppressed in the fourteenth century as "alien priories." Those that remained were gradually "discharged from all manner of subjection and obedience" to the mother house. Tanner's *Notitia*, xv.

[2] Nunneries are distinguished by an asterisk; cells by the letter C.

Barnstaple (Dev.)
Bermondsey (Sur.)
Brotton Monk, near Barnsley (York.)
Bromeholm, near North Walsham (Norf.)
Castleacre (Norf.)
Clifford (Heref.), C.
Daventry (Northants)
Derby, C.
Dudley (Worc.), C.
Hitcham (Norf.), C.
Holme (Dors.), C.
Horksley (Essex), C.
Horton, near Hythe (Kent), C.
Kershall (Lanc.), C.
Kerswell (Dev.), C.
Lenton (Notts)
Lewes (Suss.)
Malpas (Monm.), C.
Melton Mowbray, C.
Mendham (Suff.)
Monkton Farley (Wilts), C.
Montacute (Som.)
Normansberch, near Fakenham (Norf.), C.
Northampton, St. Andr.
Northampton, De la Pre*
Pontefract (York.)
Prittlewell (Essex)
Slewsham, near Methwold (Norf.), C.
Stanesgate, near Maldon (Essex)
Thetford (Norf.)
Wangford (Suff.), C.
Wenlock (Salop)

[3] Sess. xxv. c. 7, De Ref.

COAT, THE HOLY (*tunica inconsutilis, der heilige Rock, la sainte Robe*). This celebrated relic is in the treasury of the cathedral of Treves (Trier), and a very ancient tradition asserts it to be identical with the seamless coat which our Saviour wore at the time of His Passion. The Empress Helena, having come into possession of it in the Holy Land, is said to have given it to the city of Treves, where she resided for a considerable time. The earliest written testimony to this effect is found in the *Gesta Trevirorum*, a chronicle of the first half of the twelfth century, where Helena is said to have presented the relic to the church during the episcopate of Agritius (314–334). Several other notices of the Holy Coat are found in documents mounting up to, or nearly to, the twelfth century. But the most remarkable and interesting piece of evidence in support of the authenticity of the relic is an ancient ivory belonging to the cathedral (lost for some time, but recovered in 1844), on which the Empress is figured, seated at the church door, and awaiting the arrival of a procession closed by a chariot in which are two ecclesiastics guarding a chest. Above the chariot is the face of Christ, by which some relation between our Lord and the contents of the chest seems to be indicated. This ivory was examined by the Archaeological Society of Frankfort in 1846, with the result of fixing its date at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century.

We read of the translation of the relic from the choir to the high-altar of the cathedral in 1196. After an interval of more than three hundred years, it was exposed in 1512, and on several other occasions in the sixteenth century, for the veneration of the faithful. During the wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was deposited for safety in the castle of Ehrenbreitstein, or at Augsburg. In 1810, with the permission of Napoleon, the bishop of Treves, Mgr. Mannay brought the sacred relic back from Augsburg to his own city; and, in spite of the confusion of the times, a multitude of pilgrims numbering over two hundred thousand visited Treves to celebrate this joyful restoration. But the most striking and successful exposition was that of 1844, when eleven bishops and more than a million of the laity flocked to Treves from all sides during the period (from August 18 to October 6) for which the Holy Coat was exhibited. Several miraculous cures were reported, and the joy and piety of the believing throng must have been a very moving sight. Certain unstable Catholics, with a secret leaning to rationalism, took offence at the proceedings, and wrote against the authenticity of the Holy Coat. Among these were Czerski, an ecclesiastic from Posen, and Ronge, a suspended priest of Breslau. A long controversy arose, in the

course of which these men seceded from the Church and founded a sect which they called the "German Catholic Church." The movement made a great noise at the time, but is now seldom heard of. The well-known Catholic writer, Görres, published a pamphlet on the question, entitled "The Pilgrimage of Treves," in 1845.

There is another "Holy Coat," preserved at Argenteuil. The earliest reference to this relic is in a character of Hugh of Rouen (1156) in which it is called the "garment of the Child Jesus." This is understood to be the *tunica inconsutilis* of Jn. xix. 23. But the upholders of the other tradition maintain that the two garments are distinct, viz. the *tunica inconsutilis* at Treves and the *cappa pueri Jesu* at Argenteuil. (Willems, "La Sainte Robe de Trèves et la Rélique d'Argenteuil"; "Der Hl. Rock zu Trier"; Jacquemot, "La Tunique sans couture de N.S. J.-Ch. conservée dans l'Église d'Argenteuil"; Lauchert in "Cath. Enc." *Holy Coat*; Marx-Beissel in "Kirchenlex," *Rock, der heilige.*)

CODEX CANONUM ECCL. AFRICANAE. This collection of canons, 138 in number, consists substantially of the disciplinary decisions of the great African council which sat at Carthage between 419 and 422. Dionysius Exiguus [see CANON LAW] admitted the greater part of them into his first collection. The synod *in Trullo* (691) approved and adopted these canons, with those of many other councils, as suitable for use in the East. They were first published at Paris by Justeau in 1615; Mansi included them in his collection; they have been discussed by the brothers Ballerini, De Marca, &c. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 201 *sqq.*)

CODEX CANONUM ECCL. UNIVERSAE. Under this title the two Justeau (1610–1661) published the canons of which the Fathers of Chalcedon made chief use (namely, those of Nicaea, Ancyra, Neo-Caesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople II., and Ephesus) on the implied assumption that they intended to, and did in fact, erect these canons, along with their own twenty-nine, into a code receivable and binding throughout the Church. For such an assumption there was no foundation. The collection contains altogether 207 canons.

COENA DOMINI. [See BULL IN COENA DOMINI.]

COENOBITE. St. Jerome distinguishes coenobites from anchorites or hermits. He translates the former word by "in communi viventes." The word is derived from κοινὸς βίος, common life. The place in which they lived was called coenobium or κοινόβιον, and the superior, κοινοβιάρχης. Coenobites were also named συνοδῖται, which answers to the Latin *conventuales*. The word coenobite is thus equivalent to our word "monk." (Kraus, "Real-Encykl.")

COGNATE; COLLATERAL. [See CONSANGUINITY.]

COLLATION TO A BENEFICE. This, as we have seen [BISHOP, II.], is a right ordinarily belonging to bishops. It may be either free and voluntary (*collatio libera*), or restricted to the institution of a clerk presented by a third person (*collatio necessaria, non libera*). Collation by lay persons is null, except in a few cases where, by a special privilege granted by the Holy See, a king or an abbess confers a particular benefice as the procurator or vicar of the Pope. [See BENEFICE.]

The right of conferring the higher ecclesiastical dignities is now in the greater part of Europe regulated by Concordat between the Holy See and the respective Governments. In Austria the Emperor has the right of nominating to most canonries; occasionally this right is exercised by the municipality.

"The rulers of the Church," says Soglia, "confer benefices by a triple right, plenary, ordinary, or delegated: the Pope by his plenary, the bishops by their ordinary, cardinals and others holding a Papal indult by their delegated right." (Soglia, "Instit. Jur. Can." iii. 2, 18.)

COLLATION. [See FAST.]

COLLECT (*collecta*) occurs in several senses in ecclesiastical writers. (1) It signifies "collection." Thus St. Paul mentions the "collectae quae fiunt apud sanctos," where the Greek has λογία (1 Cor. xvi. 1). (2) For the assembly of the faithful σύναξις. Thus we meet with "collectam agere," "adesse ad collectam," &c. Hence (3) for the prayer said in the Mass after the Gloria and before the Epistle.[1] The name so used (*collectio* or *collecta*) is found in the Mozarabic Missal and in the old Sacramentaries. Many of the collects now said in the Mass were composed by St. Gelasius or St. Gregory.

Originally where more than one collect was said they were separated by the chant of a Lesson and Psalm-verses as now on Ember-Saturdays. The custom of multiplying them as at present is a consequence of the substituting one Mass or Office for two or more usual in ancient times when Feasts fell on a Sunday or coincided with one another. In certain churches, chiefly in France, the collect was formerly followed by certain formulae styled "laudes" or "acclamations" chanted by clergy and people together, hailing the Pope, Emperor, &c., and wishing them prosperity and long life. This practice is now restricted to the closing ceremonial of Councils and Provincial Synods. [See COUNCIL OF TRENT; "The Four Westminster Synods, &c."]

[1] "Ideo Collecta dicitur, quia populo in unum congregato et collecto recitatur, vel quia sacerdos legatione apud Deum pro omnibus fungens omnium vota in unum colligit, vel quia ex selectis S. Scripturæ et Ecclesiæ verbis compendiosa brevitate colligitur, vel quia omnes collectis animis affectus suos et mentem ad Deum attollunt." Card. Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* II. 5, § 3.

Almost all the collects are addressed to the Father, and end with the words "through our Lord Jesus Christ," &c.; only a few, and those of recent date, are addressed to the Son; the one example of a Collect addressed directly to the Holy Ghost is in the Roman Pontifical in the ceremony of the religious profession of a monk, prefatory to the Blessing of an Abbot. These collects follow one another each addressed to one of the Divine Persons. "The Mass," says Cardinal Bona, "represents the oblation by which Christ offered Himself to the Father, and therefore the prayers of the liturgy are directed to the Father Himself." (Benedict XIV. "De Missa," ii. 5; Fortescue, "The Mass," 244 *sqq.*)

COLLECTION. The word is now generally taken to mean offerings in money made during services in church. As noted above [COLLECT (1)] "collectae" are enjoined by St. Paul to be made "upon the first day of the week"; and as this day was the day for the "synaxis," or assembly, it is reasonable to suppose that the collections were made on that occasion, though not necessarily during the liturgy. The purpose of these collections was for the support of the clergy and the poor (1 Cor. ix. 7–11; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 17–18; for the poor, Acts iv. 34–35; vi. 1, &c.). In the course of time a regular system of distribution was introduced. As early as the pontificate of Pope Simplicius (475) the amount was divided into four parts: one for the clergy, one for the poor, one for the upkeep of the church, and one for the bishop. This was the arrangement made by Gregory the Great when he was consulted on the subject by St. Augustine of Canterbury (Bede, I. xxvii.). These collections were originally quite distinct from the offerings of bread and wine and other materials made during the Mass. Far larger quantities of these were contributed than were required for consumption at the Mass; and the surplus went for the support of the clergy. This fact and the fact that the faithful began to substitute money for the offerings in kind, led to the amalgamation of the two into the offertory as we now know it. During the Middle Ages in England it was called the "mass-penny." The mode of making collections and the disposal of the proceeds is regulated by custom and the statutes of provincial and diocesan synods. (Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; "Kirchenlex." *Collecten*; Gihr, "The Mass," Eng. tr. 496–514; Fourneret in DThC, *Biens Ecclésiastiques.*)

COLLEGE. *Collegia, i.e.* corporations or guilds of persons united in pursuit of a common object, were common in the Roman empire from its commencement. The Government took cognisance of, and controlled them. The Christians of the second and third centuries succeeded in evading for a considerable time laws directly adverse to them by representing their associations as burial-clubs, a kind of *Collegia* specially privileged under the Roman Emperors. Hence the importance given in early ecclesiastical history to the "coemeteria" and catacombs. (Ferraris, *Collegium.*)

COLLEGE, THE ENGLISH. [See ENGLISH COLLEGE, ROME.]

COLLEGE, THE IRISH. [See IRISH COLLEGE, ROME.]

COLLEGE, THE ROMAN. [See ROMAN COLLEGE.]

COLLEGE, THE SCOTCH. [See SCOTS' COLLEGE, ROME.]

COLLEGIATE CHURCH. After the practice had become general for the clergy of cathedral churches to live in common, under the rule formulated by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816), and with the title of canons, the churches of many large towns, besides those which were the residences of bishops, adopted a similar organisation, and were called collegiate churches. [See CANON.] Thus Darlington, to which some of the canons whom the bishop William of St. Carilef (1080–1096) replaced by monks at Durham, retired, became, with Papal sanction, a collegiate church with dean and prebendaries, and flourished as such till the Reformation. At that time (1547) a great number of collegiate churches in this country were suppressed, and their revenues confiscated, with the exception of a small portion employed in founding schools, of which King Edward VI.'s School at Birmingham is an instance. Since the seventeenth century it has been invariably ruled that a collegiate church can only be erected with Papal sanction. Among the conditions for obtaining this sanction are—that the locality should be of sufficient importance; that there be a numerous and well-disposed population and a large body of clergy; that the endowment be sufficient; that the church be of suitable size and dignity; and that all things necessary for the divine worship be provided in abundance. (Ferraris, *Collegium.*)

COLLYRIDIANS. In some pagan countries it was formerly the custom to make an offering of little cakes (κολλυρίδες) to the goddess Ceres. So, too, certain superstitious women took to offering a sacrifice of cakes to the Blessed Virgin, as a protest against the Antidicomarianites [*q.v.*] who refused to pay her any honour. St. Epiphanius condemns the practice ("Haer." lxxix., PG, xciv. 728).

COLUMBANUS, ST., RULE OF. The "Regula Monachorum" of St. Columban (†615) was printed by Goldast from a St. Gall MS. in his "Paraenetici Veteres" (Insulae, 1604). Though it speaks much of the beauty of moderation and discretion, and of the preservation of a mean between excess and defect, practically it prescribes a life of

extreme austerity. The keynote is obedience to the abbot (capp. 1, 2, 3, 14); when a monk acts in obedience, even if what he does is open to censure, he cannot be blamed; while, if he act on his own responsibility, though he may take the right course, his indocility deprives him of all merit. Chapter 4 prescribes perpetual silence, except so far as speech is absolutely necessary. The one meal (cap. 5) is to be taken at even; it was to consist of common vegetables, pulse, dough, and a small twice-baked loaf (biscuit, "cum parvo pane paximato"). The true "mortificatio" of a monk (cap. 14) extended to his thoughts, his words, and his movements; he should be ready always to say to his superior, even when giving contrary orders, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt" (Fleming, "Collectanea Sacra," PL, lxxx. 209–224). Before the end of the tenth century, the Rule of St. Columbanus was practically everywhere replaced by the Rule of St. Benedict or by that of the Canons Regulars—the one and the other much less austere. (Mabillon, "Acta Sanctorum O.S.B." ii.; Montalembert, "Monks of the West" ii.; Edmonds in "Cath. Enc.")

COMB. The liturgical use of the comb is, so far as we know, mentioned once only in our present books—viz. in the Pontifical, where the rubrics for the consecration of a bishop require an "ivory comb" to be provided. But Ducange (*ad voc.* "Pecten") shows that its use was once far more general. "It was," he says, "counted among the sacred instruments, and was used by priests and clerics for combing their hair before they went [from the sacristy] into the church." Thus Ducange quotes a will of Count Everard, A.D. 837, leaving a comb among the other "ornaments of his chapel." So in the will of Bishop Riculfus, A.D. 915, a charter of 1231, a charter of John, bishop of Capua, A.D. 1301. Maskell ("Mon. Rit." ii. p. 256) gives other examples—*e.g.* from an inventory of St. Paul's, London, A.D. 1295—and he quotes a rubric from the Pontifical of Archbishop Bainbridge of York, which directs the bishop, when about to say Mass, to comb his hair after putting on his sandals, and before he assumes the amice. The combing of the bishop's hair was as much a part of the ceremonials as putting on his mitre, and was done by the deacon or subdeacon, sometimes by both. (Mabillon, "Museum Italicum," ii. p. 292; Rock, ii. 101.)

COMMANDMENTS OF GOD (in Hebrew of Exodus xxxiv. 28, Deut. iv. 13, x. 4, "the ten words," of which "the Decalogue," *οἱ δέκα λόγοι, τὰ δέκα λόγια, τὰ δέκα ῥήματα,* is a verbal translation) were given to Moses by God on Mount Sinai. They were written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, which were placed in the Ark. Thus the commandments formed the centre and kernel of the Jewish religion. They were given more directly by God than any other part of the Jewish law, and they were placed in the most holy place, which none but the high-priest could enter, and he only once a year. The Roman Catechism (iii. 1, 1), quoting St. Augustine, points out that all the rest of the Mosaic law depends on the decalogue, while the ten commandments, in their turn, are based on two precepts—the love of God with the whole heart, and the love of our neighbour as ourselves.

Two questions about the commandments must be mentioned, the former of which concerns the binding force, the latter the division and arrangement, of the decalogue.

As to the former question, the Council of Trent defines, against antinomian heretics of ancient and modern times, that the ten commandments bind the consciences of all mankind, Christians included. "If anyone say that the ten commandments have nothing to do with Christians, let him be anathema." "If anyone say that a man, though justified and ever so perfect, is not bound to observe the commandments of God and the Church, let him be anathema."[1] The reason on which this obligation rests is manifest. God did not give a new law to Moses; He only republished a law written originally on the conscience of man, and obscured by his sinful ignorance. The ten commandments, then, did not begin to bind when proclaimed to the people of Israel, and they have not ceased to do so now that Christ has done away with the Jewish law.[2]

The second question turns on the division of the commandments, and here there are three principal views. It is well to remind the reader, first, that there are several differences in the exact words of the commandments as given in Exodus xx. and Deuteronomy v., one of which is of special moment. In Exodus, the last prohibitions run, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house: thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's." In Deuteronomy, the order is changed thus: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; and thou shalt not desire" [a different word in Hebrew from that translated "covet," though the Vulgate obliterates the distinction] "his field, or his servant, or his maid, his ox, or his ass, or anything that is thy neighbour's." We may now proceed to consider the different modes of division.

(1) Philo and Josephus, followed by

[1] Sess. vi. De Justif. can. 19, 20.

[2] *Cat. Rom.* iii. 1, 3. An exception must be made of that clause in the third commandment which fixes the seventh day for divine worship. As to the apparent prohibition of images, see Petav. *De Incarn.* xv. 6. Here it is enough to say that if, with Josephus, we hold that the commandment absolutely prohibits sculpture and painting, so that Solomon broke it when he made the twelve oxen under the brazen sea or the lions for his throne, then we must also hold that this ceremonial part of the commandment no longer binds.

Origen and other early Christians, by the Greek Church, and all Protestants except Lutherans, divide the commandments into two tables, containing each five precepts: viz. 1, on strange gods; 2, on image worship; 3, on taking God's name in vain; 4, on the Sabbath; 5, on honouring parents; 6, on murder; 7, on adultery; 8, on stealing; 9, on false witness; 10, on covetousness.

(2) The Talmud, the Targum of Jonathan, and many rabbinical commentators, make the preface, "I am the Lord thy God," &c., the first "word"; they regard the prohibition of strange gods and images as one single "word," viz. the second; for the rest they agree with the division of Philo, &c.

(3) Augustine places in the first table three commandments, relating to God—viz. 1, on strange gods and images (so that he regards the prohibition of idols as a mere application of the principle, "Thou shalt not have strange gods before me"); 2, the name of God; 3, the Sabbath. In the second table he places seven precepts, relating to our neighbour—viz. commandment 4, on parents; 5, on murder; 6, on adultery; 7, on stealing; 8, on false witness; 9, on coveting our neighbour's wife; 10, on coveting our neighbour's goods. This division has prevailed in the Catholic Church, and has been retained by the Lutherans, except that they, following the order in Exodus, make commandment 9, on coveting our neighbour's house; 10, on coveting his wife or goods: a division to which Augustine himself in some places gives support.

What has been already said shows that ignorance alone can charge Catholics with introducing a new mode of division in order to give less prominence to the prohibition of idol-worship. The division was current long before any strife on images had arisen in the Church.

Next, the Catholics, in this division of the first and second commandments, have the whole weight of rabbinical tradition on their side.

Thirdly, the modern Catholic division is the only one consistent with the Hebrew text, as usually found in MSS. and printed editions. The text is divided into ten sections, which correspond precisely with our Catholic division. These sections are admitted to be very ancient, older even than the Masoretic text, and the Protestant scholar Kennicott found them so marked in 460 out of 694 MSS. which he collated.[1]

Lastly, the wording of the text both in Exodus and Deuteronomy strongly favours the Catholic division. The promises and threats, "I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous," &c., are much more suitable on the theory that the prohibition of strange gods and idols forms one commandment, while in Deuteronomy, after the prohibition of coveting our neighbour's wife, the change of the verb mentioned above seems to indicate the beginning of a new commandment; nor is there any difficulty in distinguishing carnal desire from coveting another man's goods. (The facts as here given will be found in Kalisch, Knobel, and Keil in their commentaries on Exodus. The first is a very learned Jew, the second a Rationalist, the third an orthodox Protestant. All are opposed to the Catholic mode of division. Dillmann's Commentary (1881) has also been consulted. See also Hummelauer, "Comment. in Exod., Levit., et Deuteron."; "Catechism of the Council of Trent," Pt. iii.; Ballerini, "Theol. Moral." vol. ii., iii.; Slater, "Moral Theol." i. 207–473; Bareille, "Le Catéchisme Romain," v.)

COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH. Parents, and other persons invested with lawful authority, have power to make rules for those placed under them, so that things lawful in themselves become unlawful by their prohibition. The Scripture teaches plainly that the Church has this power. We are to hear the Church (Mt. xviii. 17). The Holy Ghost has placed bishops to "rule the Church" (Acts xx. 28). St. Paul commanded Christians to keep the "precepts of the Apostles and the ancients" (Acts xv. 41).

The Roman Catechism makes no special enumeration of the commandments of the Church; but such an enumeration is generally found in popular Catechisms, which have followed in this respect the example set by the Catechism of Canisius. The English Catechism, like the French ones of Fleury, &c., counts six commandments of the Church. Many other Catechisms reduce them to five. In our English Catechism they are given as follows: 1, to keep the Sundays and holidays of obligation holy, by hearing Mass and resting from servile works; 2, to keep the days of fasting and abstinence appointed by the Church; 3, to go to confession at least once a year; 4, to receive the Blessed Sacrament at least once a year, and that at Easter or thereabouts; 5, to contribute to the support of our pastors; 6, not to marry within certain degrees of kindred nor to solemnize marriage at the forbidden times. (Bareille, "Le Catéchisme Romain," t. vi.; Ballerini, "Theol. Moral." vol. ii. 776 *sqq.*; Slater, "Moral Theol." i. 563 *sqq.*)

COMMEMORATIONS OF FEASTS &c. As the Church celebrates many feasts, some moveable, some fixed, it may often happen that two of them fall on the same day; or again the Church may institute the feast of a

[1] There is no doubt that the prohibition of polytheism and of image-worship always forms one section. In some MSS., however, of Exodus there are only nine sections in the text of the decalogue, our ninth and tenth commandments forming one section. Kennicott, says Keil, found the division wanting in 234 out of 694 MSS. which he collated, and an examination of Kennicott's Bible confirms Keil's statement. Dillmann's assertion that Kennicott found the division between the ninth and tenth commandments wanting in most of his MSS. seems to be wholly inaccurate.

saint, just canonized, on a day already occupied by the feast of another saint. Further, as semi-doubles and all feasts of higher rank have first and second vespers, the second vespers of one feast would often have to be said at the same time as the first vespers of another. As it would be difficult to say the Mass and office of two feasts on the same day, the Church, as a rule, celebrates the greater feast, and merely commemorates the inferior one.[1]

The rules on this subject, some of which are very elaborate, are fully discussed by Gavantus and Meratus. We may, however, mention the general principle, that the greater the solemnity of a day or season, the more it absorbs attention and therefore tends to exclude commemorations. Important changes in the rules have been made, as far as the Breviary is concerned, by the Apostolic Constitution "Divino Afflatu," Nov. 1, 1911. (See Gavantus, with Meratus' note, p. 11, sect. iii. cap. 11. For the new rules see Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter and its Use.")

COMMEMORATION OF THE LIVING AND OF THE DEAD IN THE MASS. [See DIPTYCHS.]

COMMENDA. It is a Low Latin word, formed from the verb *commendare*, signifying the custody of a church or convent in the absence of a regular incumbent. A church, &c., so treated, was said to be held *in commendam*. This commendation had nothing abusive in its origin, which was perfectly natural: thus when a bishop of Fundi was driven from his see by the barbarians, Pope Gregory the Great nominated him to the vacant see of Terracina, at the same time commending Fundi to his care. A council of Merida *commended* to the metropolitan the churches of certain bishops who had been ordered to retire from their sees and do penance, for absenting themselves from a provincial council. In process of time the Roman See claimed the right of allowing a bishop, or other dignitary, to hold other benefices *in commendam* with his own preferment. For this there might often be reasonable and sufficient cause; but the practice became much too common. Matthew Paris complains (*a.* 1246) of this permission to a well-beneficed ecclesiastic to retain his benefices *in commendam* with a bishopric to which he might be appointed, as an abuse of recent origin. The Council of Constance, in its last year (1417), strove to put an end to reservations, expectatives, and commendams, but only succeeded in obtaining from the new Pope (Martin V.) a promise that all these favours should be brought under more strict control. But political reasons (*e.g.* the anger or good will of an emperor or king, incurred by thwarting or gratifying his wishes respecting the cumulation of benefices on some favourite churchman) made, or seemed to make, the complete abolition of the practice impossible. Even the Council of Trent, honestly zealous as it was for reform, ventured no more than to express its confidence that "the Roman Pontiff in his piety and prudence would, *so far as he saw the times could bear it*, set over monasteries at present held *in commendam* [by seculars] monastic persons belonging to the respective orders, capable of representing and ruling the communities."[1]

Since the destruction of Church property which recent times have witnessed, the practice of commendation has greatly dwindled, if not wholly ceased, throughout Europe. (Thomassin, pt. ii. lib. 2, capp. 10–21; Permanedes in "Kirchenlex.")

COMMENDATION OF THE SOUL (*Ordo commendationis animae*). A form of prayer for the dying contained in the Roman Ritual. The practice of bringing the priest to the bed of dying persons is coeval with the Church itself, and Amalarius tells us that several of the ancient Antiphonaries contained prayers for the dying. Parts at least of the present form are very ancient. The words "Subvenite," &c., "Come to his help, all ye saints of God; meet him, all ye angels of God," &c., occur in the Antiphonary of St. Gregory the Great; the beautiful address, "Go forth, O Christian soul," &c., is found in a letter of St. Peter Damian, written to a friend of his who was near death.

COMMENDATORY ABBOTS. [See ABBACOMITES; ABBOT, p. 31.]

COMMENDATORY LETTERS (συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, 2 Cor. iii. 1). The Christians of Ephesus, when Apollos the newly converted Jew wished to pass into Achaia, wrote to their fellow-believers at Corinth, that they should receive him (Acts xviii. 27). While the general society of the empire was still heathen, the bond between believers was close, and the distinction between Christians and non-Christians had to be firmly and sharply drawn. Commendatory letters—"letters of introduction" as we should now say—were required for everyone who travelled to a foreign country, if he wished to receive hospitality there, and to be admitted to communion. They were given by the bishop. For a long time after the conversion of Constantine the prevalence of Arianism and other heresies made it necessary still to adhere to the practice, lest those should be unawares admitted to communion whom St. John had warned Christians not so much as to bid God-speed to (2 Jn. i. 10). It is the crowning argument of St. Augustine against the Donatists, that "their letters would not be received in any churches but their own." The Councils of Elvira, Chalcedon, and Arles framed regulations about these letters, on which so much importance came to be laid that no one

[1] A greater feria or octave may also have to be commemorated.

[1] Sess. xxv. c. 21, De Ref.

whether clerk or layman, was received in any city who came unprovided with them. They were also called *canonicae*, and *communicatoriae*. The ἐπιστολαὶ εἰρηνικαὶ recommended the bearer specially for alms. The ἀπολυτικαὶ (*dimissoriae*), first mentioned in the Council in Trullo (691), referred to a permanent settlement of the bearer in the country visited; the συστατικαὶ to a temporary sojourn. Commendatory letters are still given to a cleric passing from one diocese to another. They testify not only to his lawful ordination and freedom from canonical faults, but also to his character and ability. (See CELEBRET; Smith and Cheetham, art. by Plumptre.)

COMMISSARY. An ecclesiastic who, by delegation from the bishop, exercises a portion of the episcopal jurisdiction in a particular part of the diocese, especially with reference to licences, institutions, the examination of witnesses, &c.

COMMISSIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL. These are bodies of ecclesiastics appointed for special functions or duties. They may be nominated by the Pope (Papal) or by the bishop (Diocesan). Papal Commissions are [illegible]ther committees of cardinals (*e.g.* the Bibli[illegible]l Commission, the Commission for Historical [illegible]udies, for the Codification of the Canon Law, [illegible].); or committees of other ecclesiastics, [illegible]sided over by a cardinal. Sometimes they [illegible] permanent, sometimes they are dissolved [illegible]soon as the purpose for which they were [illegible]led together has been accomplished. An [illegible]mple of the last-named was the Com[illegible]sion on Anglican Orders appointed by [illegible] XIII. in 1896, of which Card. Mazzella [illegible]resident.

[illegible]e ordinary diocesan commissions are: [illegible]e commission for the care of semin[illegible]; (2) the commission of examiners of the [illegible]y; (3) the commission on sacred music; [illegible]he vigilance committee for the repres[illegible]f modernism. There is also (by the *Maxima cura*, Aug. 20, 1910) a body of [illegible] examiners and consultors for the [illegible] (for just causes) of parish priests and [illegible] of missions.

[illegible]MMON. [See BREVIARY, MISSAL.]

[illegible]MMON LIFE, CLERKS AND BRO[illegible]RS OF THE. A holy deacon of Deventer i[illegible]e Netherlands, Gerhard Groot (†1384), wa[illegible]he founder of this remarkable institute. He had sat at the feet of Ruysbroek, one of the most eminent mystics of that age, and had been deeply impressed by the spectacle of love, peace, and joyful co-operation presented by the Augustinian brotherhood which he directed. Not long before, Ruysbroek had obtained a similar influence over the celebrated Tauler. Gerhard applied his fortune to the work of establishing and endowing a building to receive clerics, and also laymen, who, without taking perpetual vows, were desirous of leading an austere Christian life in common. Great preachers, besides Gerhard himself, came forth from this institute; to it belonged Thomas à Kempis, or of Kempen (†1471), usually held to be the author of the "Imitatio Christi." In the schools of Deventer were also trained Nicholas of Cusa, afterwards Cardinal, the most learned theologian at the Council of Basle, and the Dutch Pope Adrian VI. (1522–3). Gerhard's chief convent was at Windesheim; whence some of the canons were invited into France at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and established at Château Laudon. The order spread far and wide in the Netherlands, and was not unknown in Germany. Houses of nuns were aggregated to the institute, which is represented by celebrated monasteries in Belgium even at the present day. (Hélyot, vol. iv.; Möhler, "Kirchengesch."; Kettlewell, "Thomas à Kempis and the Brothers of the Common Life.")

COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM (also *communio idiomatum*—and in the Greek Fathers ἀντίδοσις). The appropriation of divine attributes to Christ as man, and of human qualities to Christ as God, because one and the same Person is at once God and man. Thus we may say "God died," "Mary is the Mother of God," though it was as man that Christ died and had a mother; or again, "The man Christ Jesus is the Creator of the world." This usage is consonant with Scripture, which speaks of the Lord of glory as being crucified; of the Son of God as being delivered for us, &c.; and with the definition of the Council of Ephesus, that Mary is the Mother of God. The reason on which the usage rests is that "the man Christ" implies not only human nature, but also the divine Person united with it; "God," when we think of God the Son incarnate, implies not only the divine Person but also the human nature, which he made proper (ἴδιον, hence ἰδίωμα) to himself. Observe, however, that we cannot say "the Divinity suffered," "the Manhood is eternal," &c. (See St. Thomas, 3ª, qq. 9, 16; Petavius, "De Incarn." iv. 15.)

COMMUNION. That the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Christ are given in the Communion, and that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind—*i.e.* under the form of bread alone, or wine alone—is an article of the Catholic faith, explained and proved under the article Eucharist. In this place we shall only treat of the rite according to which Communion is given. At every Mass the celebrant is bound to communicate, because his communion is necessary for the completion of the sacrifice. [See EUCHARIST, II.] In the Roman rite, the priest, after the words "Domine, non sum dignus," bowing low, but still standing, receives the Body of Christ, saying "Corpus Domini nostri," &c., "May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life." Then, having collected any particles of the Blessed

Sacrament which may remain on the corporal or paten, He puts them into the chalice and takes the Precious Blood with the words, "May the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. Afterwards, if any of the people desire to communicate, the clerk says the Confiteor, the priest pronounces a form of absolution, holds the Blessed Sacrament before the people, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God," &c., and finally gives them communion under the form of bread, using the words "May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. The clergy, servers, &c., usually communicate on the altar-steps; the people at the altar-rails, on which a white cloth is placed for the communicants to hold up near the face and so to prevent any particle from falling to the ground. In some churches a small tray, carried by the clerk from one communicant to another, is substituted for the white cloth—(this is in reality a return to the more ancient custom: Benedict XIV. "De Miss." iii. 22, 3). Communion is given to all who are sufficiently old to understand the nature of the Sacrament [see CHILDREN'S COMMUNION]; and, although the communion of the people is in no way essential either to the integrity or lawfulness of the sacrifice, still the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. cap. 6) desires that the faithful should communicate at every Mass. [See FREQUENT COMMUNION.] Of course this desire implies as a condition that the faithful should be fervent enough to communicate often with advantage. Communion may be given on all days of the year, except Good Friday—(the ancient usage permitted the faithful to communicate even on Good Friday: Benedict XIV. "De Fest." i. 339)—when it cannot be given except in dangerous sickness: and at any hour of the day during which it is lawful to say Mass. Communion may be given out of Mass, by the priest, wearing a surplice and stole either of the colour of the day or white (a red stole is used in the Ambrosian rite), and with almost the same form of words which is used in giving Communion during Mass, except that he adds the antiphon "O sacred banquet, in which Christ is taken," and concludes by blessing the people. This blessing is omitted if the priest gives Communion before Mass in black vestments.

We may now go on to trace the history of the administration of Communion. The essential points have remained unchanged from the time of the Apostles; still several striking changes have undoubtedly been made.

(1) The ordinary *minister* of the sacrament is the priest, nor can a mere deacon, according to the present discipline, give Communion without grave necessity.[1] In early times, leave to administer this Sacrament was given to deacons much more freely. Justin ("Apol." i. 65) speaks of them as distributing the consecrated bread and wine. A little later, Cyprian ("De Laps." 25, ed. Hartel, 255) and the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 12) describe the celebrant as administering the body of Christ, while the deacons gave the chalice. The Council of Nicaea, canon 18, forbids deacons to give Communion to the priests—who, according to the wont of that time, joined with the bishop in celebrating Mass—or to receive Communion themselves before a bishop who might be assisting at the sacrifice.[1] In times of persecution, the faithful took the Blessed Sacrament away with them, so that even women gave themselves Communion at home.[2] Ordinarily, the deacons conveyed the Holy Communion to the sick, but sometimes even laymen did so.[3] Pius V., in modern times, is said to have allowed Mary Queen of Scots to receive Communion from her own hands in prison.[4] By the present law of the Church, the parish priest is bound to give his parishioners the opportunity of communicating and no other priest can lawfully give Communion in private houses without his consent, except in case of necessity. In England, where there are no parishes, the leave of the priest in charge of the mission is required.

(2) All baptized persons, who are in a state of grace, and fasting, and who are sufficiently instructed, may *receive Communio*. In ancient times all who assisted at Ma were obliged to communicate, and it w only the highest class of penitents who did n come under this rule.[5] [See FREQUENT CO MUNION.] However, in Chrysostom's ti the charity of Christians had alrea grown cold, and many heard Mass with communicating. Afterwards, the fait were only required to communicate t times in the year; and finally the Fo Lateran Council introduced the present of communicating once at least in the y and that about Easter time. Further, it this day the custom in the East to c nicate infants just after Baptism, a use, Fleury says, continued in the W the opening of the ninth[6] century, whi in the thirteenth Communion was gi children in danger of death. The Cou Trent (Sess. xxi. cap. 4, De Commun. clares that children who have not come to use of reason need not receive Commun. [See CHILDREN'S COMMUNION.]

(3) The church was the *place of administration*, although in sickness, and, as we have seen, in times of persecution, Communion was given in private houses. Usually, the priests

[1] S. Alphonsus, vi. n. 237. The necessity need not be extreme.

[1] See the explanation of the canon in Hefele-Leclercq, i. p. 610.
[2] Tertull. *Ad Uxor.* ii. 5, *PL*, i. 1296.
[3] Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 44.
[4] Billuart, *De Euch.* diss. vii. a. 8.
[5] *Can. Apos.* 9, 10. Concil. Ancyr. (anno 314), can. 5.
[6] Fleury, lxxxiv. 9. The remains of the sacred species were given to children at Constantinople as late as the fourteenth century. See Fleury, xxxiii. 41.

and deacons communicated at the altar, the rest of the clergy in the choir, the laity outside the choir. But in the East the Emperor by ancient privilege, when he made his offering, approached and remained at the altar [1]; while in some parts of Gaul the laity generally did the same.[2]

(4) The time for Communion was usually early in the morning, and it was always, in virtue of an Apostolic tradition, *received fasting*. The one and only exception was the practice in the African Church of celebrating Mass and giving Communion on the evening of Maundy Thursday [see AGAPE]. Natural reverence forbade Christians to receive the body of Christ after common food. In the case of those who are in danger of death by sickness, when the Holy Communion is given as Viaticum, fasting is not required. Moreover, by a recent decree (Dec. 7, 1906), those who are sick, but not in danger of death, may partake of liquid food before receiving Communion under certain specified conditions which are mentioned in the decree and subsequent decisions.

(5) The *ceremonies* in the administration have varied considerably and still are very different in different rites. At the cry "Holy things to the holy," Christians drew near with bent body but still standing, and received the Holy Sacrament in the hollow of the right hand, supporting it with the left.[3] When the administrant said "The Body, the Blood of Christ," the communicant answered "Amen." [4] The longer form, now employed, viz. "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life," came into use in the time of Gregory the Great, though even after this date the form of words was by no means uniform throughout the West. Under Pope Agapetus (†536) the custom began of placing the Blessed Sacrament in the mouth; a council of Rouen, assigned by Mansi to the middle of the seventh century, forbids it to be given in any other way. Benedict XIV.[5] mentions the fact that the Popes in solemn Mass used to communicate sitting on their throne and facing the people. At present, the Pope, on these occasions, communicates standing at his throne profoundly inclined; but Benedict XIV. does not say when this change in the Papal rite was made.

(6) We now come to the most important of all changes in the discipline of the Church on this matter. Down to the Middle Ages, the faithful throughout the whole Church usually received the Eucharist under both kinds. That the celebrating priest should consecrate and receive under both kinds is of divine institution and therefore unalterable [EUCHARIST, II.]. But writers of the eleventh and following centuries notice the custom springing up in the Latin Church, of giving the Eucharist to all communicants, except the celebrant, under the form of bread alone, partly to counteract the heretical error that Christ is not received whole and entire under either kind, partly to prevent the spilling of the Precious Blood. St. Thomas [1] (†1274) says that in his day Communion under one kind prevailed "in some churches." The Council of Constance, to meet the errors of Hus and Jerome of Prague, made this custom of universal obligation in the West [see HUSSITES]; this decree was renewed by the Council of Basle against the Taborites and Calixtines, and by that of Trent against the Lutherans and Calvinists. Exceptions have been made by special privilege. Thus, Clement VI. gave the kings of France leave to communicate under both kinds. In solemn Mass celebrated by the Pope, the deacon and subdeacon receive the Precious Blood, and so even in the last century the deacon and subdeacon used to on Sundays and solemn feasts in the church of St. Denis near Paris, and in the church of Cluny.[2]

We take for granted here that Christ is given whole and entire under either kind [see EUCHARIST]; but it is often alleged that in any case the Church has altered the custom of communicating under both kinds which was imposed by our Lord. To this we reply with the Council of Trent (sess. xxi. cap. 1), that there is no divine precept binding anyone, except the celebrant, to receive both species. Communion under one or both kinds is a matter of discipline, which the Church may alter as she sees fit. This Catholic truth is indicated in Scripture and fully certified by tradition. It is indicated in Scripture, for our Lord says, on the one hand, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye will not have life in you"; "He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life"; but also, on the other hand, "If anyone eat of this bread he shall live for ever"; "The bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world"; "He who eateth this bread will live for ever" (Jn. vi.). It is fully certified by tradition, because the Church, from the beginning, has permitted both modes of communicating. Children received Communion under the form of wine alone [3]; the sick, and the faithful generally who communicated at home, under the form of bread alone.[4] True, Popes Leo and Gelasius emphatically condemned persons who abstained from the chalice, but this because they did so on private authority and in

[1] Trull. Syn. can. 69.
[2] Council of Tours (anno 567), an. 4.
[3] Dionys. Al. ap. Euseb. vii. 9. Tertull. *De Idol.* 7, *PL*, i. 669 where the reception in the hands and the standing posture are mentioned.
[4] Tertull. *De Spectac.* 25, *PL*, i. 657. *Constit. Apos.* vii. 12.
[5] *De Missa*, ii. 21, 4.

[1] 3, q. 80, a. 12.
[2] Benedict XIV. speaks of all these privileges as continuing in his time.
[3] Cyprian, *De Laps.* 25, ed. Hartel, 255.
[4] Tertull. *De Orat.* 19; *Ad Uxor.* ii. 5, *PL*, i. 1182, 1296; Dionys. Al. apud Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 44. Cyprian, *De Laps.* 25.

consequence of the Manichean error, which made them look on wine as evil. Moreover, the present use of the Greek and Oriental Churches makes it as clear as day that they do not consider it a matter of necessity to give Communion under both kinds, though it is their usual practice to do so. Thus the Church has ever faithfully maintained the same principles on this matter; her discipline has indeed changed from time to time, but never in any essential particular; while, on the contrary, those who charge her with innovation are themselves convicted of introducing a new principle, directly opposed to the unanimous teaching of antiquity. (In the works of Bossuet there is a short but masterly treatise on Communion under one kind. On the whole subject of Communion much interesting matter will be found in Benedict XIV. "De Missa"; Denzinger, "Ritus Orientalium"; Chardon, 267; Dublanchy in DThC, *Communion sous les deux Espèces.*)

COMMUNION (liturgical term). The antiphon which the priest says after the ablutions, at the Epistle side of the altar. Formerly it used to be sung while the people communicated, hence the name. The "Communion" is mentioned in the Roman Ordines. Cardinal Thomasius quotes an example of a "Communion Psalm," which was sung in alternate verses, till the Pontiff, the people having communicated, gave the choir a sign to end with the "Gloria Patri," after which the antiphon was repeated. (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 385.)

COMMUNION OF SAINTS is mentioned in the ninth article of the Apostles' Creed, where it is added, according to the Roman Catechism, as an explanation of the foregoing words, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church." The communion of saints consists in the union which binds together the members of the Church on earth, and connects the Church on earth with the Church suffering in Purgatory and triumphant in Heaven.

(1) The faithful on earth have communion with each other because they partake of the same sacraments, are under one head, and assist each other by their prayers and good works. Even the personal merits of a just man profit his brethren, because the greater his goodness, the greater the efficacy of his prayer for others, the more fitting it is that, as he does God's will, so God should deign to do His by increasing the graces or converting the souls of those for whom he prays.

Catholic commentators understand St. Paul to refer to this communion in good works when he encourages the Corinthians to help their needy brethren at Jerusalem. "Let your abundance," he says (2 Cor. viii. 14), "supply their want, that their abundance also may be the filling up of your want"—*i.e.* that you may share in their spiritual, as they have shared in your temporal, riches.[1] Again, God spares His people for the sake of the saints among them, just as He was ready to spare Sodom had ten just men been found in it; or forgave Job's friends at the sacrifice and prayer of Job himself; or so often restrained His wrath against His people for His servant David's sake. Of course also many graces are given primarily for the edification of the Church.

(2) We communicate with the souls in Purgatory by praying for them. [See PURGATORY.]

(3) With the blessed in Heaven by obtaining their prayers. [See SAINTS, INTERCESSION OF THE.]

COMPLINE (*Completorium*). The last, completing, hour of the daily office of the Church. It consists of (1) a short lesson (1 Pet. v. 8, 9); (2) the "Pater noster" and "Confiteor"; (3) three psalms; (4) a hymn, "Te lucis ante terminum"; (5) a little chapter (Jerem. xiv. 9); (6) a short responsion; (7) the canticle of Simeon, "Nunc dimittis"; (8) a prayer, followed by the antiphon of the season. The monastic Compline is shorter. The origin of Compline has generally been ascribed to St. Benedict (Rule, xvii., xviii.). Recent authorities have traced it back to St. Basil, and even to St. Pachomius early in the fourth century. But in truth the practice of saying prayers before retiring to rest must have been usual from very early times. To St. Benedict we may rightly ascribe the liturgical character of the hour and its rudimentary arrangement. (Cabrol, "Le Livre de la Prière Antique," 224, and "Cath. Enc." *Compline*; Bäumer-Biron, "Hist. du Bréviaire," i. 135, 147–149.)

CONCELEBRATION. Under the head of EUCHARIST and the subdivision *Ministration*, it will be found that in early days the bishop in conjunction with his presbytery celebrated Mass. Until about the beginning of the thirteenth century it was customary for several priests to unite in offering the same Mass, *concelebrate*, on the more solemn festivals of the year. The custom still prevails in the Oriental Churches, but the only vestige of it in the Latin Church is found in the Masses said by priests on the day of their ordination and by bishops on the day of their consecration. (Benedict XIV., "De SS. Missae Sacrif." III., xvi.)

CONCEPTION. [See IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.]

CONCLAVE (Lat. *conclave*; properly, a chamber that can be closed with one key). The term is applied both to the place where the Cardinals assemble for the election of a new Pope, and to the assembly itself. Several questions relating to the election of Popes—

[1] See Estius, *ad loc.* Meyer, who attacks this interpretation, admits that it is the traditional one; and it has been adopted by eminent Protestants, *e.g.* by Bengel.

e.g. whether the Roman Pontiff can legally nominate his successor; who is or is not eligible; what would happen in the event of all the Cardinals dying before the election, &c.—are considered under POPE; in this article we shall treat exclusively of the *mode* of election, as finally settled by Gregory X. in the Second Council of Lyons (1274). (See Hefele-Leclercq, vi. 178 *sqq.*) In the course of the dark ages the secular rulers of Rome made various attempts to interfere with the freedom of Papal elections. A statement even appears in the Decretum of Gratian (and was used in argument by James I. and Bishop Andrewes, when attempting to justify the subjection of the Anglican Church to the crown), to the effect that Pope Hadrian granted to Charlemagne the right of electing the Pope and regulating the Apostolic See. But this canon was shown by Bellarmine to be spurious; it was probably invented by Sigismond of Gemblours, a strong supporter of imperial pretensions, and, being found in his chronicle, imposed upon the unwary Gratian. Another canon also found in Gratian, which states that Leo VIII. granted a similar privilege to Otho I., soon after the commencement of the revived "Holy Roman Empire," at once falls to the ground when it is remembered that Leo VIII., for the unanswerable reasons given by Baronius, is not to be accounted a true Pope. In 1059 an important decree was made by Nicholas II., in a council at Rome, assigning the election of future Popes to the Cardinal Bishops, with the consent of the other Cardinals and the clergy and people of Rome, saving also the honour due to Henry, King of the Romans, and to any of his successors on the imperial throne in whose favour the Holy See should make the same reservation. This partial recognition of a right to interfere in the election proved to be fertile in antipopes and vexations of every kind; and Alexander III., having experienced what trouble an arbitrary emperor could cause, in his long struggle with Frederic Barbarossa, resolved with a wise boldness to take away from the imperial line the *locus standi* in Papal elections which the canon of 1059 had allowed, and to vindicate her ancient freedom for the Church. In a General Council held at the Lateran in 1179, it was decreed that the election should thenceforth rest with the Cardinals alone, and that, in order to be canonical, it must be supported by the votes of two thirds of their numbers. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 1087.) In the following century, the Lateran decree was confirmed and developed at the Council of Lyons mentioned above; and in all its substantial features the discipline then settled is still observed. The right of objecting (the *veto*, *q.v.*) to a candidate whose election was imminent, formerly conceded to the governments of France, Spain, and Austria, and exercised for the last time at the election of Pope Pius X., has now been finally abolished.

In the election of a Pope, it is obvious that there are certain conditions the exact fulfilment of which is of the utmost consequence. These are such as the following:—that all those qualified to vote, and only those, should take part in the election; that the election should not be unnecessarily *delayed*; that it should not be *precipitated*; that the electors should be in no fear for their personal safety, which would prevent the election from being *free*; lastly, that they should be subjected to no external persuasion tending to make them vote, or at least come under the suspicion of voting, from motives lower than those which ought to actuate them. The regulations for the conclave fixed in 1274 endeavour, so far as human forethought can ensure it, to cause all these conditions to be observed. After the death of a Pope the Cardinals who are absent are immediately to be summoned to the conclave by one of the secretaries of the Sacred College; the election is to begin on the tenth day after the death. In whatever city the Pope dies, there the election must be held. Within the ten days the conclave must be constructed in the Papal palace, or in some other suitable edifice. The large halls of the palace are so divided by wooden partitions as to furnish a number of sets of small apartments (two for an ordinary Cardinal, three for one of princely rank), all opening upon a corridor. Here the Cardinals must remain until they have elected a Pope. On the tenth day a solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost is said in the Vatican church, and after it the Cardinals form a procession and proceed to the conclave, taking up their respective apartments as the lot has distributed them. For the rest of that day the conclave is open; crowds of persons flock in and circulate among the apartments and corridors; and the ambassadors and delegates of foreign States, besides their personal friends, visit the Cardinals for the last time. In the evening everyone is turned out except the Cardinals and those authorized to remain with them, and the conclave is closed. This is done under the superintendence of two guardians of the conclave—one a prelate previously appointed by the Sacred College, who is called the *governor*; the other a lay official designated the *marshal*. Each Cardinal is allowed to have two members of his household in personal attendance upon him; these are called *conclavists*. A number of other attendants and minor officials—a carpenter, a mason, a sacrist, a monk or friar to hear confessions, two barbers, eight or ten porters and messengers, and several others—are in the common service of the whole body of Cardinals. All the entrances to the building but one are closed: that one is in the charge of officials who are partly prelates, partly officials

of the municipality, whose business it is to see that no unauthorized person shall enter, and to exercise a surveillance over the food brought for the Cardinals, lest any written communication should be conveyed to them by this channel. After three days, the supply of food sent in is restricted; if five days more elapse without an election being made, the rule used to be that the Cardinals should from that time subsist on nothing but bread, wine, and water; but this rigour has been somewhat modified by later ordinances. Morning and evening the Cardinals meet in the chapel, and a secret scrutiny by means of voting papers is usually instituted in order to ascertain whether any candidate has the required majority of two-thirds. A Cardinal coming from a distance can enter the conclave after the closure, but only if he claim the right of doing so within three days of his arrival in the city. Every actual Cardinal, even though he may lie under a sentence of excommunication, has the right to vote, unless he has not yet been admitted to deacon's orders. Even in this case, the right of voting has sometimes been conferred by special Papal indult. There are three valid modes of election—by scrutiny, by compromise, and by what is called *quasi-inspiration* [see ACCLAMATION]. Compromise is when all the cardinals agree to entrust the election to a small committee of two or three members of the body. Scrutiny is the ordinary mode; and although, since the thirteenth century, elections have usually been made by this mode with reasonable despatch, yet in times of disturbance, the difficulty of obtaining a two-thirds majority has been known to protract the proceedings over a long period, as in the celebrated instance of the conclave of 1799, described in Consalvi's Memoirs, which lasted more than three months, resulting in the election of Pius VII. (Ferraris, *Papa*; Zoepffel, "Die Papstwahlen," Göttingen, 1871; Wiseman, "Last Four Popes"; Grissell, "Sede Vacante"; Ortolan in DThC.)

CONCOMITANCE. This word is used in connection with the mode of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist (see that art. p. 327). "Some things," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent (P. II., c. iv., n. 34), "are contained in the sacrament (of the Eucharist) because united to those which are expressed by the form; for as the form used in the consecration of the bread signifies the body of the Lord, when it is said, 'This is my body,' the very body of Christ the Lord will be in the Eucharist by virtue of the sacrament, but as the blood, soul, and divinity are united to the body, all these too will be in the sacrament, not indeed by virtue of the sacrament, but as united to the body. And these are said to be in the sacrament by 'concomitance'; in which manner it is clear that in the sacrament is contained Christ whole and entire; for if any two things are actually united, where one is, there also must the other be." "The true body of our Lord and His true blood, together with His soul and divinity, are under the species of bread and wine; but the body, indeed, under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, by the force of the words; but the body itself under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under both, by the force of that natural connection and concomitance whereby the parts of Christ our Lord are united together; and the divinity, furthermore, on account of that admirable hypostatic union thereof with His body and blood." (Council of Trent, sess. xiii. c. iii.; see also St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 76, a. 2.)

CONCORDAT (Lat. *concordata*, things agreed upon). A treaty between the Holy See and a secular State touching the conservation and promotion of the interests of religion in that State.

It were to be wished that Christendom did not require concordats, for a treaty between two powers implies some felt divergency of sentiment and principle, which, having already resulted in opposition and contention more or less serious, dictates to the contracting parties the necessity of coming to an understanding as to the limits beyond which neither will give way to the other. Such divergency of sentiment only arises, speaking generally, when the secular State aims at excluding the Church from its rightful share of control over human affairs —an aim which familiar experience shows to be eminently pernicious and disastrous. When an Ethelbert or a St. Louis rules in temporals, we do not hear of concordats with the Holy See, for such rulers desire to see religion more, not less, in the ascendant among their subjects. Nevertheless, considering the actual condition of things in Europe and America, it is generally a subject of congratulation when the Pope concludes a fresh concordat; we know that, at any rate for a time, religion and its ministers will be treated with some justice and moderation in the treaty-making State; that if the Church has been robbed there in time past, some modicum of a yearly grant will now be given by way of restitution; and that the churches and convents will be made over to her—at any rate till the next revolution.

Among the more celebrated concordats of former times are the following:—

1. That of Worms in 1122, between Calixtus II. and the Emperor Henry V., by which the abusive right of appointing bishops and abbots "by ring and crosier," long usurped by the emperors, was resigned, and only the investiture by the sceptre, in token of the grant of their temporalities, retained. On the lines of this concordat the question of investiture was settled through-

out Europe in such a way as to leave intact in theory the universal pastorate of the successors of Peter, however seriously it may have been here and there compromized in practice.

2. That of Frankfort or Vienna (1446–8), called the Concordat with the German Nation, by which the Popes Eugenius IV. and Nicholas V., employing Nicholas of Cusa [BASLE, COUNCIL] and Æneas Sylvius as negotiators, agreed with the emperor Frederic III. to divide in a particular manner the patronage of ecclesiastical dignities in Germany, and as to the payment of firstfruits and other matters.

3. That of 1515, between Leo X. and Francis I., by which the latter agreed to abolish the pragmatic sanction of Charles VII. (limiting appeals to Rome, and pretending to set a general council above the Pope), and the former resigned to the crown of France the nomination to vacant bishopries and abbeys, with the proviso that the persons named should be acceptable to the Holy See.

In later times, the concordat of 1801, between Pius VII. and the first Napoleon, restoring to the French nation the public practice of the religion of their fathers, which the detestable wickedness of the revolutionists had proscribed since 1790, is a treaty of primary importance. Under its terms the Holy See agreed to a new demarcation of the boundaries of French dioceses, reducing their number from over 100 to about 60, and declared (art. 13) that neither the reigning Pope nor his successors would molest the purchasers or grantees in the peaceable possession of Church lands alienated up to that date. On the other hand, the French Government agreed to the free and public exercise of the "Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman" religion in France; consented (art. 4, 5) to the canonical institution by the Pope, under the ancient discipline, of the bishops whom the Government should nominate; promised (art. 14) a suitable annual grant for the support of the French bishops and clergy; and undertook to facilitate (art. 15) fresh endowments on the part of any French Catholics desiring to make them. These were the principal articles of the concordat signed by the Papal envoys on behalf of the Holy See. The Government of Napoleon soon afterwards added to the concordat a number of clauses called "organic articles," the tenor of which was of course highly Erastian, and by which it has been often maintained by the French and other publicists that the French clergy were bound. This, however, since the Holy See never ratified the "organic articles," was not the case.

On Dec. 9, 1905, the French Government broke altogether the compact entered into by the concordat. Two days later Pius X. solemnly protested against this violation of the rights of the Church. All ecclesiastical property has been seized, since the *associations cultuelles* ordered by the new laws were forbidden by the Pope. The churches are still in the occupation of the clergy, who, however, have no rights over them. In some places the presbyteries are let to the curés at a low rental. On the other hand, the Church has gained complete freedom as to the nomination of the bishops and other ecclesiastical officials. This anomalous state of things cannot long continue. (See FRANCE, CHURCH OF; also an interesting article by G. Fonsegrive, "The Present Religious Situation in France," in "Dublin Review," Oct. 1913.)

A list of concordats will be found in "Cath. Enc." *Concordat.*

(Ferraris, *Concordata*; Renard-Constantin in DThC, good bibliography; Soglia, i. 4, *De jure novissimo*; Möhler's "Kirchengeschichte.")

CONCUPISCENCE. Concupiscence, according to St. Thomas, $1^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 30, a. 2, is the appetite which tends to the gratification of the senses ("bonum delectabile absens"). This tendency is in itself neither good nor evil, because the object may be either lawful or unlawful. The desire of eating and drinking in moderation is good: that of eating and drinking to excess is evil; but in the one case and in the other we have an instance of concupiscence. However, the word concupiscence is constantly used for that appetite which exists in fallen man and is an incentive to sin, because it seeks forbidden objects, or permissible objects in a forbidden way. St. Paul, in Rom. vii., speaks of it as "the flesh," and again as the "law of sin that is in my members." Such concupiscence, in rebellion against reason and against the commandments of God, did not exist in Adam till he had fallen from original justice. From him it has passed to all his descendants; it remains even in those who have been born again by baptism, so that the saints themselves have had to fight against this tendency in the sensual appetite to forbidden pleasures, without being able to eradicate it.

We now come to the difference on this matter between Catholic doctrine and the tenets of the Reformers. The latter taught that concupiscence, even if the will did not consent to harbour or encourage it, had the nature of sin. Catholic doctors on the other hand, following the principle of St. Thomas, that no action can be moral or immoral except so far as it depends on the free-will of the agent, deny that concupiscence which remains, in spite of the efforts made by the will to subdue it, is to be considered sin. It is plain that the Catholic doctrine is the only one consistent with belief in the moral freedom of man. It is, moreover, the only one consistent with experience and common sense; for who can believe that a man engaged in

heroic struggle with the temptations of the flesh is all the while offending God? The Council of Trent lays down the doctrine of the Church with great clearness, in the following words: "This holy synod confesses that concupiscence or the fuel of sin (*fomes peccati*) remains in the baptized; but since it is left that they may strive against it, it cannot hurt those who give no consent, but resist manfully by the grace of Jesus Christ; nay, more, he who strives lawfully will be crowned. The holy synod declares that this concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin (Rom. vi. 12, vii. 8), has never been understood by the Catholic Church to be so called because it is truly and properly sin in the regenerate, but because it is from sin and inclines to sin. But if any man hold a contrary opinion, let him be anathema."[1] Propositions of Baius renewed the error of the Reformers with a difference of terminology—*e.g.* Prop. lxxv.: "The evil motions of concupiscence have been prohibited for the state of fallen man [in the words], 'Thou shalt not covet.' Whence, a man who feels them and does not consent transgresses the precept, 'Thou shalt not covet'; although the transgression is not reckoned as sin." (Bellarmine, "De Controv." iv. *De Gratia Primi Hominis*; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. p. 27; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." i. 55 *sqq.*)

CONCURSUS. An examination into the qualifications of candidates for ecclesiastical benefices with cure of souls. The Council of Trent ordered[2] that a board of six examiners should be appointed every year in the diocesan synod; and that when any parish became vacant, within ten days, or such period as the bishop might appoint, candidates having been duly invited to attend, an examination should be held by any three selected by the bishop from the board above mentioned. A list of those found qualified having then been made by the examiners, it was competent for the person or persons to whom the patronage appertained to select from among these the candidate of their choice, and present him to the bishop for institution. These regulations of the council have not been commonly followed on account of the difficulty of carrying them out. In England, as there are no canonically established parishes, appointments are made by the bishop. According to the National Council of Maynooth the concursus was declared to be of obligation two years after the publication of the decrees. In the United States the third Council of Baltimore has ordered it in the case of irremovable rectors.

Though a concursus is not required by common law for the appointment of a canon penitentiary and canon theologian, the Popes have decreed that it should be so (*e.g.* Benedict XIII., *Pastoralis Officii*, 1725, which deals with the mode of conducting it in Italy). The first Council of Westminster applied this to England. In Scotland it is also binding. (See Ferraris; Taunton; Bouix, *De Capitulo, De Parocho.*) Recently (1913) the English bishops have been dispensed from the obligation of holding a concursus.

CONCURSUS (DIVINE). "Not only does God watch over and administer everything that exists: the things that are moved and that act He also impels by intrinsic power to motion and action in such a way that, without hindering the operation of secondary causes, He (as it were) goes before it (*praeveniat*) since His hidden might belongs to each thing, and, as the Wise Man testifies, 'He reacheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly.' Wherefore it was said by the Apostle . . . 'He is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live and move and be.'" ("Catech. of the Council of Trent," P. I. c. ii., n. 22.) The absolute and universal dependence of creatures upon God implies that they can no more act as causes without a positive influence than, without such influence, they can begin or continue to exist. God, Who preserves their substance, also concurs in their operations, so that all positive reality caused by the activity of creatures owes its being directly to the action of God co-producing and co-operating with the created cause. This action of God is called the divine *Concursus* or concurrence. How the divine *concursus* is to be reconciled with the free action of man is variously explained by theologians. (See St. Thomas, 1ª, q. 105; "De Potentia," q. 3; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 365; Frins in DThC, *Concours Divin.*)

CONDEMNED PROPOSITIONS. [See PROPOSITIONS, CONDEMNED.]

CONDITIONAL BAPTISM. [See BAPTISM (IV.).]

CONFERENCES OF THE CLERGY. In the ninth century when dioceses became much larger than they had been in early times, the diocesan synods were no longer sufficient for the maintenance of discipline, ecclesiastical spirit, &c., among the clergy. Accordingly in many parts of Europe—*e.g.* in France, Germany, Italy, and England—the clergy of each district were required to meet under the archpriest or dean, and these meetings were called "Calendars" (because held on the first of every month), also *consistoria, synodi, sessiones.* The clergy were summoned originally by the archpriest or archdeacon. They consulted on difficult cases of conscience and the like, but besides this they often investigated crimes which had occurred since the last meeting, and announced the penalties attached to them by the Church. These Calendars seem to have fallen out of use about the thirteenth century. The last mention of them is said to be found in the Acts of a council held at London in 1237.

[1] Concil. Trident. sess. v. De Peccat. Origin.
[2] Sess. xxiv. c. 18, De Reform.

St. Charles Borromeo revived these assemblies of the clergy, or rather introduced conferences in the modern sense for the discussion of questions in morals, ritual, &c., with the object of providing that the clergy engaged in the cure of souls should have the knowledge necessary for their duties. The example of St. Charles was followed very soon by councils in France, Italy, the Low Countries, &c. Such conferences again fell into disuse at the end of the 18th century, but have been once more revived. They are held in all English-speaking countries in obedience to decrees of councils or synods, *e.g.* National Synod of Thurles for Ireland; First Council of Westminster for England; Second Plenary Council of Baltimore for the United States, &c. (Taunton; Péchenard," Étude Historique sur les Conférences," and in DThC; Schneemann *in* " Kirchenlex.")

CONFESSION, SACRAMENTAL. This consists in accusing oursevles of our sins to a priest who has received authority to give absolution. It is the pious custom of the faithful to accuse themselves of all post-baptismal sins, even if only venial, so far as they can remember them, and the priest, if duly commissioned, has power to absolve from all. But there is an absolute obligation imposed, not only by the law of the Church, but also by divine institution, upon all Christians, of confessing all mortal sins committed after baptism, so far as the penitent is able to recall them by diligent examination of his conscience. So the Council of Trent has defined (sess. xiv. can. 7).

The proofs of this obligation from Scripture and tradition will be found below in the article, PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF. Here it suffices to say that sacramental confession must be

(1) Entire. It must include the different kinds of mortal sin committed and the number of sins under each class, so far as it can be ascertained. One mortal sin wilfully concealed vitiates the whole confession. If, however, mortal sins are omitted unintentionally and without fault, they are forgiven when absolution is pronounced; only, if they occur to the penitent's recollection afterwards, he must mention them in his next confession. Further, various causes may excuse from this completeness of enumeration. Thus in shipwreck, before a battle, when the penitent is unable to speak, or can only say very little from physical weakness, a very general confession of sin may be enough for absolution; but the confession must be completed afterwards, if the opportunity offers itself.

(2) It must be vocal, though for a grave reason the penitent may make it by presenting a written paper, or by signs.

(3) It must be accompanied by supernatural sorrow and firm purpose of amendment.

(4) It should also be humble and sincere; as short as is consistent with integrity; in language which is plain and direct, but at the same time pure and modest.

The full order of confession is as follows. The penitent, kneeling at the confessor's feet, says " Pray, Father, bless me, for I have sinned." The priest gives the blessing prescribed in the Roman Ritual, " The Lord be in thy heart and on thy lips, that thou mayest truly and humbly confess thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The penitent then recites the first part of the Confiteor, enumerates the sins of which he has been guilty since his last confession, and then adds " For these and all my other sins which I cannot now remember I am heartily sorry; I purpose amendment for the future, and most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution of you, my ghostly Father." (See AURICULAR CONFESSION; PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF (3); Mangenot, Vacandard, Bernard, and Ortolan in DThC, an exhaustive article by these writers; Funk, *Bussdisciplin* in " Kirchenlex."; Boudinhon, " Sur l'Histoire de la Pénitence" in answer to Lea, " Hist. of Auricular Confession.")

CONFESSION (THE TOMB OF A MARTYR). The word was used from early times as equivalent to *μαρτύριον*, the actual tomb in which a martyr was buried. If an altar was erected over the grave, then the name " confession " was given to the tomb, the altar, and the cubiculum or subterranean chamber, in which they stood. In later times, a basilica was sometimes erected over the cubiculum or chamber beneath; the high-altar was placed over the altar on the tomb below, and so this high-altar also was called a " confession," though it was not till the Middle Ages that the entire building received the name of " confession." Sometimes, when the " basilica " was set up in a different place, the relics of the martyr were removed to it, and the name " confessio " was transferred to the spot in which the remains rested. In such cases, the relics were placed in a crypt under the high-altar, or else they were deposited in a hollow space under the high-altar in the church itself, this hollow space being enclosed with a grating or with perforated marble, and room left for the faithful to approach and touch the shrine with cloths (*brandea*). Such an arrangement, which was possible because Mass was said at the further side of the altar, is still found in the Roman churches of St. Clement and St. George in Velabro. Lastly, the name " confession " was given to that part of an altar in which the relics are placed. Thus the Pontifical, even in its present form, speaks of " the confession, *i.e.* the sepulchre of the altar."

The most famous " confession " is that of St. Peter in the Vatican basilica. Anacletus is said to have constructed " the monument of the Blessed Peter " (" memoriam B.

Petri"); it is mentioned by Caius,[1] a writer of the second or the beginning of the third century, while a new "confession" was set up by Constantine when he built the Vatican basilica. On this "confession" the reader may consult Card. Borgia's work "Vaticana Confessio B. Petri, chronologicis tam veterum quam recentiorum scriptorum testimoniis illustrata" (Romae, 1776). (Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; Barnes, "St. Peter at Rome," ch. vi. xiv.; Grisar, "Analecta Romana," 259 *sqq.*)

CONFESSIONAL. The seat which the priest uses when hearing confessions. According to the Roman Ritual it ought to be placed in an open and conspicuous part of the church, and to have a grating between the priest and the penitent. "The present form of confessionals is somewhat recent in the Church, for in more ancient times people confessed in the open church (*à découvert*), kneeling before the priest or simply seated by his side, as is still usual among the Greeks. The division [of the confessional] into compartments does not appear to go back further than the sixteenth century and the time of St. Charles Borromeo, who left ordinances on that matter, but this arrangement did not become general till the following century." (Mgr. de Montault, "Traité pratique de la Construction, &c., des Églises," i. p. 233.)

CONFESSOR (species of Saint). A name used from the earliest times for persons who confessed the Christian faith in times of persecution, thus exposing themselves to danger and suffering, but who did not undergo martyrdom. For a time the martyrs were the only saints who received special and public honour after death from the Church, and martyrs only (with the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles) are mentioned in the canon of the Roman Mass, though anciently in not a few churches the names of other saints were interpolated.[2] But at the beginning of the fourth century, public honours were also given to persons of heroic sanctity even if they had not been martyred. Thus St. Antony, as St. Jerome tells us, directed that his body after death should be concealed, because he did not wish a "martyrium" erected in his honour. Hilarion kept the vigil and feast of St. Antony; he himself after death received the same honour. Thus the name "Confessor" got the technical meaning which it now has in the Missal and Breviary—*i.e.* it was applied to all male saints who do not fall under some special class, such as Martyr, Apostle, Evangelist. At the outset the Liturgy for the feasts of all male saints below the rank of Apostles was that which we now know as the Common of Martyrs. Our Common of Confessors is certainly not older than the fourth century,[3] Among the first of God's servants to be honoured with a special office of this description was Pope St. Sylvester (Dec. 31), St. Martin of Tours (Nov. 11), and St. Eusebius, priest (Aug. 14).[1]

In the office on Good Friday "confessor" means "singer," because in the Scriptures "confessing to God" is used for singing His praises. That "confessor" had this meaning is certain from the 6th canon of a council of Toledo which met in the year 400.[2] (See Ducange; Benedict XIV. "De Servorum Dei Beatif." &c., I. v. n. 3.)

CONFESSOR (in Sacrament of Penance). The priest who hears confessions. He must have received faculties from the ordinary of the place. Formerly by the canon law the faithful were bound to confess once in the year to their parish priest ("proprio sacerdoti"). Afterwards, various religious orders received privileges which enabled them to hear confessions of seculars at all times; and by the present law seculars may always choose any approved priest for their confessor. (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." vi. 564, where, however, another interpretation of the words "proprio sacerdoti" is given.) [See FACULTIES; PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF; Taunton.]

CONFIRMATION. A sacrament of the new law by which grace is conferred on baptized persons which strengthens them for the profession of the Christian faith. It is conferred by the bishop, who lays his hands on the recipients, making the sign of the cross with chrism on their foreheads, while he pronounces the words "I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."[1] Besides conferring a special grace to profess the faith, it also sets a seal or character on the soul [see CHARACTER], so that this sacrament cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

Protestants have universally denied that Confirmation is a sacrament; either rejecting it altogether, or retaining a spurious imitation of it, in which young people renew and confirm the promises made for them in baptism. In opposition to this error, the Council of Trent (sess. vii.) defines that it is a "true and proper sacrament," and we shall endeavour to establish this point from Scripture and tradition before entering upon questions of detail.

We read in Acts viii. that when Philip the deacon had baptized the Samaritan converts, St. Peter and St. John, going down from Jerusalem, "laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Thus the gifts conveyed to the Apostles and their first converts at Pentecost were imparted by the ministry of the Church to all Christians willing to receive them. It is true

[1] Euseb. *H.E.* ii. 25, 7.
[2] Martène, lib. i. c. 4. art. 8, *n.* 16.
[3] Innocent III., *De Missa*, lib. iii. c. 10.

[1] Thomassin, *Traité des Festes*, i. 8, 19.
[2] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 123.

that when the Apostles imposed their hands miraculous gifts often accompanied the communication of the Holy Ghost. But this was an accident, and, just as the miraculous signs promised at the end of St. Mark's gospel to those "who believe" afterwards ceased without prejudice to faith, so, when miraculous signs no longer accompanied the imposition of hands, Confirmation still bestowed the presence of the Holy Ghost in increased measure; it still gave that power and courage to make confession which will always be essential to the Christian calling. Hence in the Epistle to the Hebrews the "laying on of hands" is numbered among the elementary articles of the Christian religion, and placed in immediate proximity to Baptism, in order to distinguish it from the "laying on of hands" in Holy Order. In allusion to the same sacrament of Confirmation, the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the same context, describes Christians as "partakers of the Holy Ghost" (vi. 4); and, with at least a probable reference to Confirmation, St. Paul tells Christians that they were "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." [1] Thus the miraculous gifts were only intended to make men recognize and believe in a presence of the Holy Ghost which was afterwards to be recognized by faith alone.

The Scripture is thus in perfect keeping with the Tridentine doctrine that Confirmation is a "true and proper sacrament." We have the outward sign, viz. the laying on of hands; the inward grace, viz. the communication of the Holy Ghost, already given in baptism, with greater fullness; divine institution, for the Apostles could not have used an outward sign as a certain means of giving grace, unless they had received authority to do so from Christ, the author of grace; lastly, the sign and the grace which accompanied it were to continue permanently in the Church, as appears from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The earliest tradition illustrates the teaching of Scripture on this head. Thus Tertullian mentions the imposition of hands on the baptized which "called and invited the Holy Ghost." [2] Elsewhere,[3] in a remarkable passage, he places "the sealing of the soldiers on the forehead" between Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, plainly indicating that he believed Confirmation to be a true sacrament. Many quotations might be added from Cyprian.[4] In the earliest councils we meet with formal legislation on Confirmation, but here one instance will suffice. The Council of Elvira, in 300 (?), in canon 38, decrees that persons baptized in case of necessity by laymen are afterwards to be brought to the bishops and "perfected by the imposition of hands." (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 242.) Here the effect of the sacrament (which makes us perfect Christians), and its ordinary minister (viz. the bishop), are plainly expressed. Further, the fact that the Church never allowed the sacrament to be reiterated proves the ancient belief in the indelible character or mark with which Confirmation stamps the soul.

We will now examine certain points with regard to this sacrament, following as our chief guide in the historical portion Chardon, in his "Histoire des Sacrements."

(1) The ordinary minister of the sacrament is a bishop, as is defined by the Council of Trent, and this statement is grounded on Scripture, which speaks of the Apostles, but never of simple priests, as imposing their hands to give the Holy Ghost. In the West, confirmation has always been given by bishops. Permission, however, to confirm was given to some abbots—*e.g.* to the abbot of Monte Cassino—and there was an exception to the general rule of the West in Sardinia, where Pope Gregory I. for a time forbade, but later, to avoid greater evils, permitted, simple priests to confirm. In Chrysostom's time it was customary in the East also to reserve the administration of this sacrament to bishops. But a writer of the fourth century—the author of a commentary on St. Paul at one time attributed to St. Ambrose—remarks that "in Egypt priests confirm (*consignant*) in the bishop's absence." This custom must have been well established before the schism, for Photius reproached Pope Nicholas with causing the Bulgarians who had been confirmed by priests to be reconfirmed. At Florence nothing was done to alter the Greek custom of allowing priests to confirm (though the Latin usage had been imposed at Constantinople by Innocent III. and in Cyprus by Innocent IV.), and at present it continues not only among the Greeks, but also among the Oriental Christians generally.

Such are the facts, and the following are the principles held by Catholic theologians on the minister of Confirmation. In ordinary cases, a bishop only can confirm, but the Pope may empower, and has repeatedly empowered, a simple priest to do so, provided at least the chrism which he uses has been consecrated by a bishop. It is commonly held that the Pope alone can give simple priests this power, so that if they attempt to confirm without permission from the Pope, or in any case without his tacit consent, the act is null.[1] Confirmation given by a bishop according to the rite of the Church is always valid, but it is unlawful unless given by the bishop of the diocese, or with his leave.

(2) There has been much dispute among theologians as to the essential *matter* of Confirmation. Some, with the learned Jesuit Sirmond, make it consist in the mere imposi-

[1] Ephes. i. 13. [2] *De Baptismo*, *PL*, i. 1207.
[3] *Praescript.* 40, *PL*, ii. 54.
[4] See also Innocent I. in his letter *Ad Decentium* (Alban Butler, July 28).

[1] Billuart, *De Confirmat.* a. 7.

tion of hands, arguing that this alone is mentioned in Scripture, and appealing to the canon of Elvira, already quoted, as well as to the Council of Orange (anno 441), canon 2, which seems to deny in express terms that anointing with chrism is necessary.[1] Others, and they are much more numerous, contend that anointing with chrism is a necessary part of the sacrament. They urge that the Greeks have no special imposition of hands, apart from the unction; that St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his third "Catechesis" never mentions the imposition of hands, though this "Catechesis" is entirely occupied with Confirmation; that the Greeks have always regarded the *chrismation* as the principal matter; that Cyprian makes the unction a matter of necessity; while it is prescribed in all Latin Sacramentaries. This latter opinion seems the more probable. Unction is almost certainly needed for the validity of the sacrament, imposition of hands being also required, but only such imposition as is implied in the act of putting the chrism on the forehead. (See, however, Bareille in DThC, and Scannell in "Cath. Enc.")

(3) The present form of Confirmation in the West has been already given; the Greek form is, "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit," and this they have employed from very ancient times. The present Latin form, on the contrary, is not older than the twelfth century. In an Ordo Romanus of the eighth century we find the form, "I confirm thee in the Name of the Father," &c.; in a Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, "Receive the sign of the holy cross with the chrism of salvation in Christ Jesus unto eternal life"; in the Sacramentary of Gelasius, "The sign (*signum*) of the cross with eternal life." All of these forms have been permitted, because all sufficiently indicate the grace given, and were therefore valid.

(4) All baptized persons are capable of receiving this sacrament, though to receive it with fruit they must be in a state of grace. The Greeks and Orientals give it immediately after Baptism, and in the West down to the thirteenth century a child was confirmed as soon after Baptism as possible. A synod of Worcester (1240) forbids parents, under pain of exclusion from church, to leave their children without Confirmation more than a year. But the Roman Catechism advises that Confirmation should not be given till the age of reason, when Christians have to begin their warfare with sin, and it suggests the twelfth year as a suitable time for confirmation. This sacrament is not necessary for salvation, though so great a means of grace cannot be neglected without sin.

(5) The ceremonies accompanying confirmation are these. The bishop, who wears an amice, stole and cope, of white colour, spreads his hands over those he is to confirm, praying that the Holy Ghost may descend on them; immediately after confirming them, he gives them a slight blow on the cheek, in token that they must be ready to suffer for Christ, and finally dismisses them with his blessing. Those to be confirmed are brought to the sacrament by their god-parents (specially appointed for this sacrament, each male having a god-father, and each female a god-mother), and, if old enough to do so, place their foot on the right foot of the god-parent. In ancient times a white cloth bound round the forehead after chrismation was kept on for seven days afterwards. [See CHRISMAL.] This custom is mentioned in Egbert's Pontifical and in many other places. The ceremony of the blow on the cheek is comparatively modern. It is usual to take another Christian name at Confirmation, which, however, is not used afterwards in signing the name; and formerly the "confirmandi" were required to be fasting.

(6) The place for giving Confirmation is the church. Formerly it was sometimes given in the baptistery, but occasionally the old basilicas had a special place between the baptistery and the church called "Consignatorium"—*i.e.* place for giving the seal of Confirmation. Such a "Consignatorium" may still be seen at Salona. (See Chardon, 159; De Augustinis, "De Re Sacramentaria," i. 409; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 393; Scannell in "Cath. Enc."; Ruch, Bareille, Bernard, &c., in DThC.)

CONFITEOR. A form of prayer ("I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary ever Virgin," &c.) used in the sacrament of Penance and on many other occasions, particularly by the priest in the Roman rite at the beginning of Mass, before he ascends the steps of the altar. This practice of making some general confession before Mass is grounded on the Jewish use of making confession before sacrifice, and is very ancient, being found in the liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, &c., although (at least in the liturgies of St. James and St. Chrysostom) this confession was made by the priest while preparing for Mass, and before approaching the altar. The present form of the Confiteor came into general use during the thirteenth century. A council of Ravenna (anno 1314) mentions that a variety of forms was current, and imposes the present one. The Carthusian, Carmelite, and Dominican forms are quite short, and contain only one "mea culpa." A difficulty has been raised by Protestants against confessing to the Blessed Virgin and the saints. But it is reasonable to do so, not only because we need their prayers for pardon, but also because the saints, as St. Paul tells us, will judge the world. (From Meratus, "Novae Observ. in Gavant." tom. i. p. 174. See Bona, "Rerum Liturg." ii. c. ii.; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc.")

CONFRATERNITY. An association, gene-

[1] See Hefele-Leclerq, ii. 432 *sqq.*

rally of laymen, having some work of devotion, charity or instruction for its objects, undertaken for the glory of God. The Roman jurisprudence, instinct as it was with the spirit of centralization, looked with little favour on independent corporations; originally a Christian church was in its eyes a *collegium illicitum*; and in the face of this strong political sentiment it was a great thing that the Church, the diocese, and the parish, did in the course of the first four centuries succeed in establishing their right to exist, grow, and energise by their own laws, and not according to the dictation of the State. The Roman empire was broken up; its centralization gave place to feudalism; under which local privileged corporations, circumscribed in area, but all the more intensely active within that area, tended to multiply themselves over the face of Europe. There now arose, by the side of the organization of the parish, which on the whole had survived the storm of barbarian invasion, minor organizations, governed by bye-laws and endowed with privileges, which laboured earnestly to repair the ravages and reform the confusion of the times. Hence arose confraternities; which, under the names *Gildoniae* and *Confratriae* [see GILDS], appear to be first mentioned in the writings of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, in the ninth century. Hincmar laid down rules for them, prescribing to the members frequent oblations, alms, prayers, and Masses. They were to interest themselves in every religious work and ministration—in providing lights, ordering funerals, in the collection and distribution of alms, &c. If they desired to meet together, it was to be in the presence of the parish priest, who was to exhort them to concord, give them bread to eat, and after one drink dismiss them ("semel potos dimittat"). In the three succeeding centuries little is on record as to the progress of confraternities. In the thirteenth century they received a sudden and amazing development. Odo, Bishop of Paris (†1208), is recorded as having fixed the annual fête for a Confraternity of the Blessed Virgin in his diocese. In Italy the Confraternity of the Standard (*del Gonfalone*) was erected at Rome about 1260, and the example was so extensively followed that in a short time there was no city or town in Italy, and hardly even a parish, that was without its confraternity.

Canon law contains a great number of decisions given for the regulation of confraternities. Thus it is forbidden to erect more than one confraternity of the same kind in the same place; they may not have processions without the licence of the ordinary; nor can the members have confessors whom he has not approved. In many other ways their free action is subjected to the assent of the bishop.

The ends which confraternities propose to themselves are extremely various: they include personal sanctification by means of special religious practices and exercises, and works of charity of many kinds, for the relief of the poor and sick, the payment of the last rites to the dead, the support of orphan and abandoned children, &c., &c.

When a confraternity reaches the stage at which filiations, similar to itself, are formed in other places, and adopt its rules, it takes the name of *arch-confraternity*, and acquires certain particular privileges.

The most important arch-confraternities at present existing are the Holy Family [*q.v.*], children of Mary [*q.v.*], that of the Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary for the conversion of sinners, founded in 1837 by the saintly Abbé Desgenettes, curé of Notre Dame des Victoires, Paris; that of the Scapular [see SCAPULAR]; that of St. Francis Xavier, or of the Missions, instituted to assist in the work of the propagation of the faith; and that of Christian Mothers (1859), instituted by the Abbé Theodor Ratisbonne. Confraternities of the Most Holy Rosary can only be established with the sanction of the authorities of the Dominican order. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul [see that article] is really an arch-confraternity; and the "Conferences" of which it consists are confraternities. (GILDS; Ferraris, *Confraternitas*; Thomassin; Taunton).

CONGREGATIO DE AUXILIIS. [See GRACE, p. 393.]

CONGREGATIONS, RELIGIOUS. A congregation is a community or order bound together by a common rule, either without vows (as the Oratorians, the Oblates of St. Charles, &c.), or without solemn vows (as the Passionists, the Redemptorists, &c.).

In France this term is extended to *lay* associations, whether of men or women, which, having a religious end in view, devote themselves to some work of instruction or charity. So understood, it would comprise all confraternities. In England, the use of the term is in practice more restricted, and perhaps the only lay association to which it is here applied is that of the Christian Brothers, founded by St. J. B. de la Salle, which, however, since the brothers take the three vows, partakes of the monastic character. Among the more noted congregations of men are the following:—

1. The Oratorians of St. Philip Neri, a congregation of secular priests founded in 1564. [See ORATORY OF ST. PHILIP.]

2. The French Oratorians, founded by Cardinal de Bérulle in 1611. [See ORATORY, THE FRENCH.]

3. The "Fathers of the Mission," founded by St. Vincent of Paul in 1624; they are usually called Lazarists [*q.v.*].

4. The Oblates of St. Charles, founded

by St. Charles Borromeo. [See OBLATES.]

5. The Passionists, founded in 1720 by St. Paul of the Cross. [See PASSIONISTS.]

6. The Redemptorists, founded by St. Alphonsus Liguori. [See REDEMPTORISTS.]

7. The Marists, founded by some priests of Lyons, in 1836. [See MARISTS.]

8. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, founded in 1681 by Saint J. B. de la Salle. [See CHRISTIAN BROTHERS.]

9. The Fathers of Charity (Rosminians), Paulist Fathers, Xaverian Brothers, &c.

Another kind of religious congregation is a group of monasteries belonging to some great order, which agree together to practise the rule more strictly in their respective houses, and to unite themselves together by closer ties of government and discipline. Such was the great congregation of Cluny [CLUNY], that of St. Maur [BENEDICTINES], that of La Trappe [CISTERCIANS, TRAPPISTS], and among the Canons Regular that of the Lateran.

CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN. From the earliest times the chair of Peter has been resorted to by Christians who, being in doubt on some matter of religion, desired an authoritative solution of that doubt. In later times the number of converted nations and tribes having on the whole, in spite of the losses of the sixteenth century, been much increased, and the means of communication extended—the amount of business of all kinds which the divinely appointed centrality of the Holy See brings upon it has become far too great to be dealt with except by means of an organization, planned and framed with consummate prudence and skill, which permits the Pope to use the eyes, ears, and judgments of a great number of trained and competent assistants, while retaining that initiative and that complete cognizance in every question, of which he cannot divest himself. This organization consists in the main of the congregations into which the Cardinals are distributed. The decisions of these congregations, when duly authenticated, are final in any case for the individual, and must be taken as the decisions of the Pope himself. If, however, they pass beyond interpretation, and grant or forbid anything beyond what the words of the law warrant, they have not the force of a general law unless they are issued by the special mandate of the Pope.

The original formation of the Congregations was made by Sixtus V. in his constitution "Immensa" (January 22, 1588). They were at first fourteen in number, but in the course of time others were added. The present organization was established by Pius X. ("Sapienti Consilio," June 29, 1908). The new constitution clearly defined the competency of each congregation so as to avoid, as far as possible, any conflict of jurisdiction. There are now thirteen in number.

1. The Congregation of the Holy Office (formerly called *Suprema C. Sanctae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis*). [See INQUISITION.]

2. The Congregation of the Consistory (*Consistorialis*). Formerly its duty was to prepare the business (chiefly relating to the erection, removal, and discontinuance of churches, and to the preconisation or translation of bishops) to be brought before the Papal Consistory [*q.v.*]. The new constitution has greatly extended its scope, so that now it is perhaps the first in importance of all the congregations. On account of the vast numbers of matters with which it has to deal, it is divided into two sections: (1) To prepare the business for Papal Consistories as before, and especially to establish new dioceses and elect bishops in countries not subject to Propaganda; (2) To transact all business relating to countries not under Propaganda, *e.g.* the supervision of bishops in regard to the performance of their duties, and more particularly the discipline and studies in seminaries. It has also the important function of deciding doubts relating to the competency of the other congregations. The Consistorial is composed exclusively of cardinals, but there are a number of inferior officials.

3. Congregation of the Sacraments. This congregation was established by Pius X. to deal with discipline relating to the sacraments, especially Matrimony and Holy Order. Certain matters, however, in which questions of faith are concerned, are reserved to the Holy Office, *e.g.* mixed marriages.

4. Congregation of the Council. Founded by Pius IV. (1564) to provide for the carrying out of the decrees of the council of Trent, and to settle all doubts relating to their interpretation. As these decrees extend to almost every department of canon law, the competency of this congregation was very wide. By the new constitution it has lost its jurisdiction over the sacraments and some other matters; but it still watches over the observance of the commandments of the Church, and in general it has the care of the secular clergy and the faithful.

5. Congregation of Religious. Originally founded by Sixtus V. as also was a separate congregation relating to bishops and other prelates. These two were afterwards combined into the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars to take cognizance of the differences that arise from time to time between bishops and the regular communities established within their dioceses, in regard to exemption, visitation, and other matters. By the new Constitution this last congregation was abolished, and the affairs of bishops transferred to the Congregation of the Council, while the affairs of regulars were entrusted

to the new congregation called the Congregation of Religious.

6. Congregation of Propaganda. [See PROPAGANDA.]

7. Congregation of the Index. [See INDEX.]

8. Congregation of Rites. [See RITES, CONGREGATION OF.]

9. Congregation of Ceremonies. This is distinct from the last-named, and is indeed the more ancient of the two. It has to deal with papal ceremonies, and those of the cardinals, as also with all those belonging to the papal court.

10. Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. In times of exceptional circumstances the Popes have formed special congregations to consider these; *e.g.* during the French revolution and for some time afterwards there existed a Congregation for the Ecclesiastical Affairs of France. The scope of this congregation was afterwards extended to the whole world, as the state of affairs created by that great upheaval was still exceptional. It is now a permanent body, but it only comes into activity when any matter is remitted to it by the Pope.

11. Congregation of Studies. This was formerly a congregation for the superintendence of the university of Rome, and later of the studies in the Pontifical States. By the new constitution this congregation has jurisdiction over ecclesiastical studies throughout the world.

12. Congregation of Loreto. [See LORETO.]

13. Congregation of the Fabric of St. Peter's.[1]

The Pope sometimes constitutes a special congregation *ad hoc*; this was done by Leo XIII. when he selected cardinals from the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars and Propaganda to examine sundry points of controversy between the bishops and regular missionaries of England and Scotland. See the Constitution *Romanos Pontifices* of May 8, 1881. (For the Roman congregations as they formerly were constituted see Ferraris, *Congregationes Ecclesiasticae Romanae*; for the new arrangement see Ojetti, "De Romana Curia," and art. in "Cath. Enc.")

CONGREGATIONS AT GENERAL COUNCILS. When a Council meets, congregations of bishops must be appointed, by or with the approval of the Pope, for drawing up rules for the orderly despatch of business, determining when and where the sessions shall be held, preparing the questions to be debated, and many other matters of the same kind. A different kind of congregation came prominently into view at the Council of Constance—that of the Nations. The Latin Church was at that time understood to be divided into four nations—the Italians, French, English, and Germans—and the vote was taken in the Council by nations, not by individuals. The bishops of each nation, therefore, formed themselves into a congregation, in order to prediscuss all questions about to come before the Council, in the light of their bearing on the interests of their respective countrymen. [See CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF.]

CONGRESSES. Catholic congresses are gatherings for the purpose of promoting the spiritual, social, and intellectual welfare of the faithful. Though they are not of recent origin, they nevertheless have come into prominence during the last sixty or seventy years. A striking feature of them has been the active share taken by the laity both in their organization and in the discussions. The peculiar circumstances of Catholics in Germany and the German character have naturally formed a favourable soil in which these gatherings could flourish. Since the year 1848 they have been held almost annually either in Germany itself or in Austria. Numbers of smaller gatherings for special subjects have also been held, which we in England should call "Conferences." France, for political reasons, did not take up the movement until some twenty years later; but since the importance of combining social with religious work has been realized, congresses have become frequent and have been well attended. Unfortunately their success has been somewhat marred by differences of political opinion. Belgium, Switzerland, and even Denmark have their congresses. In Ireland and England in pre-emancipation days gatherings of Catholics for the purpose of obtaining relief from their disabilities were constantly held. In our own time, mainly through the action of the Catholic Truth Society [*q.v.*], conferences partaking of the character of the German congresses have been held in both countries. Latterly these conferences have developed into regular congresses. Since the publication of the Encyclical on Christian Doctrine (1905), catechetical congresses have been held at Munich (1905, 1907); Vienna (1905, 1908); Salzburg (1906); Lucerne (1907); Paris (1908), &c. At these gatherings scientific, yet practical, lectures were delivered, and demonstrations were given of actual catechizing. Unlike the Eucharistic congresses, these catechetical congresses have been merely national, and in many cases merely diocesan, since the solution of some problems varies according to the different conditions in the different countries and dioceses. Besides these national gatherings, international congresses have from time to time met in different countries. The first and most famous were those of Mechlin (1863–64); but the marked differences of opinion regarding liberalism and science led to their discontinuance. By limiting the scope of the matters for discussion to purely religious

[1] Benedict XV. (Nov. 4, 1915), erected by *motu proprio* a new congregation, "De Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus."

subjects on which all are in the main agreed, it has since been found possible to hold highly successful gatherings.

The International Eucharistic Congresses, the first of which was held at Lille in 1881, have for their object the propagation of devotion to Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, and have succeeded marvellously in stirring up the faith and devotion of Catholics. The congress held in London in September 1908, presided over by Cardinal Vannutelli, will long be remembered as the most imposing religious assemblage ever held in England.

America has also had its Catholic congresses. The first of these, for the United States, was held at Baltimore in November 1889. A second met at Chicago in September 1893. Montreal was the place of the Eucharistic Congress of 1910, and the splendour of the functions, and the numbers and devotion of the people, amply justified the choice of that city for the celebration. Two congresses have been held in Australia: Sydney, September 1900, and Melbourne, 1904.

The so-called "Congresses of Religions," held in various places, have been disapproved of by the Holy See. (See Spahn and Meehan in "Cath. Enc."; "Catholic Social Work in Germany"; "Dublin Review," July 1908.)

CONGRUISM. [See GRACE, p. 393.]

CONSANGUINITY is taken here in its widest sense, to include all that theologians mean by *cognatio*. Natural consanguinity (*cognatio carnalis*) is the bond between persons descended from the same stock. By the law of nature, marriage is prohibited—and, indeed, a true marriage is impossible—between parent and child. Many theologians consider further that the law of nature nullifies marriage between all persons related in the "direct line"—*i.e.* between grand-parent and grandchild—and also, in the "collateral" line, between brothers and sisters. They argue from the horror of such unions which nature itself seems to inspire.

The Levitical law forbids a man to "approach" one who is a blood relation, and specially interdicts marriage with the mother, grand-daughter, sister or half-sister and aunt.[1] Probably these prohibitions are no more than instances, meant to be extended on analogy, for the marriage of a man with his daughter is omitted; and we can scarcely suppose that this is an enormity which did not require to be considered, since it is not more unnatural than the marriage of a man with his mother, and yet that is specially forbidden. As a matter of fact, the Levitical prohibitions were extended by the Talmudists.[2]

[1] The most complete list is given in Levit. xviii. 6 *seq.*; but see also Deut. xxvii. 22; Levit. xx. 17 *seq.*

[2] However, only to a very slight extent. Marriages between uncle and niece were encouraged by the rabbins. But the Karaites, the great opponents among the Jews of rabbinical tradition, objected to the marriage of cousins.

In the Roman law the degrees of collateral relationship are calculated by summing up the number of persons in each line, omitting the person from whom they descend. Thus, brothers and sisters are akin in the second, cousins in the fourth degree. Several changes were made in the Roman prohibitions of marriage. That between cousins was not allowed in early times, though not infrequent after the second Punic war. Such a union was prohibited by Theodosius, though his son Arcadius repealed this interdict and Justinian adhered to the more lenient view. Marriage between uncle and niece was unlawful among the Romans. Claudius, to contract a marriage of this kind, exercised strong pressure on the senate, and so got the law altered on this point; and later authorities restored this general prohibition.

In the Eastern Church, the Council in Trullo forbade marriage between cousins. Under the Isaurian emperors, Leo and Constantinus, alliances were interdicted between persons standing in the sixth degree of consanguinity according to Roman computation—*i.e.* between the grandchildren of brothers and sisters. Not long afterwards the seventh degree likewise was forbidden, and so the law stands to this day among the Greeks.

In the West, the old Teutonic mode of computing collateral consanguinity obtained, according to which brothers and sisters are related in the first degree, cousins in the second, uncle and niece in the second, &c. The canon law prohibited marriage to the seventh degree of kindred, a prohibition which, though in words the same as the Greek rule, did in reality extend the prohibited degrees twice as far. In the year 1216, Innocent III., in the Fourth Lateran Council, reduced the prohibition to the fourth collateral degree. This ordinance continues in force, and hence at present a man cannot marry any woman from whom he is descended or who is descended from him, nor again anyone who is related to him collaterally (cousin, second-cousin, niece, grand-niece, &c.) as far as the fourth degree inclusive. The changes made in the church law by Protestant sects and Governments are very numerous and diverse. (See any of the ordinary treatises on Moral Theology; and for the historical facts the very learned essay of Kalisch on Matrimonial Laws in his "Commentary on Leviticus," vol. ii. p. 354 *seq.*).

Besides real consanguinity, the Church also recognizes such relationships as are spiritual and legal (*cognatio spiritualis et legalis*). Spiritual consanguinity is an impediment to marriage between the god-parent and the god-child, and between the god-parent and the natural parents of the child, and again between the minister and receiver of the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. Such is the present law of the Church. Spiritual relationship first appears as an

impediment to marriage in the sixth century, and there have been important changes in the law respecting it. Among the Greeks the impediment from this kind of affinity extends much further than among the Latins, but among the former it can only arise from Baptism, for they have no Confirmation sponsors. Legal affinity impedes marriage (1) between the adopter and the adopted and his children, so long as these children are under their parent's control; (2) between the adopted and the children of the adopter, so long as they are under their parent's control; (3) between the adopter and the wife of the adopted, as well as between the adopted and the wife of the adopter [see ADOPTION.]

CONSCIENCE. The word "conscientia" is used in the Vulgate as the translation of συνείδησις, the latter word being scarcely found in classical writers, though it frequently occurs in the New Testament. St. Thomas and other theologians define conscience as "the judgment or dictate of the practical intellect, which [arguing] from the general principles [of morals] pronounces that something in particular here and now is to be avoided, inasmuch as it is evil, or to be done, inasmuch as it is good."

A few words are needed to explain this definition and to point out how St. Thomas's conception of conscience differs from others common among modern philosophers. The reader, then, will observe that conscience denotes an act, and so is very different from the "faculty of conscience," of which Bishop Butler[1] and others speak. Further, it is concerned with a judgment, not on general principles, but on an act to be done or omitted. Conscience, for example, does not tell me that theft is sinful. General principles are perceived, according to St. Thomas, by the intellect, and the mind recognizes primary moral truths without any process of reasoning, through a habit congenital to it, which the scholastics call synderesis (*i.e.* συντήρησις). Conscience is the conclusion from premisses ultimately derived from this synderesis. Thus, knowing that evil acts are to be avoided, and that theft is an evil act, I form the practical conclusion, "I am bound to avoid this particular act of theft." Lastly, conscience is an act of the intellect, not of the will, though the will influences, in more ways than one, the formation of conscience.

From the definition given it is plain that conscience is not an infallible guide of action. As in speculative questions, so in morals, the reason may start from false principles or may argue wrongly from true principles. Hence conscience is said to be true or false; and, again, certain and doubtful, so far as the conclusion is formed with or without doubt; also scrupulous, if an action is judged or feared to be evil on grounds unworthy of serious consideration; and lax, if a judgment is formed on trifling grounds that an evil action is permissible or that a great sin is a little one. Other divisions of conscience are of less importance or are really included in those already given. Thus a "doubtful conscience" is either absolutely doubtful—*i.e.* the intellect, because it can see no reasons for enabling it to decide, or else reasons equally balanced on both sides, suspends judgment—or "probable," *i.e.* the intellect forms an opinion on grounds good, as far as they go, but not positively convincing.

Two great principles concerning conscience are laid down by Catholic divines. First, a man is always bound to follow his conscience, even if false and erroneous. Thus St. Paul, speaking of eating food which it was really lawful to eat, says, "He who distinguisheth [*i.e.* this food, as unlawful, from other food], if he eateth is condemned, because it is not from faith [*i.e.* as is evident from the context, because it is not from conscience]; but all which is not from faith is sin."[1] The reason is obvious. We apprehend the law of God in the particular case through the dictate of conscience, and here a disobedience to conscience is an act of rebellion against God; just as a man who believed that the governor of a province conveyed the command of the sovereign would, even if the governor had altered the command, be guilty of disobedience to the sovereign if he set the order intimated to him at nought. Accordingly, a Protestant who is seriously convinced that it is a sin to hear Mass or to speak to a priest would undoubtedly commit sin by so doing. Nor can any injunction of any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, make it lawful for a man to do that which his conscience unhesitatingly condemns as certainly wicked. God Himself, Billuart says, cannot make it lawful for a man to act against his conscience, because to do so without sin is a contradiction in terms.

Secondly, a man is bound to form his conscience, or, in other words, his judgment on the moral character of his actions, with great care. It is not always a sufficient excuse to say that one who does wrong is following his conscience. If a person has grave grounds for suspecting that his conscience is erroneous, he is under a strict obligation of looking well into the matter. He is bound to take all reasonable means—such, in other words, as good and honest men do take when there is danger of offending God. He ought to pray and also, according to his opportunities, to consult others, particularly those

[1] The writer attributes this to Bishop Butler from recollection, without pledging himself to its accuracy. But anyhow, the opinion that conscience is a special faculty has been maintained,

[1] Rom. xiv. 23. So the Vulgate. The Greek really means, "he who doubts is condemned," *i.e.* by God. *Cf.* for the sense of διακρίνεσθαι, iv. 20, and ἐκ πίστεως = from Christian faith, informing the conscience. But this does not affect the argument we have drawn from the text.

set over him, to reconsider the grounds on which his conscience was formed, &c. If after the due use of means his ignorance cannot be overcome, it is plain that he is not responsible for the error into which he has fallen. The diligence spent on the inquiry need not be the greatest possible. The amount required depends on the gravity of the matter, the strength of his motives for doubting whether he is right, and the circumstances of the agent. (From St. Thomas, 1ª, q. 79 a. 12–13; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. i. tr. 1; Billuart, "De Actibus humanis," diss. v.)

CONSECRATION. 1. In general is the act of dedicating some person or thing to the service of God. It is not the same as blessing, though the two are not easily distinguished [see BLESSING]. We speak of the consecration of a bishop, the blessing of an abbot; the consecration of a chalice, the blessing of a font, the blessing of the holy oils. Roughly speaking, we might say that consecration requires a more solemn and elaborate ceremonial, a bishop for minister, and the use of holy oils; but this distinction does not always hold good. The Pontifical mentions the consecration (1) of a bishop; (2) of a church; (3) of an altar and an altar-stone; (4) of a chalice and paten; (5) of a virgin (nun). Some account of these consecrations will be found in the articles BISHOP, DEDICATION OF A CHURCH, ALTAR, CHALICE.

2. When, however, we use the term "Consecration" by itself, we mean the act of changing the bread and wine into Christ's Body and Blood in the Mass. This technical use of the word first occurs in Tertullian, "De An." 17.[1] The form for the consecration of the bread in the Roman Missal is "Hoc est enim corpus meum"; that of the wine, "Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur, in remissionem peccatorum." Some reckon the following words, "Haec quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis," as also pertaining to the form. Probably the mere words "This is my body," "This is my blood," would suffice for validity. The opinion of Scotus, that the words immediately preceding the form, viz. "who the day before he suffered," &c., are essential, need not be discussed here. But it is necessary to say something on a special difficulty with regard to the words of consecration. It arises from the liturgies of the Greeks.

In these liturgies, as well as in those of other Orientals, we find a form of prayer (ἐπίκλησις), after the consecration, imploring the Holy Ghost to descend on the gifts, making the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine His Blood. This has led some of the schismatic Greeks to make the consecration depend on these prayers. But

1. No mention is made of prayers after the words of consecration by any one of the synoptic evangelists or by St. Paul.

2. The earliest Fathers, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Chrysostom,[1] evidently make the consecration depend on the words of consecration.

3. The Greeks themselves at the Council of Florence unanimously admitted that the change was effected by the words of consecration, "Hoc est corpus," &c., convinced, as they said, by the words of their great doctor Chrysostom.[2]

4. The Oriental liturgies admit of a satisfactory interpretation. The prayers referred to are really a petition that what has been bread and wine may manifest itself by the effects produced on the souls of the communicants as the true body and blood of Christ: or, again, the prayer for the change of the gifts may be regarded as one act with the consecration. These interpretations will not appear forced to anyone familiar with the language of the Eastern liturgies. Thus in a Ritual of Severus God is asked after the actual baptism to sanctify the baptized persons with the laver of regeneration. Similar examples are collected by Meratus. There is a special Catholic treatise on this subject, "Die Eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese," by Dr. Joseph Franz. (Fortescue, "The Mass," 402–7; Rauschen, "Eucharistie u. Buss-sakrament," § 6; Schulte, "Consecranda"; Van der Stappen, "Sacra Liturgia," iii.; Bona, "Rerum Liturg."; "Pontificale Romanum.")

CONSECRATION OF ALTARS. Altars and altar-stones are consecrated by the bishop with ceremonies prescribed in the Pontifical. The most essential part of the rite consists in the anointing with chrism (to indicate, according to Gavantus, the richness of grace), and the placing of relics in the sepulchre or repository made in the altar-stone and afterwards sealed up. The consecration endures till the altar-stone is broken or the seal of relics broken. Cardinal Bona contends that the practice of consecrating altars is of Apostolic origin. Putting aside doubtful decrees of early Popes, we find such consecration first mentioned by the Fathers of the fourth and councils of the sixth century. (From Gavantus, and Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie." See also DEDICATION OF CHURCHES.)

CONSISTORY (Lat. *Consistorium*). A meeting of official persons to transact business, and also the place where they meet. The word is classical, and was used of the privy council of the Roman emperors.[3]

[1] St. Ambrose makes St. Laurence say that Pope Xystus had entrusted to him, though only a deacon, "dominici sanguinis consecrationem," *i.e.* probably "the consecrated Blood of our Lord," viz. for distribution to the people.

[1] Tertullian's statement is explicit: "He made the bread his body, saying, This is my body."—*Adv. Marc.* iv. 40, *PL*, ii. 460. The difficulty in the words which follow has nothing to do with the question before us.

[2] Hefele, *Concil.* vii. p. 740.

[3] Ausonius (*Grat. Act.* 29), addressing the Emperor Gratian, speaks of "illa sedes, ut ex more loquimur, consistorii, ut ego sentio, sacrarii tui."

Before the Reformation every English bishop had his consistory, composed of some of the leading clergy of the diocese, presided over by his chancellor. The name is still retained in the Anglican Church, but the consistory is with them a court and nothing more. In the Catholic Church the term is now seldom used except with reference to the Papal consistory, the ecclesiastical senate in which the Pope, presiding over the whole body of Cardinals, deliberates upon grave ecclesiastical affairs, and communicates to his venerable brethren, and through them to Christendom, the solicitudes and intentions of the vicar of Christ as to the condition of some Christian nation, or the definition of some Catholic doctrine. The ordinary meetings of the consistory, held about once a fortnight, are secret; they are usually, but not invariably, presided over by the Pope. Public consistories are held from time to time, as occasion may require; they are attended by other prelates besides the Cardinals, and by the representatives of foreign Courts. In them the resolutions which the Pope has arrived at in secret consistory are announced, and an allocution on some matter of pressing importance is commonly delivered by the Pontiff to the assembled Cardinals.

CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION. [See CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN (2).]

CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF. An attempt had been made early in the fifteenth century to close the schism in the Papacy by the convocation of a general council at Pisa (1409). Twenty-four Cardinals assembled there had claimed to depose both Gregory XII. and the antipope, Peter de Luna, Benedict XIII., and had elected Cardinal Philargi, who took the title of Alexander V. On the death of Alexander in a few months at Bologna, the Cardinals chose Balthasar Cossa, then governor in that portion of the Papal States, to succeed him. Balthasar took the title of John XXIII. Neither Gregory nor Peter de Luna consented to make a renunciation in favour of John; hence there were three persons each claiming to be the true Pope, and the action of the Council of Pisa had only resulted, for the moment, in making the confusion worse than before. The emperor of Germany, Sigismund of Luxemburg, formed the praiseworthy determination to use every means in his power to terminate so disastrous a state of things. In concert with John XXIII. he summoned a general council, with the threefold object of terminating the schism, extirpating heresy, and reforming the Church in head and members. Constance, an imperial city on the lake so named, was fixed upon as the place of meeting. John, though his blemished character made him shrink from facing the council, had been able to find no excuse against the emperor's importunity; but he trusted that it would meet somewhere in Italy, and that the great preponderance of Italian bishops, many of whom were bound to him in various ways, would suffice to screen him from attack. His heart sank when he heard that his legates had consented to the selection of a city beyond the Alps, and he went to the council with a reluctance which the result completely justified.

All through the autumn of 1414, whatever was most illustrious in Europe for piety, learning, power or enterprise—the Pope and the Emperor, the princes of the empire, Cardinals, statesmen, bishops, theologians, merchants, artists, representatives of every rank and every calling in the then civilized world—was streaming from all directions along the roads that led to Constance. Among the English bishops the chief was Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury. France was represented by Peter d'Ailly, the Cardinal Archbishop of Cambray, and Gerson, the famous chancellor of the University of Paris. Among the Italians, none was of greater weight than Zabarella, the Cardinal Archbishop of Florence; he, with D'Ailly, soon came to the front, and took the lead in the deliberations of the fathers.

The council was opened by John XXIII. on November 5; the first public session was held on the 16th of the same month. With regard to the form in which business should be carried on, it was prearranged that the bishops should be divided into congregations answering to the nationalities to which they belonged (Italians, French, English, Germans —a fifth was added for Spain in 1416), and that the voting in the council should be by nations, not by individuals. The object of this was to neutralize the overwhelming numbers of the Italian bishops, who would otherwise have been able to outvote all the rest. It must be remembered that the objects for which the council met were to a large extent political and disciplinary; there was as yet no real schism on a grand scale with regard to any point of faith. Hence a mode of voting which would have been improper at Trent might offer the best solution of existing difficulties at Constance.

John Hus, or Huss, rector of the University of Prague, who had adopted many of the opinions of Wyclif, and was to justify himself, if he could, before assembled Christendom, arrived at Constance just before the opening of the Council,[1] furnished with a safe-conduct from the Emperor. Other Bohemian ecclesiastics also came, and denounced the preaching of Hus; before the end of the month the council ordered that he should be arrested and put in custody. A commission of three theologians was appointed to examine his teaching. In the following March he endeavoured to escape, but was retaken.

The more the antecedents of John XXIII.

[1] Nov. 3, 1414, not, as Milman states (*Latin Christianity*, xiii. 8), Dec. 3.

became known, the more evident appeared his unfitness for the Pontifical office; and the majority of the council came before long to the conclusion that he, with the other two claimants, must resign his pretensions, so that the Cardinals might proceed to a new election. This John agreed to do (1415, March 2), provided Gregory and Peter de Luna would do the same. Soon after, finding that his past career was being inquired into, he secretly withdrew (March 21) from Constance, and went to Schaffhausen, to be within reach of his friend Frederick, the Archduke of Austria. Long negotiations ensued; at length (1415, May 29, sess. xii.), John having failed to make the cession of his office in the form prescribed—the commission appointed to inquire into the charges brought against his character having also reported most unfavourably, and John himself having admitted the truth of a portion of those charges—the council declared him guilty, and deposed him from the Pontifical office, of which he shortly afterwards made the formal resignation that he had promised.

In the fourth and fifth sessions (March 30, April 6) decrees were adopted declaring that the council, representing the Catholic Church, held its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and that everyone, even the Pope himself, was bound to obey it in all that concerned the faith, the extinction of the schism, and the reform of the Church in its head and members. These decrees have often been quoted as if they involved a dogmatic definition subordinating the Pope to a general council. Attentively considered, they appear to be carefully restricted in their range, and to apply in their fullness only to that particular group of circumstances which they were intended to remedy. Even so interpreted, they must be regarded as untenable, and as excluded from the guarded and limited confirmations given by Martin V. and Eugenius IV. Still, in the midst of the uncertainty which prevailed as to who was the true Pope—an uncertainty which the best-disposed Christians, owing to the obscurity of the facts, often could not clear up for themselves—it may be admitted that there is much to be said in extenuation of the violent and uncanonical acts and speeches which appear on the conciliar record; since, unless the council could succeed in enforcing obedience to its decisions, there seemed to be no hope of restoring unity to the Church.[1]

The commission which had been appointed to examine the opinions of Wyclif and the Lollards was aided by the learning and zeal of the great English Carmelite, Thomas Walden, author of the "Doctrinale Fidei" and the "Fasciculi Zizaniorum." The wild and monstrous opinions to which Wyclif had set his hand were maturely examined, and the report of the commission was made about this time to the council. In the eighth session (May 4) the memory of Wyclif was solemnly condemned, and it was ordered that his remains should be exhumed, and, as those of an impenitent heretic, cast forth from the place of Christian burial in which they lay.

In the thirteenth session (1414, June 15) the lawfulness and expediency of giving communion to the laity under one species were affirmed, and those who obstinately maintained the contrary were to be treated as heretics.

In the fourteenth session (1415, July 4) Gregory XII. gave in his resignation of the Papacy. Peter de Luna, in spite of the entreaties of the king of Aragon, refused to renounce his pretensions. He was consequently disregarded, and, abandoned by nearly all his adherents, he was left to fulminate idle censures from the rock of Peñiscola.

In the fifteenth session (July 6) the doctrine of Jean Petit, who had written a book to justify the assassination of the Duke of Orleans by the order of the Duke of Burgundy in 1407, was partially condemned. A condemnation of Hus, who had refused to recant his heretical opinions, was at the same time published, and he was delivered to the secular arm. He was burnt at the stake on the same day. An outcry being raised on the ground of the violation of the safe-conduct given him, the council (sess. xviii. Aug. 17) adopted a decree by which the emperor was exonerated from all blame. He had done, it was said, all that depended on him to keep his word; and if Hus had been less obstinate, he would have gone and returned in safety. But the emperor had not the power, nor did he intend, to control the course of ecclesiastical discipline, which, when defied, executed itself by the means regarded in that age as efficacious.

About the same time the case of the margraviate of Brandenburg, vacant by the death without heirs of the last margrave of the house of Ballenberg, was brought before the council. The qualifications of several princes having been discussed, the choice of the council fell on the young Conrad of Hohenzollern, an insignificant principality in South Germany. This was the beginning of the extraordinary rise of that now celebrated and imperial house.

The years 1416 and 1417 were chiefly taken up with negotiations respecting the election of a Pope, and endeavours to remedy ecclesiastical abuses. The English and Germans wished to postpone the election of a Pope till after the completion of the reforms; the French and Italian nations took the

[1] The learned Cardinal de Turrecremata, who was present at the council, writes:—"Manifeste, decretum illorum Patrum non loquitur universaliter, sed de illa [synodo] singulariter pro cujus tempore non erat in Ecclesia unus pastor totius Ecclesiæ indubitatus." (Quoted in Bail's *Summa Conciliorum*, i. 485.)

opposite view. The latter, in the opinion of Möhler, were clearly in the right. At last (1417, Nov. 11) the Cardinal Otto Colonna was elected Pope by twenty-three cardinals and a representative delegation of thirty prelates, six for each nation, Spain being now included. Cardinal Colonna, who took the name of Martin V., was a man of great integrity and ability, and of irreproachable morals. The new Pope confirmed the council's acts, limiting his confirmation to what had been done "conciliariter in materiis fidei, et non aliter nec alio modo."

The bishops were now weary of their conciliar labours, and anxious to return to their dioceses. Concordats between Rome and the principal nations, regulating future relations and cutting off some of the worst abuses, were hastily framed, and the council was dissolved in its forty-fifth session, April 22, 1418. (Fleury, "Hist. Eccl."; Bail, "Summa Conciliorum"; Möhler, "Kirchengeschichte"; Pastor, "History of the Popes," vol. i.; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," book ii.; Salembier, "The Great Schism of the West," good bibliography; Baudrillart in DThC.)

CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF. (1) *General Councils.*—The Second General Council (1st of CP.). A council of 150 Eastern bishops, which met in 381. It was presided over first by Meletius of Antioch, then by Gregory of Nazianzum, who had re-established the orthodox faith in the city. The true faith was maintained against Arianism in all its manifold varieties, as well as against Apollinarianism and Macedonianism. The last heresy—named from Macedonius, a semi-Arian bishop of Constantinople, deposed by the Catholics in 360—consisted in a denial of the Holy Ghost's perfect Godhead. To meet this error the council added to the Nicene Creed the words "and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and Son is together worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." This council had in itself no claim to be oecumenical, but it was generally recognized as such since the sixth century, because its doctrinal definitions (not its disciplinary canons) were accepted throughout the Church.

The Fifth General Council (2nd of CP.) met in 553 with 165 bishops. It condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, the erroneous portions in the writings of Theodoret, and the letter of Ibas, because of their Nestorian tendency. There was no explicit condemnation of Origen's errors, though he was named and anathematized among other heretics. The decrees of this council were received by Popes Vigilius and Pelagius, but it was long before its oecumenical character was acknowledged throughout the West. [See THREE CHAPTERS.]

Sixth General Council (3rd of CP.), convoked in 680 by Constantine Pogonatus in union with Pope Agatho, and presided over by the Papal legates. It accepted Pope Agatho's definitions of "two physical wills [*i.e.* in Christ], without division, change, partition, confusion, the two wills not being contrary to each other, but the human will being subject to the divine." [See MONOTHELITES.] Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius [see HONORIUS], Pyrrhus, Paul, were anathematized. Pope Leo II. confirmed the decrees.

Eighth General Council (4th of CP.) met in 869, and endeavoured to heal the schism which threatened to separate the East from Rome, by deposing Photius and restoring Ignatius lawful patriarch of Constantinople. The Greeks finally refused to acknowledge the council, substituting for it a council of 879, in which the conduct and ordination of Photius were approved.

(2) *Particular Councils.*—Special mention is due to the synod in Trullo (*q.v.*), which met in 692. It passed 102 canons dealing with numerous questions of discipline, and partly with the worship of the Eastern church. The decrees betray a strong animus against Rome, and though regarded as œcumenical by the Greeks, it was never received in the West.

(3) Of schismatical councils we may name two, held in 1638 and 1642, against the Calvinistic errors of Cyril Lucar. (Hefele-Leclercq, tomes i.–iii.)

CONSTANTINOPLE, PATRIARCHATE OF. The church of Byzantium was originally a simple bishopric, subject to the metropolitan see of Heraclea. A new state of things began when the city became the seat of the imperial Court; the metropolitan of Heraclea could no longer exercise his authority over his suffragan of Constantinople; and in 381 canon 3 of the Second General Council assigned to the see of Constantinople a primacy of honour (*πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς*) after that of Old Rome. The Greek canonist Zonaras frankly admits that this canon acknowledges the superiority of the Roman bishop. But did it give real patriarchal power to the bishop of Constantinople? De Marca answers in the negative; so does Hergenröther; but Hefele considers it more likely that this canon gave, not only a primacy of honour, but also real jurisdiction in the district of Thrace to the Bishop of Constantinople. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 26.)

With this power the bishops of Constantinople were not content, and they found it easy to extend their jurisdiction. In the West, Cyprian, the Council of Sardica, and other authorities, accepted the principle expressed by St. Augustine when he says "The Lord laid the foundations of his Church in the Apostolic sees," and to such foundation Constantinople could make no plausible claim. But in the East the notion prevailed that the ecclesiastical should correspond with

the civil dignity of a city, a principle clearly implied in the 9th canon of the Synod in Encaeniis, which met at Antioch in 341. Moreover, bishops came from all parts of the East, to lay their petitions before the emperor. He often referred them to the bishop of the place, *i.e.* of Constantinople, and the latter settled the matter in a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* composed of the bishops who happened to be in the capital, over which synod he himself presided. Thus very often the affairs even of other patriarchates were tried by agreement of the contending parties, and soon this custom led to a claim as of right. This power grew under St. John Chrysostom, of whom Theodoret says that he ruled Thrace, Asia and Pontus, in all twenty-eight provinces. Atticus, the second bishop after Chrysostom, was empowered by an imperial edict to consecrate metropolitans even beyond Thrace. In the earlier part of the fifth century we find Proclus of Constantinople ordaining bishops for Pontus and Asia. About the middle of the fifth century Anatolius of Constantinople actually appointed Maximus bishop of Antioch and thus assumed authority over the ancient patriarchal see. True, opposition was made to these pretensions, but without permanent effect, and at the Fourth General Council (Chalcedon) Anatolius tried to get the claims of his see fully and formally acknowledged. The time singularly favoured such a project. The bishoprics of Alexandria and Ephesus were vacant. Maximus of Antioch was a creature of Anatolius, while Juvenal of Jerusalem was specially indebted to him. Accordingly, in canon 28 of Chalcedon, the decree of the Second Council placing Constantinople next in dignity to Rome was confirmed, and further it was determined that the bishop of Constantinople should consecrate the metropolitans of Pontus, Asia Proconsularis, and Thrace, and also the bishops in "barbarous countries."[1] Pope Leo absolutely refused to confirm this canon, as his predecessors had ignored canon 2 of Constantinople,[1] and for long the Greeks, who had acknowledged that it needed Papal confirmation, omitted it in their collection. Still the see of Constantinople did in fact exercise the power assigned to it at Chalcedon and continued to do so, in spite of repeated protests on the part of the Popes. Gregory the Great had to protest vigorously against the assumption of the title "Oecumenical Patriarch" by John the Faster (about 587). Justinian confirmed the rank of Constantinople; while the Greek synod in Trullo repeated 28 of Chalcedon. Illyria during the Iconoclastic controversy was torn from the Roman, and united to the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, under which it continued when the strife on images was over; and finally, after the schism of the East, the patriarch of Constantinople became independent head of the whole (schismatic) Eastern church, with the provinces of Pontus, Asia, Thrace, and Illyria in immediate subjection to himself. Later, he also obtained a primacy over Russia, in accordance with the canon of Chalcedon, which placed the territory of barbarians under his care.

However, in modern times, political causes, which had originally established, grievously diminished the power of Constantinople. In the sixteenth century (1589), a Russian patriarchate was instituted at Moscow, and although it exists no longer, the Russian church is governed by a "holy synod" (1721) independent of Constantinople. The church of the kingdom of Greece also secured its independence in consequence of the revolution of 1821. The Greek schismatical bishops in the Austrian territory are also independent of Constantinople. So now are the schismatics of Bulgaria and Montenegro, and the patriarch's jurisdiction is limited to Turkey in Europe and all those dioceses in Asiatic Turkey which do not belong to the other three patriarchates.

A Latin patriarchate was founded at Constantinople during the time of the Latin rule there (1204–1261). The title is still borne by one of the high dignitaries of the Papal Court. There is also a Vicar Apostolic for the Latins. In the Fourth Lateran Council Innocent III. gave the second place among the sees of Christendom to the Greek Patriarchate, and this privilege was renewed in the Second Council of Lyons and in the Council of Florence. (See Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus"; Hefele-Leclercq, vol. ii.; Lamy in the "Dublin Review" for July 1880; Vailhé in DThC; Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church." See also Hergenröther's "Photius.")

CONSTANTINOPLE, RITE OF. [See BYZANTINE RITE; LITURGIES, p. 529.]

CONSTITUTIONAL CLERGY. This was the name given to that portion of the French clergy which gave in its adhesion to the "civil constitution" provided for them by a law of the National Assembly passed in August 1790, and took the oath of fidelity to it in the manner prescribed in the law itself.

The committee which drew up this notable scheme were not atheists, nor deists, nor Protestants; they were what would be called now bad, or liberal, Catholics. They aimed at introducing what they considered principles of liberty into the religious life of the nation, by releasing the bishops from their obedience to the Pope, and the inferior clergy from their dependence on the bishops. Yet they did not desire, like the English reformers of the sixteenth century, absolutely to reject the Pope and break off communion with him. For the 19th article of the Civil Constitution, after forbidding a newly-

[1] On the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the East, see Fleury, xviii. 7.

elected bishop to obtain any confirmation from Rome, proceeds:—"But he shall write to him [the Pope], as to the chief of the universal Church, in testimony of unity of faith and of the communion which he is bound to maintain with him."

The French clergy, to relieve the distress of the nation, had voluntarily renounced their tithes; of their landed property they had, on the motion of the notorious Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand, been stripped by a decree of the National Assembly. The Assembly recognized the obligation under which it lay, having expropriated the landed property of the clergy, to support them by a competent annual subvention from the public revenue. Had the bishops and the Holy See been allowed to frame the new arrangements which the change in the mode of supporting the clergy rendered necessary, it is probable that no serious difficulty would have arisen. But the Gallican party thought they saw their opportunity of erecting a church almost entirely national and self-governed; they seized it eagerly, and the result of their action was a terrible increase in the distractions of France, and a potent stimulus to the horrors and abominations of the Revolution.

The new constitution suppressed many of the French dioceses (which at that time were about 130 in number), and pretended to assign the boundaries of others, without the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authority. It decreed that the bishops should be elected by local conventions of the clergy, and confirmed by the metropolitans, without having recourse to the Holy See for canonical institution. It prescribed a number of minute regulations for the internal government of the French church, of which it is enough to say that, whether good or bad in themselves, they were such as no secular authority had any right to impose without the consent of the ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, all beneficed and employed clergy, whether bishops, priests, or others, were required to take an oath to maintain "the constitution decreed," on pain of deprivation *ipso facto* if the oath were refused.

The Pope (Pius VI.), on learning the nature of the law that was passing through the Assembly, wrote to Louis XVI., and to the Archbishops of Bordeaux and Vienne, urging the inevitable fall into schism which must be the result of such legislation. Thirty bishops, who had seats in the National Assembly, signed a paper called "Exposition of Principles on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy," which was drawn up in a sense antagonistic to the constitution by Boisgelin, archbishop of Aix. Nearly all the French bishops, and the doctors of the Sorbonne, adhered to this Exposition, and the great majority of the inferior clergy followed their example. This fidelity is in remarkable contrast with the conduct of the English bishops under Henry VIII., and with that of the majority of the beneficed clergy at the accession of Elizabeth.

The constitution was finally decreed on August 24, 1790, and the period terminating on January 4, 1791, was named as that within which the oath must be taken. The day came, and all the ecclesiastics in the Assembly, whether bishops or priests, refused the oath, and lost their seats in consequence. In the provinces also the oath was very generally refused; the only archbishop who took it was Loménie de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse, whose weakness was imitated by three bishops, those of Autun, Orleans, and Viviers. One hundred and twenty-seven prelates remained firm and refused the oath. Among the inferior clergy a similar constancy was manifested; still the influence of the Government, of a lay society much infected by unbelief, and of the old Gallican prejudices, was strong enough to induce a large number of priests to take the oath. These were the "jurants," the "prêtres assermentés," or "constitutionnels"; while the other side were called "dissidents," "prêtres non-assermentés," &c. Between the two parties a violent conflict arose.[1]

The Pope acted with great vigour; in briefs dated in March and April 1791, and addressed to the clergy and people of France, he discussed the terms of the constitution, showed how repugnant they were to the just freedom of the Church, and how inconsistent with the rights of that divine institution which Jesus Christ established upon earth, and laid under the ban of religion both those among the actual clergy who had taken the oath, and those who, in order to obtain clerical emolument and position, might in future take it. He also degraded Loménie de Brienne from the cardinalate.

Nevertheless, the schism continued to extend itself in France; new bishops were consecrated by Talleyrand and his accomplices, according to the forms prescribed by the civil constitution, and the Government soon lent its weight to the persecution which the revolutionary sect had commenced against the faithful priests. The Legislative Assembly decreed (Nov. 1791) that priests refusing the oath should be reputed under suspicion of revolt against the law and disaffection to their country; that they should be deprived of all salary, and imprisoned in such places as the departmental administrations might appoint. Further decrees in the course of the following

[1] Carlyle describes with evident satisfaction the blows and insults which the "dissident" priests had to endure at the hands of revolutionary *citoyennes* in Paris. He sums up the quarrel as amounting to this: that one party held that a bishop, "his creed and formularies being left quite as they were, can swear fidelity to King, Law, and Nation"; the other, that "he cannot, but that he must become an accursed thing." The extreme unfairness of this way of putting the matter is apparent even from the short sketch of the facts that we have given. (*French Revolution*, vol. ii. book iv. 1, 2.)

summer condemned all ecclesiastics "non-assermentés" to banishment. More than fifty thousand of the clergy came under this proscription; they left or prepared to leave the country in great numbers. The hatred and fear of the revolutionists were aroused, and a massacre of the priests began simultaneously in many parts of France.

The schism took the downward course usual with such movements; before long several of the constitutional bishops and priests married; those of them who had seats in the Convention nearly all voted for the king's execution; and in November 1793 the Bishop of Paris (Gobet) and his grand-vicars publicly abjured Christianity in the hall of the Convention. Yet these unhappy men did not save their lives by their apostasy; the greater number of them fell victims either to private vengeance or to the sanguinary patriotism of the Jacobin Government. Merged in the more horrible revolt against all law and "all that is called God," into which the Satanic energy and determination of the Jacobins plunged the whole French nation, the less criminal schism of the constitutionals almost disappears from sight. The worship of Reason and Nature was solemnly inaugurated in the church of Notre Dame; wherever the Convention had power the voice of religion was silenced, and the churches closed. When in 1801 the First Consul concluded a concordat with the Holy See for the restoration of Christian worship, twelve constitutional bishops were allowed to have sees, but only upon making the following declaration: "I declare before God that I profess adhesion and submission to the judgments of the Holy See on the ecclesiastical affairs of France." (CONCORDAT; Constantin, *Constitution Civile du Clergé* in DThC; Sicard, "L'Ancien Clergé de France.")

CONSTITUTIONS. In Roman law "a constitution is an ordinance of the emperor by decree, ordinance, or letter, and was always recognized as having the force of a statute" (Gaius i. 5). So in the canon law it is an ordinance of an ecclesiastical authority by decree or letter. It is especially applied to those emanating from the Pope. These may be issued either by a Bull or a Brief (see these arts.; see also POPE).

CONSTITUTIONS, APOSTOLIC. [See APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.]

CONSUBSTANTIAL (ὁμοούσιος). The word used by the Fathers of Nicaea, to establish the true Godhead of the Son, inserted by them in their Creed, and ever since the watch-word of those who have true faith in the divinity of Christ. A man may be said to be of one substance with another because he has the same specific nature; but the Son is consubstantial with the Father in another sense, for His nature is numerically one with that of the Father; else, there would be two Gods. Hence, when we say that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, we confess His perfect equality and co-eternity with the first Person of the Trinity and at the same time exclude all imperfection from His eternal generation. A human son receives an individual nature and is separate from his father; but God the Son is ever in the Father and the Father in Him.

The word had long been used in the Church. Tertullian (Adv. Prax. 13 and 4, PL, ii. 170, 159) says the Son is "of one substance" and "from the substance of the Father," and closely similar phrases occur in Clement of Alexandria and Novatian.[1] At the same time Paul of Samosata had used the word in an heretical sense, and, so understood, it had been condemned by an orthodox council at Antioch. Probably, as Hefele, following St. Epiphanius, thinks, Paul made the Son (apart from His humanity) a mere attribute of God, not a distinct Person from the Father, and expressed his view by the word consubstantial.[2]

At Nicaea, the word was chosen because it did, which other and Biblical terms did not, exclude the Arian error, beyond possibility of evasion. The Arians were willing to allow that the Son was from God, His power, His image, even that He was eternal, because their sophistical skill enabled them to rob these words of their natural meaning, and to show that they might in a certain sense be applied to creatures. Accordingly, to put their meaning and faith beyond all doubt, the Fathers of Nicaea chose the word consubstantial.[3] [See ARIUS; Quilliet in DThC.]

CONSUBSTANTIATION. An heretical doctrine which maintains that the substance of bread and wine co-exists with the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord after the consecration. This was condemned by the Fourth Lateran Council, the Council of Constance, and the Council of Trent (sess. xiii. can. 2). Another term for the heresy is Impanation [*q.v.*]. (See EUCHARIST, p. 327; Franzelin, "De SS. Eucharistia," thes. xv.; Scannell in "Cath. Enc.")

CONSULTORS. A number of specialists placed at the service of the Roman congregations to advise the actual members. They have no voice in the decisions, but naturally their opinions have great weight with the judges.

In the United States and Australasia, where there are no cathedral chapters, a certain number of the clergy (four to six) are chosen to act as official advisers of the bishop. Their mode of appointment, and rights and duties, are much the same as those of canons in chapters in England. (See Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore; Smith, "Elements of Eccl. Law.")

CONTEMPLATION. A word used to

[1] See Cardinal Newman's note on Athanas. *De Decr. Nic.* cap. v. § 64.
[2] Hefele-Leclercq, i. 202. [3] *Ibid.* p. 431 *sqq.*

describe the life of those (religious and others) who devote themselves to prayer and meditation, rather than to active works of charity. No doubt such a life, in order to be real, implies a vocation of no ordinary kind. But when Protestants or ill-instructed Catholics condemn such a life as useless, &c., they oppose themselves to the tradition of the Church, since the earliest religious—the Fathers of the desert, &c.—devoted themselves to the contemplative life and were venerated throughout the Christian world for doing so. Moreover, reason itself may teach us that a contemplative is not a useless life. Man's merit consists in loving God and man for God's sake. And in itself the life which is occupied directly in the love of God is more meritorious than that which is occupied chiefly in the love of our neighbour for God's sake. Protestants who accuse contemplative orders of idleness really take for granted that the love of God is no part of man's duty, whereas it is the noblest occupation in which he can possibly engage. And whereas the ministries of the active life cease after death, the contemplative life is perfected and continued in heaven. It is that "good part" which Mary chose and which will never be taken away (Lk. x. 42). It may of course happen that a person merits more by resigning the sweetness of contemplation for a time in order to obey the call of God to the active life. (See MEDITATION; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 181, a. 2; Lejeune in DThC.)

CONTRACT. This subject plays a large part in moral theology and canon law, as well as in the civil law. It can only be briefly dealt with here. Contract is defined by Ferraris as "the consent of two or more persons, giving rise to an obligation towards each other." In other words, it is an agreement whereby one or more persons bind themselves to one or more other persons to do or not to do something. To make a contract valid, a number of conditions are required which are determined by the various laws, canon and civil. Speaking generally, however, (1) the persons must be capable of contracting; (2) there must be lawful consent, *i.e.* internal, external, mutual, and free; (3) the subject-matter must be lawful. Which persons are capable of contracting, what constitutes lawful consent, and the matters which are lawful will vary according to the positive enactments of the ecclesiastical or civil authority concerned. There are many kinds of contracts. The most important divisions are: (1) express or implied; (2) unilateral (binding only one side, *e.g.* a mere promise) or bilateral; (3) gratuitous (without a consideration) or onerous. The effect of a valid contract is to establish a bond between the parties which continues until the matter of the contract has been fulfilled. Thus, in a contract of sale, when the goods are delivered and the purchase money is paid, the contract is at an end; the parties are not bound to each other any longer. In the same way, the contract of marriage "until death do us part" (expressed or implied) is terminated by the death of one of the parties (Rom. vii. 1-3). Where the matter of the contract is something immoral there is, of course, no obligation.

> "It is great sin to swear unto a sin,
> But greater sin to keep a sinful oath."
> 2 *Henry VI.*, v. 1.

If, however, one of the parties has fulfilled his portion of the immoral contract and the corresponding portion is not immoral (*e.g.* money payment for the crime committed), is the other party bound to perform his portion? This question is hotly discussed among moralists (St. Thom. 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 32, a. 7; q. 62, a. 5; St. Alphon. "Theol. Mor." lib. iv. n. 712; Ballerini, "Op. Theol. Mor." vol. iii. p. 484). The subject of contracts will be found in all the works on moral theology, generally under the heading of the seventh commandment and the sacrament of matrimony. (See Ferraris, *Contractus*, a long and exhaustive article; St. Alphonsus, "Mor. Theol." lib. iv. c. iii.; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. iii. part iii.; Carrière, "De Contractibus"; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. book vii.; Anson, "Law of Contract.")

CONTRITION, in its widest sense, is defined by the Council of Trent as "grief of mind and detestation of sin committed, with a purpose of sinning no more." Thus understood, it includes attrition [*q.v.*]; but in its narrower sense contrition is used for that sorrow for sin which arises from consideration of God's goodness[1] which sin has outraged, and which includes a resolution never to offend God (at least mortally) because God so deserves our love. The Council of Trent declares that "contrition perfected by charity, and accompanied by a desire to confess and be absolved, may reconcile the sinner with God even before he receives the sacrament of penance. It is not necessary that the grief for sin arising from the love of God should be more intense[2] than other and natural sorrow; it is enough for reconciliation with God, apart from the sacrament of penance, if the sinner would rather endure any evil or sacrifice any good than offend so good a God. Thus, for example, a man may feel more intense sorrow for his wife's death than for all his mortal sins, but this is not inconsistent with perfect contrition, unless it implies that he would sin mortally against an all-holy God if by this course he could undo the calamity which has fallen upon him. (See PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF; St. Thomas, Supp. qq. 1-5; St.

[1] So the majority of theologians; but others think the consideration of any divine attribute may supply a sufficient motive for contrition.

[2] This may now be considered an admitted point, though it was once keenly debated.

Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." vi. tract 4, cap. 1.)

CONVENT. The hermitages and "lauras" [see LAURA] of the first ages gradually gave place to the coenobite mode of life; only in the orders of Chartreuse and Camaldoli has the solitary life been partially retained to this day. Monachism was firmly planted in Western Europe by St. Benedict of Aniane in the ninth century, and from that time the name "conventus"—applied alike to communities of men and women living under a rule and practising the evangelical counsels—came into common use.

Different orders preferred different sites for their convents. The Culdees of Iona chose islands or lonely spots, removed from the beaten tracks of trade and travel; this pious instinct is attested by the position of Iona, Lindisfarne, and Old Melrose. The Benedictines were said to prefer hillsides; the Cistercians chose quiet valleys; the mendicant orders, who depended on alms, and made preaching one of the great aims of their institution, repaired to the villages and towns. The Society of Jesus, as a rule, is found in cities:

> Bernardus valles, montes Benedictus amabat,
> Oppida Franciscus, magnas Ignatius urbes.

In illustration of these preferences, the reader is referred to the lists of old English monasteries which he will find under CISTERCIANS, FRANCISCANS, DOMINICANS, &c.

The parts of a convent are: 1. the church; 2. the choir, viz. that portion of the church in which the members say the daily office; 3. the chapter-house, a place of meeting in which the rule is read, elections made, and community business discussed; 4. the cells; 5. the refectory (in old English, *fraitour*, or *frater*); 6. the dormitory; 7. the infirmary; 8. the parlour, for the reception of visitors; 9. the library; 10. the treasury; 11. the cloister; 12. the crypt.

The legislation on convents forms a large and important section of canon law. Among the chief regulations is the law of enclosure, which "separates the convent from the world by the prohibition or restriction of intercourse from without." (Gasquet, "English Monastic Life"; Ferraris; Taunton.)

CONVENTUALS. [See FRANCISCANS.]

CONVERTS, RECEPTION OF. [See RECEPTION OF CONVERTS.]

CONVOCATION. The assembly of the clergy, in the provinces of Canterbury and York, chiefly for purposes of taxation. Blackstone says[1]:—"The convocation, or ecclesiastical synod, in England, differs considerably in its constitution from the synods of other Christian kingdoms: those consisting wholly of bishops; whereas with us the convocation in each province is the miniature of a parliament, wherein the archbishop presides with regal state: the upper house of bishops represents the house of lords; and the lower house, composed of representatives of the several dioceses at large, and of each particular chapter therein, resembles the house of commons with its knights of the shire and burgesses. This constitution is said to be owing to the policy of Edward I." The origin of Convocation is treated of in Burn's "Ecclesiastical Justice" and Hody's "History of Convocation." It seems to have assumed its peculiar form owing to the endeavour of Edward I. to organize the clergy as a third estate of the realm, which should meet, deliberate, and grant the king taxes, concurrently with the two other estates, the lords and the commons. The writ of summons which he addressed to the archbishops and bishops, requiring them to call together the clergy of their respective dioceses, received, from the first word of it, the name of the *praemunientes* writ. He experienced great resistance from the clergy, who were indisposed to admit any right in the civil power to summon them together; and at last it was settled that while the king issued his writ of summons to the archbishops, they should issue their writs, as of their own authority, to the bishops, deans, archdeacons, colleges, and diocesan clergy of the province, calling them together in Convocation. The mode of obeying this summons was ultimately arranged thus: the bishops, deans, and archdeacons were to attend in person, the chapters and colleges to be represented by one proctor each, and the clergy of each diocese to be represented by two proctors. The archbishops and bishops sat separately in an upper house, corresponding to the House of Lords. The English clergy were in those days so careful to guard the rights and freedom of the Church that they frequently, without waiting for the king's writ, met in Convocation under the archbishop's writ alone, and transacted business. For the national Church created at the Reformation this was rendered impossible by the Act of Submission (25 Hen. VIII. c. 19), which, starting with the false assertion that Convocation had always been assembled only by the king's writ, purports that the clergy will never presume thereafter to meet in Convocation except by royal authority, nor ever attempt to pass any canons or ordinances there unless with the sovereign's assent. (For the later history of Convocation, in Anglican times, see Hallam, "Constit. Hist." iii. 242–247; Stephen, "Commentaries" ii. 544–546; Phillimore, "Eccl. Law of the Church of England.")

COPE (*cappa, pluviale*). A wide vestment, of silk, &c., reaching nearly to the feet, open in front and fastened by a clasp, and with a hood at the back. It is used by the celebrant in processions, benedictions, &c., but never in the celebration of Mass, for the Church reserves the chasuble for the priest

[1] *Commentaries*, i. 7.

actually engaged in offering sacrifice, and thus carefully distinguishes between Mass and all other functions; see, however, CHASUBLE. The cope is used in processions by those who assist the celebrant, by cantors at vespers, &c., so that it is by no means a distinctively sacerdotal vestment. Mention is made of the cope in the ancient Ordo Romanus for the consecration of bishops. No special blessing is provided for the cope. (From Gavantus and Meratus; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 306–358; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Ed. Bishop in "Dublin Rev." Jan. 1897.)

COPTS. The Monophysite Christians in Egypt. Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, because he maintained that there was only one nature in Christ. Orthodox Patriarchs and other officials, ecclesiastical and civil, were sent from Constantinople to Egypt, but the mass of the people were fanatically attached to Monophysite error. Many fled to Upper Egypt or took refuge among the Arabs, and at last, when the occasion came, the Copts betrayed Egypt to the Saracens, who drove Greeks and Romans out of the land, and for a time treated the Copts well. But it was only for a time, and under successive Mahometan dynasties the Copts were subjected to cruel oppression, and had to pay an extortionate price for leave to practise their religion.

At present they form about a tenth of the population in the country. They represent the ancient inhabitants of Egypt, and celebrate Mass in the old Coptic language. In doctrine they agree on the whole with Catholics, except on the single point which led to their separation from the Church, viz. the two natures of Christ. Their supreme head is the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, who has great authority and who is chosen from the monks. Then come the bishops, priests, deacons, inferior clergy, and monks. The priests are allowed to live with their wives, and, as they receive scarcely any support from the church, generally pursue an ordinary trade. They are obliged to acquire some acquaintance with Coptic, for this, the language of the liturgy, is a dead language, Arabic being the vulgar tongue. They have four fasting-seasons, which they observe with remarkable strictness. Their Lent begins nine days earlier than ours, and during it they abstain from eating, drinking, and smoking, till the service in the church is over, *i.e.* till about one o'clock. The principal peculiarity in their ritual is in the administration of the sacrament of extreme unction, which they give along with the sacrament of penance, to heal the diseases of the soul even when there is no bodily illness. They have also a custom of blessing large tanks of water in which the people bathe. They have adopted circumcision, probably to satisfy Mohammedan prejudice.

The Egyptian Abbot Andrew went to the Council of Florence to seek reunion for the Monophysites with the Roman Church. But most of the Copts adhere to their heresy. The United Coptic Church is divided into three dioceses: that of Alexandria for Lower Egypt, and those of Hermopolis and Thebes for Central and Upper Egypt. The Copts of Ethiopia are under a Latin Vicar Apostolic. (See Lequien, "Oriens Christianus," ii. 329 *sqq.*; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," 215 *sqq.*; Hyvernat, *Egypt*, in "Cath. Enc.")

CORDELIERS. [See FRANCISCANS.]

CORONATION. The Jewish kings were anointed for their office, and the Church has instituted the same ceremony for Christian sovereigns. The ceremony chiefly consists (1) in the admonition which the bishop (usually a metropolitan) gives on the duties of the royal dignity, and the promise on the part of the sovereign elect to fulfil them; (2) the Litany of the Saints is sung while the sovereign elect lies prostrate before the altar; (3) the bishop anoints the king with oil of catechumens on the right arm and between the shoulders; (4) the bishop, after Mass has begun, presents him with the sword, places the crown on his head and the sceptre in his hand, and enthrones him. Finally, the new king makes the bishop an offering of gold at the offertory, and afterwards receives Communion, the bishop also giving him wine (not the Precious Blood) from the chalice. Theodosius was the first Christian emperor to receive the blessing of the Church. The Gothic Wamba was anointed with the holy oil at Toledo in 672, and "this," says Fleury,[1] "is the first example that I find of the unction of kings." (See "Pontificale Romanum"; Thalhofer in "Kirchenlex."; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

CORONATION OF POPE. [See POPE, p. 677.]

CORPORAL, CORPORAS. The linen cloth on which the Body of Christ is consecrated. It used to cover the whole surface of the altar, as may be gathered from an Ordo Romanus where the corporal is said to be spread on the altar by two deacons. The chalice also was covered by the corporal, a custom still maintained by the Carthusians. The corporal is and must be blessed by the bishop or by a priest with special faculties. It represents the winding-sheet in which Christ's body was wrapped by Joseph of Arimathea. (Van der Stappen, "Sacra Liturgia," iii. 102–110; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

CORPORAL WORKS OF MERCY. [See MERCY, WORKS OF; CHARITY, WORKS OF.]

CORPUS CHRISTI. From Apostolic times the Church has celebrated the institution of the Eucharist on Thursday in Holy Week. But, since the Church at that season

[1] xxix. 51.

is occupied with the consideration of Christ's Passion, it was desirable that another day should be set apart as the feast of the Blessed Sacrament. The B. Juliana, a holy religious of Liège, believed that she had seen a vision encouraging her to use her influence with the ecclesiastical authorities for the introduction of this feast. In 1230, when she became prioress of her order, she consulted several theologians and Church dignitaries on the matter, among others the Archdeacon of Liège, who afterwards became Pope with the title of Urban IV. An office was composed, and in 1246 Robert, Bishop of Liège, ordered the day to be kept throughout his diocese.

After Juliana's death, Eve, a holy woman who had been in her confidence, induced Henry, the next bishop of Liège, to petition Urban IV. for the celebration of the feast throughout the Church. Urban IV. assented, moved in part by the miracle of Bolsena [see the article], partly by his former knowledge of Juliana, partly by his desire to stem the heresy of Berengarius, which consisted in the denial of transubstantiation; and in 1264 he published a bull commanding the celebration of the feast on the Thursday following the first Sunday after Pentecost throughout the Church. However, Urban IV. died shortly afterwards, and, as Durandus (who lived twenty-two years after Urban) is silent on the feast of Corpus Christi, probably the bull was never executed, although undoubtedly Urban himself and the Roman Court celebrated the feast. Clement V. in the Council of Vienne confirmed Urban's constitution. John XXII., who succeeded Clement in 1316, took great pains to secure the celebration of the feast; while Martin V. and Eugenius IV. promoted the devotion to Corpus Christi by grants of indulgences. The Council of Trent speaks of Corpus Christi as a triumph over heresy, and in sess. xiii. can. 6, anathematizes those who censure the feast or procession of the Blessed Sacrament. This custom of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in procession on Corpus Christi has been almost from the first a recognized part of the ceremonial, if it was not, as many authors think, actually instituted by Urban IV. The office which is still used was composed by St. Thomas of Aquin at the bidding of Urban IV. The feast was formerly a day of obligation. (Butler, "Feasts and Fasts"; Guéranger, "The Liturgical Year.")

CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS. The body of the Roman law, as it was codified and reduced to order by Justinian, in the sixth century after Christ. It consists of (1) the Digest, a classified compilation of the decisions of the best Roman jurisconsults on all points of disputed law: this, when translated into Greek, was called "Pandectae"; (2) the Code, a general collection of the laws then in force in the empire; (3) the Institutes, a treatise, founded on the Digest, on the first principles and elements of law; (4) the Novels, a collection of the constitutions and edicts published by Justinian himself, whereby great innovations and alterations were made in the ancient law. (Hunter, "Roman Law.")

In imitation of the Roman lawyers, the canonists have digested the great body of decisions and decrees constituting the Canon Law [see that article] into a *Corpus juris canonici*.

COSTUME, CLERICAL. In the early ages of the Church the dress of the clergy was not distinct from that of the laity; but a cleric would naturally avoid garments that savoured of luxury or excessive expense. Pope Celestine enjoins that "we (the bishops and clergy) should be distinguished from the common people by our learning, not by our clothes; by our conduct, not by our dress; by cleanness of mind, not by the care we spend upon our person" (Mansi "Concilia" iv. 465). In the course of time the laity in the west began to adopt the serviceable dress of the barbarian invaders (breeches, tunic, and mantle), while the clergy kept to the flowing, lengthy robes of the old Romans. The various mediaeval decrees on the subject are directed against worldliness in dress or any approach to military attire. Gradually the cassock, reaching down to the heels and closed in front, evolved itself, and became the characteristic clerical dress, over which was worn a "closed cope" (*cappa clausa*). The head and shoulders were protected by the "almuce" [*q.v.*]. The modern regulations on clerical dress date from Sixtus V. (1589) and Urban VIII. (1624). According to these, the cleric should wear the cassock with girdle and a long cloak or similar outer garment, and he should be tonsured. In non-Catholic countries the rules are naturally less rigid. In England and in the United States the rules are practically the same. "The dress of ecclesiastics ought to distinguish them from laymen, but not confound them with heterodox ministers. It should be black or of a dark shade. . . . At home their most becoming dress is the cassock (or if they prefer it the zimarra) with the biretta." "We order that every priest shall wear the Roman collar, not merely whilst he is fulfilling his sacred duty, but at all times, in order that he may be recognized by all as a priest. We desire likewise that the custom in vogue amongst ecclesiastics in Rome of not wearing whiskers or beard should be strictly followed" (I. Prov. Syn. of Westminster, xxiv. 5, 6; IV. do. xi. 13, 14). (See also the III. Plenary Council of Baltimore, 77; Barbier de Montault, "Le Costume et les Usages Ecclésiastiques"; Ferraris, *Habitus*; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

COTTA. *Cotae* (the form *Coti* is also found) are mentioned, as an ordinary garment worn by laymen, in the synod of Metz,

anno 888. But in the thirteenth century *cotae* were regarded as identical with surplices, and the 14th Roman Ordo says the Pope's chaplain must wear a cotta or surplice ("cottam seu superpellicium"). The word cotta is commonly used now in Italy for a short surplice, and is also employed by some English Catholics. (Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii. p. 178. See under SURPLICE.)

COUNCIL. *Concilium* and σύνοδος are synonymous, and denote, first, meetings of any kind, and next, in a more restricted sense, assemblies of the rulers of the Church legally convoked, for the discussion and decision of ecclesiastical affairs. We find *concilium* employed in this technical sense by Tertullian about 200 A.D., and σύνοδος perhaps a century later in the Apostolic Canons. Acts xv. furnishes the first example of such a council, and we may conclude that the Apostles held it in consequence of a divine commission; otherwise they would not have dared to say "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Language of the same kind is frequently used by or applied to later councils. Thus Constantine professed to revere the decision of the Nicene Fathers as "the sentence of the Son of God." Athanasius and Augustine express themselves in the same way, while Gregory the Great compares the authority of the first four councils with that of the four Gospels. After the Apostolic Council, held according to the most probable chronology in A.D. 51, we next hear of councils which met in Asia about 150 and were occasioned by the Montanist controversy.

I. *Classification of Councils.*

(α) *Oecumenical* councils are those to which the bishops and others entitled to vote [see below] are convoked from the whole world (οἰκουμένη) under the presidency of the Pope or his legates, and the decrees of which, having received papal confirmation, bind all Christians. The definition assumes the possibility that a council oecumenical in its convocation may not succeed in getting its decrees acknowledged as of oecumenical authority. Such was the case with the Robber-synod of 449, and, in part, with the councils of Constance and Basle.

(β) Synods of the East or of the West. The first Council of Constantinople was originally a mere Council of the East and ranks as oecumenical only because its decrees on faith were ultimately received in the West also.

(γ) Patriarchal, national, plenary and primatial councils, representing a whole patriarchate, a whole nation, or, lastly, the several provinces subject to a primate.[1]

(δ) Provincial councils, under the metropolitan of a province.

(ε) Diocesan synods, consisting of the clergy of the diocese and presided over by the bishop or vicar-general. [See SYNOD.]

We may add two other kinds of council, which are abnormal, viz.—

(ζ) Councils held at Constantinople and consisting of bishops from any part of the world who happened to be at the time in that imperial city. They were called σύνοδοι ἐνδημοῦσαι.

(η) Mixed councils, meeting to settle both spiritual and civil matters. They were composed of secular as well as ecclesiastical dignitaries. Sometimes, though not always, the clergy and laity voted in separate chambers. Such councils were held during the early Middle Age in Italy, France, England, Germany, and Spain.

II. *Convocation of Councils.*—The right of the bishop to convoke diocesan, the metropolitan to convoke provincial, the patriarch or primate to convoke national synods, &c., has always been clear and undoubted. Logically and according to the nature of the thing, the convocation of general councils must proceed from the head of the universal Church, viz. from the Pope. This principle was recognized in ancient times, for Socrates tells us that Pope Julius I., about the year 341, stated the acknowledged law of Christendom to be, that "the churches must not pass laws (κανονίζειν) contrary to the judgment of the Bishop of Rome." However, in early times, the emperors, who often defrayed the travelling expenses of the bishops, were allowed to take a great part in convoking general councils. "The first eight general councils were convoked by the emperors. All the later ones, on the other hand, were called and summoned by the Popes: but even in the earlier councils we see the Popes taking a certain part in their convocation, and this share which the Popes took in summoning them appears more or less prominently in individual instances." (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 13.) All general councils from the ninth onwards were directly convoked by the Popes; although, even in the West, lesser councils were convoked by emperors and kings. In the Fifth Lateran Council (sess. xi.) Leo X. put great stress on the principle that the right of convoking, removing and dissolving general councils belongs to the Popes.

III. *Members of Councils.*—The diocesan synod must be distinguished from all other synods or councils. It consists (putting aside the bishop of the diocese), as a rule, only of the inferior clergy. The bishop alone decides, the other members having at most a consultative vote. The bishop is bound to summon the deans, arch-priests, vicars forane, the vicar-general, the clergy with cure of souls, and, according to the later canon law, the canons of the cathedral and collegiate churches, with their provosts, and the *abbates*

[1] Another class may be added, viz. those representing certain neighbouring provinces, but not all the provinces subject to the primate.

saeculares. Cathedral prebendaries who are not canons need not be summoned, but are bound to attend if called upon to do so. The "simple clerics"—*i.e.* those without cure of souls or dignity—need not attend, unless the object of the synod is to reform the clergy, or to communicate the decrees of a provincial council. Members of exempt religious orders, if their monasteries are connected with others and placed under a general chapter, need not attend, unless they have cure of souls. In other cases, religious must be present at the synod.

As to other councils, they are composed

(*a*) Of bishops. Chorepiscopi appear at early synods. Whether titular bishops are entitled to vote has been disputed. (Ferraris, *Concilium*.) They had, however, equal rights with other bishops at the Vatican Council, where 117 such bishops were present.

(*β*) Priests and deacons had a decisive vote in a council if they represented absent bishops, as appears from innumerable instances in the acts of early councils. At the Council of Trent this right was given to the procurators of absent bishops only with great limitations. At the Vatican Council such procurators were not even admitted to the Council Hall. Other clerics have been employed from early times as notaries.

(*γ*) The archimandrites, even if priests, had no voice at the early councils. From the seventh century the practice with regard to admitting the votes of abbots began to vary; and archdeacons sometimes were allowed to vote, even if their bishop was present. At the end of the mediaeval period it was generally held that Cardinals, even if not bishops, and abbots were entitled to vote, and this right they have maintained; while a like privilege is extended to the generals of regular orders. At the last general council Abbots Nullius (*i.e.* of quasi-episcopal jurisdiction), mitred abbots of whole orders or congregations of monasteries, generals, &c., of clerks regular, mendicant and monastic orders, were allowed to vote.

(*δ*) Theologians (*e.g.* doctors in theology and canon law) were also called to consult at synods. But it was only in exceptional circumstances—*e.g.* in times of storm and confusion such as prevailed during the Synods of Constance and Basle—that they voted.

(*ε*) Although the earliest councils were composed merely of bishops, still in the third century laymen began to attend in Africa and Italy; and even in 1598 the Congregation of the Council expressly declared that distinguished and well-instructed laymen might be invited to attend provincial councils. Lay people, however, were merely present to give advice, make complaints, assent to the decisions, &c. They had no claim to a decisive vote, and usually did not sign the decrees. We even find the Abbess St. Hilda present at the Council of Whitby, in 664, and her successor Ælfleda at a Northumbrian council. The Roman emperors, personally or by their representatives, attended general councils. We also find kings or their commissaries present at national and provincial synods. However, Rome holds fast to the principle that no royal commissary may be present at any council, except a general one in which "faith, reformation, and peace" are in question.

IV. *The Presidency at Councils.*—The bishop of right presides at diocesan, the metropolitan at provincial, the Pope or his legates at general councils. True, ancient authorities do undoubtedly attribute a presidency at general councils to the emperor. However, this is but an apparent difficulty. The presidency of the emperor was a mere presidency of honour. It was his place to provide for peace and order, to assist in giving effect to the conciliar decrees; but it was the Papal legates who presided over the council when occupied in its proper business of deciding questions on faith and discipline. Thus the Emperor Theodosius II. says, in his edict addressed to the Council of Ephesus, that he had sent Count Candidian to represent him, but that this commissary of his was to take no part in dogmatic disputes, since "it is unlawful for one who is not enrolled in the list of the most holy bishops to mingle in ecclesiastical inquiries." That the Papal legates did as a matter of fact preside at the early councils is proved at length by Hefele. The Council of Chalcedon acknowledged that Pope Leo, by his legates, presided over it—"the head over the members." At Nicaea, Osius, Vitus, and Vincentius, as Papal legates, signed before all other members of the council. It would be useless to multiply evidence on this point from later councils.

V. *The Confirmation of Conciliar Decrees.*—The decrees of general councils have no binding authority till confirmed by the Pope. This admits of easy proof from the nature of the case, because a council cannot be said to represent the teaching Church till the visible head of the Church has given his approval. At the same time, the evidence on this point with regard to early councils is not always conclusive, a fact which need not surprise us when we remember that the Popes were accustomed to send legates with full instructions, and that usually the Pope had already made his own mind clear on the points in debate, so that the formal approbation of the Pope did not attract special notice. Still, the principles of the early were identical with those of the present Church on this point. It cannot be denied that the Council of Chalcedon considered the Papal confirmation of its decrees a matter of absolute necessity; and the strong language in which this declaration is made shows that the Pope's right of confirmation was an understood thing in the Church. Taking this

for granted, we may well believe that the Roman synod of 485 has preserved the true tradition of historical fact in its statement that the Fathers of Nicaea "reserved the confirmation and authorization of their proceedings to the holy Roman Church ("confirmationem rerum atque auctoritatem sanctae Romanae ecclesiae detulerunt") strengthened as this statement is by the words of Julius I. quoted above. (See Leclercq's note, i. 61, where he denies this interpretation of the action of the synod.)

VI. The infallibility of general councils so confirmed follows from that of the Church [see the article]. "What God," says St. Athanasius, "has spoken through the Council of Nicaea remains for ever." St. Leo considered the "consent" of the Council of Chalcedon to be *irretractabilis*—*i.e.* to exclude all further question—and denies that anyone who rejected its decrees could be counted a Catholic.

VII. *Order and Method of Voting.*—Usually bishops took their places according to the rank of their sees, though in Africa they sat according to the date of their ordination. At the Vatican Council the members were arranged in accordance with their hierarchical rank. First came the five cardinal legates (unless, of course, the Pope himself was there), then the Cardinals, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops (according to seniority), abbots, generals of orders, &c. As a rule, the voting at councils has always been by single voices. At Constance, however, in order to keep the Italian prelates from outweighing the rest, the voting was by nations [see CONSTANCE]. At Basle the members were divided into four deputations, which met separately. Decrees passed by three deputations were accepted as conciliar. At Trent the matters to be discussed were first debated and prepared for the council in special commissions, so that no disputations appear in the Tridentine acts. A similar method was pursued at the Vatican Council.

VIII. *Number and Names of Oecumenical Councils.*—(1) Nicaea, 325; (2) First of Constantinople, 381; (3) Ephesus, 431; (4) Chalcedon, 451; (5) Second of Constantinople, 553; (6) Third of Constantinople, 680; (7) Second of Nicaea, 787; (8) Fourth of Constantinople, 869–870; (9) First Lateran, 1123; (10) Second Lateran, 1139; (11) Third Lateran, 1179; (12) Fourth Lateran, 1215; (13) First of Lyons, 1245; (14) Second of Lyons, 1274; (15) Vienne, 1311; (16) Constance, 1414–1418. This council was only oecumenical in its last sessions (42–45 inclusive) and with respect to certain decrees of earlier sessions, approved by Martin V. (17) Basle, 1431 and following years, only oecumenical till the end of the 25th session, and of these decrees Eugenius IV. approved such only as dealt with the extirpation of heresy, the peace of Christendom and the reform of the Church, and which at the same time did not derogate from the rights of the Holy See. (18) Ferrara-Florence, 1438–1442: really a continuation of Basle. (19) Fifth Lateran, 1512–1517; (20) Trent, 1545–1563; (21) Vatican, December 8, 1869, to July 18, 1870.

IX. *Collections of Councils.*—Early collections by Merlin (Paris, 1523, in one folio); Crabbe (Cologne, 1538, in two folios); Surius (1576, Cologne, four folios); Binius (Cologne, 1606, four folios). The Roman edition of 1608–1612 only contains general councils; in it the Greek text of very many conciliar acts was for the first time printed. This Roman edition formed the basis of all the later collections, of which the chief are the Collectio Regia (Paris, 1644, in thirty-seven folios); the collection of the Jesuit Hardouin (Paris, 1715, in twelve folios); and that of Mansi, who, building on the foundations of Labbe, Cossart, and Colet, published at Florence in 1759 and the following years his great collection consisting of thirty-one folios. This is the most perfect of all the collections, but it only reaches to the fifteenth century. Hardouin, which goes down to 1714, and is more correct in the printing than Mansi, is still much used. The later councils are to be found in the "Collectio Lacensis," Freiburg, 1870 *sqq.* Hefele's "Conciliengeschichte" in seven vols. (1855–1874); second ed. 1873–1890, is the standard work on the subject. The French ed. by Leclercq, in course of publication, contains so many additions and emendations that it may almost be looked upon as a new work based upon Hefele's labours. This is the edition referred to in the present work. There is also an English translation (incomplete) in five vols., 1871–1896.

The dogmatic questions connected with the Councils are treated of by Scheeben in "Kirchenlex."; Forget in DThC, *Conciles*; and Wilhelm in "Cath. Enc." [See NICENE COUNCILS; CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF; TRENT, COUNCIL OF; VATICAN COUNCIL, &c.]

COUNSELS, EVANGELICAL. [See EVANGELICAL COUNSELS.]

COWL (*cucullus, cuculla*). *Cucullus* is classical; in a well-known passage in Juvenal's sixth satire "nocturni cuculli" mean a cap or hood enveloping the head, and at the wearer's will concealing the features. The cowl was a garment with a hood, *vestis caputiata*, black or grey or brown, varying in length in different ages and according to the usages of different orders, but having these two permanent characteristics, that it covered the head and shoulders, and that it was without sleeves. Cassian, speaking of the solitaries of Egypt about the end of the fourth century, says that they used very small cowls (covering the head, but barely reaching the shoulders), which they wore both day and night. St

Benedict of Aniane, about A.D. 800, finding that his monks had adopted the practice of wearing the cowl very long, so as to reach the heels, ordered that for the future it should not exceed two cubits in length. In the fourteenth century the cowl was sometimes confounded with the frock; whence Clement V. at the Council of Vienne said, "We declare that we understand by the name of *cowl* (*cuculla*), a habit long and full, but without sleeves; and by *frock*, a long habit with long and wide sleeves." (Ducange, *Cucullus.*)

CREATION. Making out of nothing. That God did so create out of nothing is the great doctrine which is expressed in the first verse of the Bible, and which became a cardinal doctrine of the Jewish and afterwards of the Christian faith. The belief in creation is, indeed, a tenet peculiar to revealed religion. Heathen religions attributed the origin of the world to emanation, or else represented it as made out of pre-existing matter. The doctrine of ancient philosophers is summed up in the familiar axiom "Nothing is made out of nothing." *Ex nihilo nihil fit.*

It is true that neither the Hebrew word בָּרָא nor the Latin *creare*, by which it is rendered in the Vulgate, means of itself to make out of nothing. *Creare* may mean to "bear a child" as in Virgil's line, "Silvicolae Fauno Dryope quam nympha crearat," and בָּרָא, which probably meant originally to "hew out," [1] is employed to express all that God produces in the kingdom of nature (Num. xvi. 30), or of grace (Ex. xxxiv. 10, Ps. li. 12), even if such production does not answer to the idea of creation in the strict sense. But that Genesis means to teach that the world was made out of nothing is plain, because it is said that "God created the heavens and the earth," the Hebrew phrase for the entire universe, and also because the mention of chaos ("the earth was without form and void") is placed significantly after that of God's creative act.

The Fourth Lateran Council defines that God created everything out of nothing, and that the world is not eternal, but had a beginning. The Vatican Council further defined that the world and all things therein contained, both spiritual and material, according to their whole substance, were produced out of nothing by God of His own free will and for His own glory (sess. iii. cap. i. and can. 5). According to the common teaching of theologians, no creature can receive power to create, because it needs an infinite might to bridge over the infinite distance between nothing and being. Whether we can suppose, without involving ourselves in contradiction, that God could, had it so pleased Him, have created from all eternity, so that, *e.g.*, angels would have been eternal by participation, is a question freely disputed in the schools. We are only required to believe that as a matter of fact God did not so create.

The scientific difficulties in the six days of creation cannot be discussed here. But we have a few words to say on the latitude of interpretation permitted in the Church. (1) St. Augustine interprets the six days in a purely figurative and mystical sense; and St. Thomas, though he does not actually adopt this view, treats it with marked respect. In comparatively modern times Cajetan gave an interpretation which agrees at least on the main point with that of St. Augustine, for he taught, according to Petavius, that "all was produced in a moment; but that the history of creation was arranged by Moses in six days, that he might adapt his narration to six grades of natural perfection." (2) Although undoubtedly the Schoolmen as a rule understood the "days" as natural days of twenty-four hours, still many Catholic writers in modern times have interpreted the days as geological periods, and this without incurring any censure. (3) Some have gone further, and have admitted that the "days" do not correspond to well-defined geological periods, and that the order in which the different living beings are said to have been created does not agree with the facts of geology and astronomy. Revelation, they say, has to do with theological and moral truths; when it touches upon scientific matters it does so merely for the purpose of considering them from a theological or moral point of view. Hence it naturally makes use of the scientific opinions current at the time of the inspired writer; or, to put it in another way, "the inspired writer set down what God, speaking to men, signified, in the way men could understand and were accustomed to." (Leo XIII., *Providentissimus Deus*, § 28.) This view is based upon the teaching of St. Jerome ("In Jerem. Proph." xxviii., PL, xxiv. 885), St. Augustine ("De Gen. ad Lit." ii. 9, 20, PL, xxxiv. 270), and St. Thomas (1^a, q. 70, a. 1).

We may conclude with the grave words of St. Thomas: "In these questions, as Augustine teaches ('De Gen. ad Lit.' l. 48), two things are to be observed. First, that scripture truth be unshakenly maintained (*ut veritas Scripturae inconcusse teneatur*). Secondly that since the Divine Scripture may be expounded in many ways, it is not right to attach oneself so strictly to any one opinion as still to maintain it after sure reason has proved the statement supposed to be contained in Scripture false; lest on this account Scripture be derided by infidels, and the way to faith closed against them."

[1] If at least we may judge from the use of the Piel in Jos. xvii. 15. The Piel is used only of the slow work of man; the Kal only of the free act of God. See Ewald, *Grammar*, § 126 a.

(1ª, q. 68, a. 1.) (See Petavius, "De Opere VI Dierum"; Gigot, "Special Introd. to the O.T." ch. iv; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ed. 3, i. p. 384; Reusch, "The Bible and Nature"; Pinard in DThC, good bibliography.)

CREDENCE. A table on which the cruets with wine and water, the humeral veil for the subdeacon, the burse, chalice, the candlesticks borne by the acolytes, &c. &c., are placed during High Mass, and from which they are taken when required for use in the function. The credence should be on the epistle side of the altar. It should be covered with a linen cloth, but neither cross nor images should be placed upon it. In ancient times, when the oblations were presented by the faithful during Mass, there was not the same necessity for the use of a credence. (Gavant. tom. I. p. ii. tit. 2.)

The name is derived from the Italian *credenzare*, to taste meats and drinks before offering them to another, for the purpose of showing him that he might believe them free from poison and wholesome. This practice is still observed when the Pope celebrates Mass. The wine and altar-breads are tasted before being brought to him at the offertory.

CREED. A summary of the chief articles of faith. Various names are used, to signify what we now mean by the word Creed, in early writers. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the *πίστις* or "faith" which served as the basis of catechetical instruction.[1] Origen, in the Latin translation of Rufinus, describes the creed as a "compressed word" ("verbum breviatum"), in allusion to Romans ix. 28. Tertullian[2] speaks of the "words of the oath" ("verba sacramenti" perhaps with reference to the confession of faith made in baptism. Lastly, in Cyprian's[3] time we meet with the word "symbolum" or token, by which a man might be known and recognised as a Christian; and this term has been ever since familiar in the Church. Our "Credo" or Creed of course simply indicates the word with which most such professions of faith begin.

Four Creeds are at present used in the Catholic Church, viz. the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, the Athanasian, and that of Pius IV.

I. *The Apostles' Creed.*—It is certain from the Acts that persons desirous of baptism were questioned as to their faith. When the Ethiopian eunuch wished to be baptized, "Philip said: If thou believest with thy whole heart, thou mayest. And he, answering, said: I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." (Acts viii. 36.) Thus even in Apostolic times a profession of faith was made in baptism, and from this no doubt the so-called "Apostles' Creed" arose. But neither Scripture nor any single writer of the first three centuries gives at length the profession of faith made at Baptism. However, in Irenaeus and Tertullian we meet with allusions from which we can construct a form used at Baptism and approaching very nearly to the "Apostles' Creed" in its present shape. It is impossible, for example, to believe that in the following passage of Irenaeus the coincidence, in words and order of ideas, with our present Creed is accidental. He says that in virtue of Apostolic tradition all who belong to the Church have the same faith, since, "all teach one and the same *God the Father*, and believe the same economy of the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, and know the same gift of the *Spirit*, and meditate on the same precepts, and maintain the same form of constitution with respect to the *Church*, and look for the same *coming* of the Lord, and wait for the same *salvation* of the whole man—that is, of the soul and body."[1] The supposition that Irenaeus had a formula like the Apostles' Creed in his mind when he wrote is confirmed by a statement which he makes elsewhere, that the catechumens received the unchangeable rule of the faith in baptism; and by the fact that other traces of the formula appear in Clement of Alexandria and in Tertullian. At a later time, Rufinus († 410) wrote an exposition of the "symbol" of the Apostles, and from this work we receive definite information on the form of words in use. Rufinus says that whereas in other churches changes were made in the Apostles' Creed in order to meet new heresies, the Roman Church, on the contrary, had preserved the original form, partly because no heresy had ever arisen in that city, partly because there the catechumens had to recite the Creed publicly before receiving baptism. The Roman form according to Rufinus ran thus: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was born from (*de*) the Holy Ghost, of (*ex*) the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, rose the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, thence he will come to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh." Thus the articles "descended into hell," "the communion of saints," "eternal life," and the words "suffered," "catholic," "amen," were not in the original form of the Creed. They were added in the fifth century.

We are now in a position to answer the question, How far does the "Apostles' Creed" deserve its name? It is rightly so

[1] Clem. Al. *Paedag.* i. 1, § 38; *Strom.* vii. 10, § 56, *PG*, viii. 249; ix. 477. So Probst interprets these passages; but the allusion to definite Creed seems far from certain.

[2] Tertullian, *Ad Martyr.* 3, *PL*, i. 624. Here again Probst's interpretation is precarious.

[3] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxix., ed. Hartel, p. 756.

[1] Iren. i. 9, 4, *PG*, vii. 550.

called, if we understand the title to signify that it is a summary of Apostolic teaching; and there are at least probable grounds for the hypothesis that it is the extension of a form used from the Apostles' time in baptism. But, on the other hand, the legend that each of the Apostles contributed one of the twelve articles to the Creed is not supported by good evidence and is hard to reconcile with attested fact. The Apostles' Creed is recited in the Roman Office at the beginning of Matins and Prime and at the end of Compline; also during Prime and Compline when the *preces* are said.

II. *The Nicene Creed* (really the Creed of Nicaea and Constantinople).—The following Creed was put forth by the Fathers of Nicaea in 325: "We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, only begotten from the Father, *i.e.* from the substance of the Father: God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things came into being, both the things in heaven and the things in earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, became man, suffered and rose again on the third day and ascended into heaven, and is to come to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost."[1] Osius of Cordova, according to St. Athanasius —Athanasius himself, according to St. Hilary —had great part in drawing up this Creed.

At Constantinople in 381 a Creed with one notable exception almost precisely identical with what we are accustomed to call the Nicene Creed was received. We say received, for Tillemont has proved that this enlarged form of the Nicene Creed was in use some years before the Council of Constantinople. Two additions to the old Nicene formula adopted at Constantinople deserve special notice. The clause "of whose kingdom there shall be no end" was added against Marcellus of Ancyra, who denied that Christ's reign would continue after the day of judgment.[2] Again, after "and in the Holy Ghost," the words "the Lord the life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and Son," &c., were appended against the Macedonians who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The words *Filioque*, "proceeding from the Father *and the Son*," occur in Spanish confessions of faith the earliest of which was drawn up in 447. Pope Leo, attacking the anti-Trinitarian errors of the Priscillianists in a letter to Turibius, a Spanish bishop, spoke of the Holy Ghost as proceeding "from each," *i.e.* from the Father and the Son, and hence the formula "proceeding from the Father and the Son" became usual among Spanish Catholics, and was added by them to the Nicene Creed in the Synod of Toledo (anno 653). During the reign of Charlemagne the Nicene Creed was sung with the addition of the "Filioque" in the Frankish church, and the Latin monks settled on the Mount of Olives offended the Greeks by singing the Creed as they had been accustomed to hear it in the imperial chapel. As late at least as the ninth century this addition was not made to the Creed in Rome itself. In fact Leo III., though he approved the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, refused to add the words "Filioque" to the Creed, even when urged to do so. For the doctrine of the double procession we must refer to the article on the TRINITY. But this is the place to mention an objection made by the Greeks to the addition, apart from the dogmatic controversy. They said that the Council of Ephesus had expressly forbidden any Creed except the Nicene to be used. Petavius replies that the council meant simply to forbid a Creed contrary to that of Nicaea, and that a Creed in perfect agreement with that of Nicaea is not "another Creed" (*ἑτέραν πίστιν*) in the sense of the Fathers of Ephesus. They were referring to a new and heterodox Creed concocted by Nestorius. We may add that even if the council had meant to interdict the use of another Creed, this was a mere disciplinary rule, and that it could be set aside at any time by competent authority. At Florence it was defined that this addition was "lawfully and reasonably" made to the Creed.

On all Sundays and on the feasts of our Lord, his Blessed Mother, Apostles, doctors, &c., the Creed is said or sung at Mass immediately after the Gospel, that the people may show their faith in the doctrine of Christ which the Gospels contain. It is fitting, St. Thomas says, that it should be sung on the feasts of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles, "who founded this faith." At what time the Creed began to be recited in the Roman Mass is very doubtful. Apparently it was said as early at least as the ninth century, though it was not sung till the beginning of the eleventh. In Spain and in the East this practice was introduced much earlier, viz. in the fifth or sixth century. (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 287.)

III. *Athanasian Creed.*—By this name is commonly called the confession of faith in the breviary (known as "Quicunque vult," from its first words), which is said on certain Sundays at prime. Its proper designation would seem to be "Fides Catholica," so at least it is headed in the Utrecht Psalter, a MS. of the sixth century, which contains the earliest copy known to exist. How early it was attributed to St. Athanasius, among whose genuine works it does not appear, it is

[1] The text is taken from a letter by Eusebius of Caesarea to his flock. See Hefele-Leclercq, i. 442.

[2] Petav. *De Incarnat.* i. 3, § 11. Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 0 *sqq.*, i. 724, 729, 730.

difficult to say. A canon passed by a Council of Autun, in the time of Bishop Leodegar, about 640, enjoins the use of what can be nothing else than this Creed under the name of "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius"; but some doubt exists as to the true date of this canon. The Creed, being in Latin, was unknown in the East for many centuries after it had received wide diffusion in the West. The fact of its being written in Latin was accounted for by the Papal envoys who visited the East in 1233, after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, on the ground that St. Athanasius composed it during the period of his exile in the West. It was after this translated into Greek, and its doctrine was admitted by the Eastern Church. In this theory of its composition while Athanasius was in exile there is nothing intrinsically improbable: only it lacks direct confirmation. Waterland, who wrote a learned dissertation on this Creed near the beginning of the last century, was inclined, as is well known, to assign its authorship to St. Hilary of Arles (about 430). Others have given it to Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers in the sixth century. A third conjecture, of greater plausibility than either of the former two, would trace it to Virgilius of Thapsus, an African bishop, who composed a treatise on the Trinity in the fifth century. This perhaps is a matter which never can be certainly determined. A far more important fact about the *Quicunque* is, that, whether written by Athanasius or not, its teaching is distinctly Athanasian. This was proved to demonstration by Brewer, in the work [1] in which he replied to the volume by Ffoulkes presently to be noticed. It has also been often observed that the *cast of doctrine* which this Creed presents suits the second half of the fourth century better than any earlier or later time. It is difficult to believe that if it had been written after the Council of Ephesus (431) it would not have contained words excluding more pointedly the error of Nestorius; still more that, if later than the Council of Chalcedon (451), it would not have used some expression about the "two natures," condemning more distinctly the heresy of Eutyches. Again, it is absolutely silent on the questions agitated in the great Pelagian controversy, and by the Monothelites. It seems undeniable that it might have been written by St. Athanasius, even if it was not.

An elaborate attempt [2] was made some years ago to prove the *Quicunque* to be a forgery of the age of Charlemagne! The author of this view, after reading Alcuin's letter to Paulinus the patriarch of Aquileia, written about 800 (in which our countryman thanks Paulinus for having sent him a "libellus" containing a description [*taxatio*] of the Catholic faith, which in the writer's opinion might with great advantage be circulated among the clergy as a "symbolum fidei," and committed by them to memory), boldly came to the conclusion that the tract here spoken of—though Alcuin does not cite one word of it—was and could be nothing else than the *Quicunque vult*! He stopped at nothing which could discredit the natural objections to such a view, charging Alcuin, Paulinus, and Charlemagne with being leagued in a conspiracy to palm off this composition of Paulinus upon the whole Church as the genuine work of Athanasius, taxing Alcuin in particular with having lent himself, out of mere cowardly subserviency, to the propagation of the forgery, and crediting the emperor alone with what are called "the damnatory clauses." Brewer, in the work already cited, pointed out that Ffoulkes's theory rested simply on a subjective hypothesis, and that not a single shred of positive evidence could be produced in its support. He might have added that the concluding portion of the same letter of Alcuin on which Ffoulkes relies appears to be inconsistent with this theory. After speaking of the "symbolum fidei" composed by Paulinus, as above mentioned, Alcuin goes on to speak of three prevailing errors: one, a revived Adoptionism springing up in Spain; the second, an irregular mode of administering baptism which had come into use in some northern region; the third, a wrong view as to the condition of the souls of saints before the day of judgment. "But it is thy part," he proceeds, "O chosen pastor, when the Philistines . . . blaspheme the army of the living God, *to crush them all with a single stroke of truth*" ("uno veritatis ictu totos conterere"). The "libellus" of Paulinus, then, contained a refutation of these three errors; if so, it could not be the Athanasian Creed, which contains nothing of the kind.

But the theory of the late origin of the Creed was destined to be still more effectually demolished. As the controversy raised by Ffoulkes's book proceeded, it transpired that there was in Holland an ancient copy of the Creed, known as the Utrecht Psalter. Photographs of this MS. were obtained, and Lord Romilly, then Master of the Rolls, instructed Sir Thomas D. Hardy, Deputy-Keeper of the Records, to prepare a report on the subject of the antiquity of the Psalter. The report—a most interesting and valuable document—was prepared accordingly. For our present purpose it is enough to say that it records the unhesitating opinion of all skilled palaeographists who had seen the MS. or the photographs, that the copy of the *Quicunque vult* which it contains is in a handwriting not later at any rate than the seventh century. The words of Sir Thomas Hardy—and no one could speak with more authority on such a matter—are: "The handwriting is certainly of the sixth century."

[1] *Athanasian Origin of the Athanasian Creed*, 1872.
[2] *On the Athanasian Creed*, E. S. Ffoulkes, *n.d.*

It is well known that Cranmer and the other reformers, far from rejecting the *Quicunque*, treated it with great honour; and to this day, in spite of many efforts to get rid of it, it is recited on certain specified days in the Anglican service. The disestablished Irish Church has rendered its use optional instead of compulsory. In the Roman Breviary it is said, at prime as above mentioned, on the minor Sundays after the Epiphany and after Pentecost (when there is no commemoration of a double or an octave) and on Trinity Sunday.

IV. *The Creed of Pius IV.*—The Council of Trent (sess. xxv. De Reform. cap. 2) required archbishops, bishops, &c., in the next provincial council to promise true obedience to the Pope, and to anathematize all heresies, especially those condemned at Trent. All the clergy bound to attend the diocesan synod were required to make the same protestation at the first diocesan synod at which they were present; and from doctors, masters, &c., in universities an oath to teach according to the decrees and definitions of Trent was to be exacted at the beginning of each year. Accordingly, Pius IV., in the year 1564, published a "Profession of the Tridentine Faith." It consists of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed with a summary of the Tridentine definitions. Pius IX. in the year 1877 embodied in the formula of Pius IV. a declaration of acceptance of the Decrees of the Vatican Council and "in particular of those affirming the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff." In fine, Pius X. (1 Sept. 1910) appended to the same a solemn repudiation of the errors of MODERNISM [*q.v.*] to be made under oath by ecclesiastics on those occasions on which Church law obliges them to a formal profession of faith.

CREMATION. On May 19, 1886, the following decree was issued at Rome: "Several bishops and prudent members of Christ's flock, knowing that certain men possessed of doubtful faith, or belonging to the Masonic sect, strongly contend at the present day for the practice of the Pagan custom of cremation, founding special societies to spread this custom, fear lest the minds of the faithful may be worked upon by these wiles and sophistries so as to lose by degrees esteem and reverence towards the constant Christian usage of burying the bodies of the faithful—a usage hallowed by the solemn rites of the Church. In order, therefore, that some fixed rule may be laid down for the faithful, to preserve them from the insidious doctrines above mentioned, the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition is asked:

"1. Is it lawful to become a member of those societies whose object is to spread the practice of cremation?

"2. Is it lawful to leave orders for the burning of one's own body or that of another?

"Their Eminences the Cardinals General Inquisitors, after grave and mature consideration, answered:

"To the first question, No; and if it is a question of societies connected with the Masonic sect, the penalties pronounced against this sect would be incurred. To the second, No.

"When these decisions were referred to our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., His Holiness approved and confirmed them, and directed them to be communicated to the bishops, in order that they might instruct the faithful upon the detestable abuse of burning the bodies of the dead, and might do all in their power to keep the flock entrusted to their charge from such a practice."

We have given this decree in full, so that the exact position of the Church's teaching concerning cremation may be clearly seen. There is nothing intrinsically wrong in burning the bodies of the dead. The practice might become necessary at times of excessive mortality or of danger to the living, *e.g.* after a battle or during a plague. But in ordinary times cremation disturbs the pious sentiments of the faithful; it is not in keeping with the beautiful rites of Christian burial; and it has been introduced by enemies of the Church for the purpose of shutting her out from one of her most touching functions. These reasons justify the condemnation above quoted. To go into the various sanitary, legal, and economical arguments for and against cremation would be beyond the scope of the present work. (See CEMETERY; FUNERAL; *Dublin Review*, April 1890; *Month*, May 1884; Valton in DThC.)

CRIB. The actual crib in which Christ was born is said to have been brought from Bethlehem in the seventh century, and to be now preserved in the Liberian basilica at Rome. The present custom of erecting a crib in the churches at Christmas time with figures representing our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph, &c., began during the thirteenth century in the Franciscan order. (Benedict XIV. "De Festis," i. n. 641, n. 679; *see* HOLY PLACES.)

CROSIER, CROZIER, or PASTORAL STAFF (*baculus pastoralis, pedum, cambuta*). The staff given to the bishop at his consecration as the symbol of the authority with which he rules his flock. It is said that such a staff is first mentioned by Isidore of Seville (†636). This staff is curved at the top, straight in the middle, and pointed at the lower end. Hence the mediaeval line quoted by Gavantus, "Curva trahit, quos dextra regit; pars ultima pungit." The Pope alone of all bishops actually ruling a diocese does not use a pastoral staff. According to some, this is because the curvature in the staff is a token of limited jurisdiction (?)

The crosier is given to abbots also at their blessing, and an abbot carries his crosier as a bishop does, but an abbess has her crosier borne before her.

According to our present Roman Pontifical, abbesses do not receive the crosier. Formerly however, in the Sarum Rite, they received it, as may still be seen in many of our old church monuments. Rock adds that "abbesses in our English convents, though they have ceased to be solemnly presented with it after the old rite of Sarum, keep up, in a certain way, a remembrance of the ancient custom, and usually have a pastoral staff leaning by the side of them in the choir." At the present time abbesses undoubtedly have the right to the crosier. [See ABBESS.]

Formerly it was common to attach a long linen napkin to the staff, just under the crook. This was not peculiar to abbots' crosiers, but was simply used for the sake of cleanliness.

The crosier must not be confounded with the archbishop's cross. (See CROSS, IV.; ARCHBISHOP; Rock, ii. 149 *sqq.*)

CROSS (SIGN OF; ADORATION OF; PARTICLES OF TRUE CROSS; FEASTS OF, &c.).

I. "God forbid," says St. Paul (Gal. vi. 14), "that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," *i.e.* in the sufferings and death of our Saviour. No wonder, then, that the mere form of the cross, which could remind the heathen only of a horrible and ignominious death, should be dear from the first to the Christian heart; no wonder that Christians began their prayer and sanctified each action, with that sign which reminds us at once of that Sacred Passion, which is the fount of all grace and mercy. "At every step and movement," Tertullian writes, "when we go in or out, when we dress or put on our shoes, at the bath, at the table, when lights are brought, when we go to bed, when we sit down, whatever it is which occupies us, we mark the forehead with the sign of the cross." [1] From early times the image of the cross (the *crux exemplata*, as distinct from the *crux usualis*, made with the hand) was familiar to Christians. Constantine placed a cross of gold with precious stones in the chief hall of his palace.[2] Indeed, so great was the devotion of Christians to the cross that in Tertullian's time they were charged, just as Catholics are charged now, with worshipping the cross.[3]

Two points with regard to the Church's use of the cross need explanation. The former of these points is connected with the Mass. It is natural that the Church, accustomed to bless everything with the sign of the cross, should so bless the unconsecrated bread and wine. But it is surprising at first sight that the sign of the cross should be frequently made over the Body and Blood of Christ. Many explanations have been given. Usually the rite is meant to indicate the blessing which flows forth from the Body and Blood of Christ. At the words "Through whom, O Lord, thou dost ever create all these good things, sancti + fiest them, givest them + life, bless + est them and bestowest them on us," the signs of the cross were originally meant to be made over the *eulogia* or blessed bread placed on the altar and then given to those who did not communicate. Lastly the signs of the cross made with the Host at the words, "Through Hi + m, and with Hi + m, and in Hi + m, is unto thee, God the Father + Almighty in the unity of the Holy + Ghost, all honour and glory," probably arose from the custom of making the sign of the cross in naming the Persons of the Trinity. Such at least is the result of Hefele's careful investigation of the subject. According to another authority "the signs of the cross need cause no difficulty. They are not merely ways of pointing, but are real blessings. As such they exemplify a common idea. The whole consecration-prayer is one thing, of which the effect is the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. During this prayer we ask continually for that grace; although the prayer takes time to say and God grants what we ask at one instant, not necessarily the last instant of the prayer. . . . Consecration is the answer to that one prayer. It takes place no doubt at the words of institution, but it is the effect of the whole prayer. There is no sequence of time with God" (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 347). The mystical interpretations of Gavantus and Meratus deserve all respect, but scarcely explain the actual origin of the practice.

The second point concerns the "adoration" of the cross on Good Friday,[1] and the well-known statement of St. Thomas, that the cross is to be adored with latria, *i.e.* supreme worship. The word "adore" with respect to the cross occurs from early times—*e.g.* in a verse of Lactantius quoted by Benedict XIV.[2] The language of St. Thomas [3] need create no difficulty if properly understood. We may, he says, regard an image in two ways: (1) in itself, as a piece of wood or the like, and so "no reverence is given to the image of Christ"; or (2) as representing something else, and in this way we may give to the cross relatively—*i.e.* to the cross as carrying on our mind to Christ—the same honour which we give to Christ absolutely, *i.e.* in Himself. We need not, as Bossuet points out, in a letter on this subject, adopt St. Thomas's mode of expression, but there is nothing in it to scandalize a person of sense and candour.

II. *Particles of the true Cross.*—From the

[1] Tertull. *De Coron.* 3, *PL*, ii. 80.
[2] Euseb. *Vita Constant.* iii. 49.
[3] "Qui crucis nos religiosos putat." Tertull. *Apol.* 16, *PL*, i. 365.

[1] On the "creeping to the Cross" in old English churches, see Rock, iv. 100.
[2] *De Fest.* i. § 329
[3] 3a, q. 25, a. 3 et 4.

time that the cross on which Christ died was found by Helena, mother of Constantine, Christians esteemed it a great happiness to possess a particle of its sacred wood. We read in the "Peregrinatio Etheriae" how on Good Friday at Jerusalem the bishop used to tell the people: "Be ready here that you may be able to behold the holy wood of the Cross, each one of us believing that it will be profitable to his salvation." . . . "A silver-gilt casket is brought in which is the wood of the Holy Cross. . . . The custom is that the people come one by one and bowing down at the table, kiss the wood and pass on." (Duchesne, "Christian Worship," Append. p. 510.) St. Paulinus speaks of such a particle as a "protection of present and pledge of eternal salvation." Many such minute particles of the true cross are still in the possession of religious houses, churches, or even private persons. Usually the particle is placed in a glass like a monstrance which is closed with the Papal or episcopal seal. The faithful usually show their devotion by kissing this glass; the particles may be incensed at solemn Mass, used to bless the people, &c.

III. *Feasts of the Cross.*

(α) The "Finding of the Cross," a feast kept on May 3rd, commemorates an event which occurred in 326. The heathen had filled up our Lord's tomb with rubbish, and Hadrian had erected a temple of Venus on the spot. Constantine wrote to Macarius, then bishop of Jerusalem, telling him that he wished to erect a costly church over the sepulchre, and in 326 Helena, mother of Constantine, instituted a search for this holy tomb. Not only did she find the tomb itself, but also three crosses near to it, with nails and the inscription on our Lord's cross, lying apart. Macarius, unable to discover which of the three was the cross of Christ, brought a lady in the last extremity of illness to the spot, and when the last of the three crosses touched her, she was suddenly cured. Helena sent the nails, the title,[1] and a considerable part of the true cross, thus miraculously attested, to Constantine. The rest of the cross was left at Jerusalem, placed in a silver case, and in the succeeding age it was shown once a year, on Good Friday, in order that it might be venerated by the faithful. This finding of the cross and the miracle are attested by authors, so many, of such high authority, and who lived so near the event (viz. Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret), that we cannot reasonably refuse to believe it. (See Fleury, xi. 32, and Benedict XIV. "De Fest." where the references are given.) The Bollandists conjecture that the feast, which is mentioned in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, was first kept in the church of Santa Croce at Rome and that gradually the commemoration spread through the West. Gregory XI. ordered a special office to be composed for this feast. Clement VIII. raised it to a double of the second class, and removed certain parts of the old office which were founded on apocryphal "Acts."

(β) The "Exaltation of the Cross" was celebrated from ancient times in memory of the miraculous apparition which Constantine saw in the year 312 as he was preparing to fight against Maxentius. He beheld in the daylight a luminous cross, with the inscription "Conquer by this" (*τούτῳ νίκα*). Eusebius assures us that he had heard the story related on oath by Constantine himself.[1] Thomassin supposes that Constantine himself may have caused the feast to be instituted.[2] The day was afterwards kept with greater solemnity when, after his victory over the Persians in 627, Heraclius recovered the true cross, which Chosroes, the Persian Emperor, had carried away when he became master of Jerusalem, thirteen years before. Coins were struck to commemorate the recovery of the cross. Heraclius first of all replaced the cross in Jerusalem, and then for the sake of safety put it in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople. Clement VIII. made the feast of the Exaltation (Sept. 14) a greater double.

IV. *Cross and Cross-bearers in Processions.*—The cross is carried between two acolytes bearing lights. The cross-bearer in the more solemn processions should be a subdeacon, distinct from the subdeacon of the Mass, and wearing the vestments of his order. "The back of the cross," says Gavantus, "should be turned to the cross-bearer, as a symbol of the duty laid on Christians of following their Master; but the Papal or archiepiscopal cross is turned towards the Pope or archbishop, to show that the thought of Christ crucified is to support them in their toils." The use of the cross in processions may be traced, Baronius says, further back than the year 398. (Gavantus, P.I. tit. 19; Cabrol in "Cath. Enc."; Quilliet in DThC; Gretser, "De Sancta Cruce.")

CRUCIFIX. The cross, as we have shown in an earlier article, was used in Christian worship from the earliest times; the crucifix, or representation of Christ crucified, was probably introduced much later. No crucifix has been found in the Catacombs; no certain allusion to a crucifix is made by any Christian writer of the first four centuries. It is true that in excavations made on the Palatine hill, near the church of St. Anastasia, a picture was found on the wall known as the "blasphemous crucifix." A figure with the body of a man and the head of an ass is hanging on a cross, a slave stands by adoring the figure, and the inscription, in Greek uncials, runs *Ἀλεξάμενος σέβετε[αι?] θεόν*, "Alexamenus worships [his]

[1] See, however, Fleury, cxvii. 26. It is said that the title of the cross, having fallen out of sight, was found in a vault under the church of Santa Croce at Rome in 1492.

[1] Euseb. *Vita Constan.* i. 28.

[2] Thomassin, *Traité des Festes*, ii. 24.

God." This caricature belongs no doubt to the ante-Nicene age; but does it prove the use of crucifixes among Christians at that time? It might be regarded as an additional proof, were other and more convincing ones forthcoming. As it is, we must suppose that a heathen, having heard that the Christians worshipped a crucified God, and being also familiar with the common calumny that the Christians worshipped the head of an ass, combined the two ideas in his rude fresco.

In the first four centuries, then, there is no conclusive evidence that Christians ever placed a figure on the cross. In the fifth century it became usual to put the figure of a lamb or even a bust of Christ on the cross, sometimes above, sometimes below, sometimes in the middle, and many crucifixes of this kind still exist. St. Paulinus of Nola (Ep. 32) describes one of them in the words

"Sub cruce sanguinea niveo stat Christus in agno";

so that the cross here must have been red, the figure on it white.

From the sixth century onwards crucifixes in the strict sense were in use. St. Gregory of Tours ("De Gloria Martyrum," 1, 2, 3), towards the end of the sixth century, mentions a picture of the crucifixion in the Church of St. Genesius at Narbonne. A small cross of brass with the figure of Christ on it was found in the grave of the Frankish sovereign Chilperic. A Syriac MS. of the Gospels, written in 586, and now in Florence, contains a picture of the crucifixion. In 692 the Synod in Trullo, recognizing a custom which had already become predominant, decreed (can. 82) that for the future, instead of the Lamb, the figure of Christ should be placed on the cross.

We pass on to speak of the form given to the crucifix. In the Syriac book of the Gospels, Christ is completely clothed, with hands and feet nailed, each foot being fastened by a separate nail. In the crucifix at Narbonne described by St. Gregory, Christ's body was almost naked. But in one point all the earliest crucifixes agreed. They all represented Christ as nailed, indeed, to the cross, but with open eyes, in dignified repose, and without any trace of pain on His face. Sometimes a royal crown was placed on His head. When the Greeks, though not before the tenth century, painted Christ on the cross, with anatomical correctness, as dying or already dead, the innovation gave great scandal to the Latins. Cardinal Humbert attacked the Greeks for this practice in very violent language, while a synod[1] under the schismatical patriarch Michael Cerularius speaks of godless men from the West who anathematized the orthodox church because it "did not change unnaturally the form of man" which Christ took. Gradually, however, the Greek custom prevailed even in the West, partly because it was reasonable, partly because Greek artists often settled in Western Europe; and D'Agincourt gives copies of Italian crucifixes from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which follow the Greek fashion. (From Hefele, "Beiträge," &c.; Cabrol in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 1106.

CRUETS. Vessels to hold the wine and the water for use in the Mass. It is clear that something of the kind must always have been required. They were called *Hamae* or *Amae*, or *Amule*, and are mentioned in the inventory of gifts made by Constantine to the churches of Rome. ("Lib. Pont." Silvester, i. p. 173.) In the days of Communion under both kinds they were, of course, much larger than those at present in use. (See Leclercq in DACL, *Burettes*; Rock, i. 125; Ducange.)

CRUTCHED or CROSSED FRIARS. An order of mendicants which "was instituted or at least reformed," says Tanner, "by one Gerrard, prior of St. Mary of Morello at Bologna, and confirmed A.D. 1169 by Pope Alexander III., who brought them under St. Austin's rule, and made some other constitutions for their government." They first appeared in England at the synod of Rochester in 1244, armed with a sweeping papal privilege. "At first they carried a cross fixed to a staff in their hands; whence they were called *fratres cruciferi*; afterwards they had a cross of red cloth upon their backs or breasts" (Tanner). They wore a blue habit by order of Pius II.; previously they wore black or brown. Their first house was at Colchester; and in the course of time they established themselves at a few other places: Barham (Camb.) (c. to Welnetham); Brackley (Northants); London, near Tower Hill (their chief house); Welnetham, Great (Suff.); Wotton-under-Edge (Glouc.); and Oxford (in Grandpont Street). (Matt. Paris, iv. 393; v. 794, Rolls ed.)

CRYPT (*crypta*, from *κρύπτω*). The word originally meant an underground place, natural or artificial, suitable for the concealment of persons or things. Juvenal gives the name of "crypta" to a sewer (Sat. v. 106); Suetonius uses it as equivalent to "cryptoporticus," a sheltered shady arcade or gallery (Calig. 58); Vitruvius classes "cryptae" with "horrea" and "apothecae," with the general notion of cellar, store-room, or granary. Secret and underground places, *cryptae*, were often used for Christian worship in the ages of persecution. After the conversion of Constantine, churches were often built over the ancient crypts; but more generally crypts were excavated beneath churches. Besides the great advantage of securing the church from damp, this arrangement also provided a space which, when furnished with altars, could

subserve at need the purposes of public worship, or might be used as a place of interment for the ecclesiastics serving the church. Good instances of the crypt may be observed at Canterbury and Gloucester cathedrals, at one of the churches of Bordeaux, and beneath the ancient chapel of St. Audry belonging to the bishops of Ely, in Ely Place, London, lately recovered for Catholic worship. (Ducange; Facciolati.)

CULDEES. A Celtic word (*ceile De*, servant of God) denoting those who had strictly devoted themselves to the divine service, whether as monks or seculars. It is commonly applied to the monks whom St. Columba planted at Iona, and to the numerous communities which grew out of that foundation; the word, however, does not occur, nor is it in any way referred to, in the writings of Bede. A kind of hereditary transmission of office is sometimes traceable among them, for in the distraction and confusion of the dark ages the discipline of celibacy was much neglected; see the account by Symeon of Durham of the custodians of the body of St. Cuthbert at Lindisfarne. ("Hist. Eccl. Dunelm." ii. 12, iv. 3.)

CULTUS. Veneration or worship. Catholic theologians distinguish three kinds of cultus. Latria (*λατρεία*) or supreme worship is due to God alone, and cannot be transferred to any creature without the horrible sin of idolatry. [See LATRIA.] The word *λατρεία* is used in this sense by the Greek Fathers and corresponds to the Hebrew עֲבוֹדָה. Dulia (*δουλεία*) is that secondary veneration which Catholics give to saints and angels as the servants and special friends of God. The same idea is expressed by Cyril of Alexandria when he speaks of the "relative veneration and cultus of honour" (*οὔτε προσκυνεῖν εἰθίσμεθα λατρευτικῶς ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς*).[1] Lastly, hyperdulia, which is only a subdivision of dulia,[2] is that higher veneration which we give to the Blessed Virgin as the most exalted of mere creatures, though of course infinitely inferior to God and incomparably inferior to Christ in His human nature.

CURATE (*curatus*, one entrusted with the cure of souls). In former times the word was used in English in its proper sense as above; and such is the meaning of it in the Anglican Prayer Book. The French word *curé* also retains the original meaning. By a peculiar turn of phraseology in English, the word has come to mean priests who assist a rector in his cure of souls, and so corresponding with the French word *vicaires*. They are the *capellani vel vice-curati* of Ferraris, who says of them that "they administer the sacraments, not in their name but in that of another—namely the rector (parish-priest)—and therefore they ought to be called assistants (*co-operatores*), not rectors, although they have the cure of souls." The rights and duties of curates (in the English sense of the word) are laid down by the Westminster Provincial synods. The Fourth Synod says: "Where there are two or more priests at a mission one of them alone, independently of anyone save the Ordinary, shall fulfil the office assigned to him, but the others in dependence upon him. The assistants receive, indeed, their faculties from the bishop, but, for the preservation of order, we command them to make use of these only under the direction of the rector of the church; and hence in the formula of faculties there should be the following or similar words: 'dependently upon the rector of the church to which you are appointed'" (xi., n. 5.) (Ferraris; Taunton; Smith, "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law.")

CURE OF SOULS. [See PARISH and PARISH-PRIEST.] As now understood, a cure of souls is that portion of responsibility for the provision of sacraments to, and the adequate instruction of, the Christian faithful, which devolves upon the parish-priest of a particular district in regard to the souls of all persons dwelling within the limits of that district. In ancient times the cure of souls throughout his diocese (often called *paroecia*) was held to fall upon the bishop, who discharged his responsibility by the agency of priests sent to such places as he judged suitable, supported with such disbursements as he thought sufficient, and removable at his pleasure. The division of dioceses into parishes with fixed incumbents and permanent revenues cannot be traced back beyond the fourth century.[1] It was once commonly held that this change was introduced by Pope Dionysius in the second half of the third century, but the statement to that effect only rests on the authority of the Pseudo-Isidore.

A district is not allowed by law to have a parish-priest appropriated to it if it contain fewer than ten houses or families. There can be only one parish-priest or rector in a parish, having cure of souls by ordinary right. (Ferraris, *Parochia*.)

CURIA ROMANA. The Curia, in the stricter sense, designates the authorities which administer the Papal Primacy; in a wider acceptation it embraces all the authorities and functionaries forming the immediate *entourage* or Court of the Pope. The following sketch of its history is abridged from the article by Buss-Kreutzwald in the "Kirchenlexicon." While there are many features in the Curia which resemble an ordinary episcopal administration, there are also certain characteristics which from

[1] Petav. *De Angel.* ii. 9.

[2] St. Thomas, 2ª 2ᵉ, q. 103, a. 4. This is an important point, for we must not, of course, put the Blessed Virgin between creatures and God. She is herself a mere creature.

[1] Soglia, ii. 8, 84.

the first distinguished it, and gave to it a peculiar elevation. The ancient Presbyterium of Rome was gradually, as we have seen [CARDINAL], transformed into the Cardinalate. The power of the archdeacon, exercised in the third century by the martyr St. Laurence (the glory of whose virtues shone throughout Christendom), passed to the Cardinal Camerarius, or Camerlengo, who was the head of the Camera, or financial department of the Apostolic See, and as representing the ancient archdeacons, wielded also an extensive jurisdiction. Other great officials in ancient times were the archpriest, and the Primicerius of the Notaries. The former had the chief charge of what related to worship, and was represented, as the cardinalate developed itself, by the Cardinal Vicar. The Primicerius, being at the head of the department which came in due time to be called the *Cancelleria* or Chancery, corresponds to the Cardinal Vice-Chancellor presiding over that important ministry. But there were also in the body of functionaries by whom the Roman Pontiff was surrounded points of resemblance to the Imperial Court at Rome or Constantinople; this appears in the Familia, or household, of the Pope (*Famiglia Pontificia*) in many ways, and is also observable in the important post of *Praefectus Apostolici Palatii*.

In the Middle Ages the business which flowed in upon the Papal Curia was immense. The changed conditions, civil and religious, of Europe made inevitable the multiplication of appeals from metropolitan courts to the Holy See. Dispensations also, and nominations to reserved benefices, could not easily, at a time when communication was still difficult and intermittent, be obtained without personal visits to Rome. To dispose of the various applications and petitions, and try the various suits, a large staff of officials, both administrative and judicial, had to be employed. The Popes could not always exercise an efficient control over this mass of subordinates; hence abuses arose, and extortion was loudly imputed to the Roman officials. The high rates of the *taxes*, or fees of office, demanded at the Chancery for the expediting of any bull or brief, the delays in the settlement of affairs, and the multiplication of rules and formalities, were the subject of frequent complaints. Reforms were begun by Pius IV. and carried on energetically by St. Pius V. and Sixtus V. Nevertheless, if any supineness ever existed on the part of the reigning Pope, abuses reappeared. Thus, in the seventeenth century, the practice of burdening benefices, the appointments to which proceeded from the Chancery, with pensions to one or other member of the Curia, attained to a very pernicious height. However, Benedict XIV. "decreed a radical reform; his system was continued by Leo XII. and Gregory XVI., and is pursued under the strict and regular administration of Pius IX." [1]

The different branches of the Curia have now to be described in detail; but it may assist us in dealing with this vast and complicated subject if we first endeavour to obtain a rough general view of it, by considering what are the chief ends for which the Papacy exists, and which the action of the Curia is directed to promote. As the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ, the Pope has, first of all, to govern and feed with sound doctrine the whole flock of Christ—*i.e.* the universal Church—and his own diocese in particular. The agencies in the Curia by which he fulfils these purposes are the Sacred Congregations of Cardinals, the Secretariat of State, and the Vicariate of Rome; and the machinery employed is supplied by the Chancery, the Dataria, and the Camera Apostolica. As the "supremus judex" in Christendom, the Pope acts partly through special congregations and delegated judges [DELEGATION], partly through the regular tribunals of the Rota and the Segnatura (*forum externum*) and the Penitenziaria (*forum internum*). Before the usurpation of the temporal power, the Camera also was a court of justice. Again, the Vicar of Christ must be diligently and uninterruptedly occupied with the worship of the true God; to this end corresponds the institution of the Papal Chapel (*Capella Pontificia*). As living and reigning, the Pope, like any other sovereign or any other bishop, has his "family" or household (*Famiglia Pontificia*), one important branch of which is the department having charge of the Papal residences (*Prefettura del Sacro Palazzo Apostolico*). To carry on the necessary external relations with the powers of the world, the Pope has Legates, Nuncios, and Apostolic Delegates, receives ambassadors, appoints and admits consuls. Lastly, as a sovereign ruling over that extent of dominion which came in the dispositions of Providence to the Papacy, and was usurped by violence in 1870, the Pope had ministries, judges civil and criminal, boards, commissions and all the usual machinery of administration in civilized countries.

In the order indicated by this brief sketch, we shall now describe the principal attributions of the various branches of the Curia. The mode in which the action of the Cardinals is applied to assist the Pope in the government of the Church has been already described in the article on CONGREGATIONS (ROMAN); but mention was not there made of a Congregation the action of which is important in reference to the present subject—viz. the *Congregatio Visitationis Apostolicae*, of which the Cardinal Vicar is president. This Congregation, organized by Clement VIII.

[1] Buss, writing before 1870.

and Innocent XII., represents the Pope in his character of a bishop visiting his diocese.

The Cardinal Secretary of State is the exclusive channel through whom must pass all communications carried on between the Holy See and foreign Powers. He is the Pope's Prime Minister—not of course in the sense which the word bears in countries where the Minister is more powerful than the Sovereign, so that the former's "advice" overrides the latter's initiative—but in the proper sense of the term: a faithful agent and servant executing the intentions of his master, whom he serves to the best of his ability. He carries on the negotiations, in which the Pontiff is perpetually engaged, which have for their object to secure the liberties, extend the limits, and promote the welfare of the Catholic Church. Under him are placed the Nuncios and other diplomatic agents of the Holy See, and to him they make their reports. The officials under him consist of several "Minutanti," a writer in cypher, an archivist, a sub-archivist, &c. Being in close and permanent relations to the Pope, "he represents the principle of the Pontifical Government; his influence is consequently felt in all ways in acts emanating directly from the person of the Pope; he directs all important political measures, puts in force the decisions relative to the organic institutions of the Church, and transmits the instructions by which the functionaries of the Curia are guided." [1]

The Vicariate of Rome is under the Cardinal Vicar, assisted by a Vicegerent, a Promotor Fiscal, and two or three other officials, of whom one is the "Defensor Matrimonii" [see that article].

The celebrated department of the Roman Chancery is that which drafts and expedites the bulls and briefs by which the mind of the Pontiff is made known to Christendom, or to particular suitors. The Cardinal at its head is not called "Chancellor," but "Vice-Chancellor," probably because the title of Chancellor, having sprung out of a function which was originally purely subordinate and ministerial, was thought to be beneath the dignity of the Sacred College.

"At what time," says Ferraris, "the office of the Chancellor attained to that height of eminence and prerogative which it is now seen to possess in the Roman Curia is a point not accurately determined. Inquirers into its origin tell us that it was planned and established after the time of Innocent III. In his time, it is known that the duties of Chancellor were discharged by private persons, but such as were of known and conspicuous probity and erudition. In course of time, under Boniface VIII., it is certain that the dignity of Chancellor was assigned to one of the Cardinals." He explains the addition of "vice" to the title, and proceeds: "The Vice-Chancellor has a fixed cardinalitial title—namely, that of the collegiate church of St. Laurence in Damaso. The more pressing, weighty, public, and solemn affairs of the Apostolic See, such as are those debated on in the Consistory, pass through the hands of the Vice-Chancellor, so that he must be called, by analogy with similar offices elsewhere, the Papal Chancellor. Among his numerous subordinates, the one of highest rank is he who is called the Regent of the Chancery, who revises bulls that have been expedited and promulgated, and, if any error has crept in, corrects it. The other officials of the Vice-Chancellor to whose posts prelatical rank is annexed are the Presidents of the greater or lesser "Parcus," so called from the name by which the place in the Chancery where they meet is popularly called. The prelates of the greater Parcus of the Chancery constitute a kind of tribunal, when they meet and decide doubts which may arise concerning the form of documents, or the clauses and decrees which have to be inserted in them, and also respecting the payment of fees and charges. The prelates of the lesser Parcus have a restricted jurisdiction, the one object of their institution being to transmit and deliver bulls to the prelates of the greater Parcus. The writers, abbreviators [see that art.], and others responsible for the preparation of documents in the Roman Chancery, all share in those rights and emoluments which are commonly called the Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery.[1]

The proceedings of the Chancery are governed by certain fixed rules, which, as already mentioned [CANON LAW], form a substantive part of the *Jus Novissimum*. They are of force, however, only during the lifetime of a Pope; every Pontiff, on the day after his accession, publishes them anew, with such omissions or additions as he may think fit to make. The late Pope, Pius X., among other reforms in Roman procedure, has greatly simplified the Chancery by abolishing the Greater and Lesser Parcus, and diminishing in various directions the number of officials.

For an account of the Dataria, see that article. The Camera Apostolica or department of finance in the Papal Government is presided over by the Cardinal Camerlengo. Previously to the loss of the temporal power in September 1870, the Camera was also a court of justice, which, like our Court of Exchequer in ancient times, took cognizance of offences committed against the revenue laws, or by persons in its employment.

Coming now to the organs by which the Papal jurisdiction is exercised, we have first to name the Rota [ROTA ROMANA], and the Segnatura [*q.v.*].

[1] Buss.

[1] Ferraris, "Cancellaria," § 44.

The Penitenziaria Romana has a Cardinal at its head, called the Penitentiarius Major, who is assisted by a Regent, a Theologian, and other officials. The Grand Penitentiary is appointed by the Pope; he must be of the order of Cardinal Priests, and a master in theology, or a doctor in canon law. His faculties extend to—absolving from sins and censures, dispensing in cases of irregularity [IRREGULARITY], commuting, or releasing from, oaths and vows, and in various other ways exercising the power of binding and loosing given to St. Peter by our Lord. He sits in one or other of the three great basilicas of Rome on four days in Holy Week (in St. John Lateran on Palm Sunday, in St. Mary Major on Wednesday, and in St. Peter's on Holy Thursday and Good Friday), and there hears the confessions of such of the faithful as resort to him, and touches the heads of those who stoop low before him—"*pie sese submittentium*"—with the rod of the Penitentiary, granting to them at the same time an indulgence of a hundred days. He is entitled to solemnize Mass in the Capella Pontificia on three days in the year, viz. on Ash Wednesday, Good Friday (Mass of the Presanctified), and All Souls' Day, and to bring to an expiring Pope the last rites and succours of religion. The voluminous Constitution of Benedict XIV. beginning "Pastor Bonus" defines with exactness the duties, powers, and privileges of the Penitenziaria, and of all the officials connected with it.

On the *Capella Pontificia* the reader will do well to consult the learned work of Dr. Baggs entitled "The Pope's Chapel." The dignitaries, prelates, &c., who have a recognized place in the chapel for the sacred functions, are all arranged according to their respective order and precedence. First, the College of Cardinals; next, the College of Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops assisting at the Pontifical Throne. Then come, in the order named, the Vice-Camerlengo, the Princes assisting at the Throne, the Auditor and Treasurer of the Camera, the Majordomo, archbishops and bishops generally, the prelates of the College of Apostolic Protonotaries, abbots, heads of orders, chamberlains, chaplains, the officials of the various Papal departments, clerks, sacrists, vergers, &c., every one having his proper place and just precedence assigned to him.

The *Famiglia Pontificia* consists of certain Cardinals selected by the Pope, the Majordomo, the Master of the Sacred Apostolic Palace, a number of domestic prelates, and clerical and lay chamberlains of various grades, some paid, some honorary—among the latter being reckoned the honorary chamberlains "di spada e cappa," who are laymen of family and position selected from the various European countries. The Swiss Guard, the Noble Guard, the Pope's private chaplains, and many other officials variously designated, belong also to the *Famiglia*. It includes, moreover, the Prefecture of the Sacred Palaces, an important department, with a Cardinal at its head.

As sovereign of the Roman States, the Pope formerly carried on the government with the help of the following departments, which now—pending the re-establishment of the temporal power—remain in abeyance: viz. the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministries of Finance, Commerce, and Arms, a Council of Ministers, a Council of State, several boards and commissions, a Consulta (financial), and courts of law for trying civil and criminal cases.

The authorities of the Curia, below the rank of Cardinal, are technically divided into two classes—the prelates of the *mantelletta* (a short cloak), and those of the *mantellone* (a long cloak, reaching to the feet). In the first class are included Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Protonotaries Apostolic, Domestic Prelates, the Clerks of the Camera, the Auditors of the Rota, the Referendarii of the Segnatura, the Abbreviators of the greater Parcus, the Majordomo, and the Maestro di Camera. Four among these, designated prelates of the *fiocchetti*, take precedence of the rest—the Auditor of the Camera, the Treasurer, the Vice-Camerlengo, and the Majordomo. Among the prelates of the *mantellone* are ecclesiastical chamberlains, masters of ceremonies, &c. (Ferraris, *Cancellaria*; "Annuario Pontificio"; "Gerarchia Cattolica"; Hilling, "Procedure of the Roman Curia"; Ojetti in "Cath. Enc." *Roman Curia.*)

CURIALIA. The duties and functions of a *curialis*, one attached to the *curia* or court of a prince. Ducange cites passages from mediaeval writers in which *curialis* plainly signifies a mere clerk or secretary. But the sense of "courtier" was much more common, as in the title of two well-known works by John of Salisbury and Walter Map, "De Nugis Curialium." There is a canon in the Corpus Juris bearing the name of Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 404) which excludes those who were invested with *curialia* from the clerical order, the due performance of both functions by the same person being considered impracticable.

CURSING. Calling down evil upon God or creatures. In the former case it is always wrong, and is a form of blasphemy [*q.v.*]. To wish evil to others, and especially to ask God to inflict it upon them, is, generally speaking, wrong; but if this is done for their good (*e.g.* that a sinner may be brought to repent), or in fulfilment of God's justice, it may be lawful. Thus, God Himself commanded the Levites and people to curse various sorts of offenders (Deut. xxvii. 15–26). And St. Paul wishes "anathema" against those

who preach any gospel other than he had taught (Gal. i. 8, 9). In like manner, the Church pronounces anathema against all who reject her teaching.

The ordinary English expression "cursing and swearing" really means neither of these, but rather blaspheming, *i.e.* speaking injuriously of God. (St. Thom. 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 76; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. 238; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 378.)

CUSTOM, according to St. Thomas and canonists generally, has three legal effects:

(1) It may, either through the consent, tacit or express, of lawful authority or by prescription, impose a new law. This is clearly laid down both in the canon and civil law. To have the force of law, the custom must be good and useful; it must have been formed by public acts, proceeding from the greater part of the community; the people from whom the custom proceeds must have the intention of binding themselves (thus the custom of taking holy water in entering churches has not the force of a law). If it is introduced by way of prescription, the custom must continue uninterrupted for a certain space of time before it binds the conscience.[1]

(2) On much the same conditions custom may abrogate an existing law, or modify it, unless the law in question be natural or divine. But here, if the custom operates by way of prescription, ten years, according to the common opinion, are required before custom abrogates civil, forty before it abrogates ecclesiastical, laws.

(3) Custom interprets law, and, unless the law be natural or divine, may introduce an "authentic" interpretation—*i.e.* it may give an authoritative sense to a law, although that sense is discordant with the original intention of the legislator. (Billuart, "De Legibus" Diss. v. a. 2; Ferraris, *Consuetudo*; Taunton; Dolhagaray in DThC, *Coutume*; and the Canonists generally.)

CUSTOS. By this name was formerly designated the canon, in a cathedral or collegiate church, who with the approval of the bishop had the spiritual charge of the cure attached to the church. It was also applied to sacristans or treasurers who had charge of the sacred vessels, church ornaments, furniture, &c. In the revolutionary period this office was generally in abeyance; in Austria, however, it stood its ground, and has been again introduced in Prussia, the canon having charge of a metropolitan cure being called *summus custos*. In France the ecclesiastic with corresponding functions is called *archiprêtre*.

[1] St. Alphonsus, *De Leg.* 107 *seq.*, says generally that custom, to have the force of law, must be continued for a long time without interruption. Some say that the length of time required depends on circumstances: others that ten years is the time required. Again, some maintain that while a prescription of ten years suffices to change civil law, a custom must last forty years to abrogate Church law. Probably ten years is enough in either case.

CYCLE (including Golden Number, Dominical Letter, Epact) is a series of numbers, letters standing for numbers, always counted over again in the same order when the series has been completed. Cycles are employed in ecclesiastical as well as civil chronology, since the solar, lunar, and Paschal cycles enable us to reckon the time at which the feasts of the Church will fall in each year. The lunar cycle (*cyclus lunae, decemnovennalis, ἐννεαδεκαετηρίς*) consists of nineteen years, and after the expiration of each lunar cycle the new and full moons fall once more on nearly the same days of the month. This cycle was invented by the Greek astronomer Meton. Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, employed it towards the close of the third century for calculating the date of Easter.[1] Soon afterwards the Nicene Council ordained that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday which followed the first new moon after the vernal equinox (March 21), and this led to a more exact computation of the lunar cycle. The bishops of Alexandria, the seat of mathematical science, were entrusted with the task of fixing the day on which Easter fell.[2] In order to lighten their task, the Alexandrian church constructed *Paschal cycles*, which contained a number of *lunar cycles*, and fixed the date of Easter Sunday for a long course of years. Thus Theophilus of Alexandria drew up a *Paschal cycle* of 418 years—*i.e.* of twenty-two *lunar cycles*—beginning with the year 380. This cycle, partly on account of its obscurity, partly on account of its incorrectness, found small acceptance in the West, and in the year 444 Easter Sunday, according to Roman reckoning, fell on March 26, according to Alexandrian, on April 23. In consequence of a letter from Pope Leo, Cyril corrected the *Paschal cycle* of his predecessor and reduced it to one of ninety-five years, extending from 437 to 531, and embracing five *lunar cycles*. As this cycle was drawing to its end, Dionysius Exiguus, in 525, constructed a new one of 304 Julian years of sixteen *lunar cycles*. The defects of the Dionysian computation were inseparable from those of the Julian year, which consisted of 365 days, 6 hours, instead of 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, so that the calculation of the vernal equinox became more and more erroneous as time went on, forty-four minutes too much being added to each leap-year. The remedy was provided by the Gregorian reformation of the Calendar.[3] [See CALENDAR, JULIAN.]

The Golden Number, which is closely connected with the lunar cycle, indicates the place any given year holds in the *lunar cycle* (whether, *e.g.*, the year of Christ 1914 is 1, 2, 3, &c. in the lunar cycle of nineteen).

[1] Euseb. *H.E.* vii. 14.

[2] The Alexandrian bishop was to fix the date, and the Bishop of Rome was to notify the day fixed to the whole Church.

[3] See Hefele-Leclercq, i. 457.

It gets its name from the fact that it was set in golden colours against the days on which the new moon fell in the Roman and Alexandrian calendars. Christ, according to the common reckoning, was born at the end of the first year in the lunar cycle, so that the Golden Number for each year is obtained by adding one to the number of the year (*e.g.* to 1914) and dividing the sum by nineteen. The remainder gives the Golden Number; if there is no remainder the Golden Number is nineteen. Thus if to 1914 we add one and divide by nineteen, we get fifteen as a remainder, and this is the Golden Number for the year in question.

The solar cycle or cycle of *Dominical Letters* is a series of twenty-eight years, after which Sundays and week-days again fall on the same days of the month. The first seven letters are used to indicate the days of the week, A being used in all cases to mark the first of January, and the letter which thus comes to mark the first Sunday being the Sunday letter or *littera dominicalis* of the year. Thus 1914 began with a Thursday, and hence the Dominical Letter is D. The same Dominical Letter would recur every seven years. But as a day is intercalated in the February of each leap-year, viz., February 25, which has the same letter assigned to it as February 24, hence each leap-year has two Dominical Letters; the former extending to February 24 inclusive, the latter embracing the rest of the year. Now, as this intercalation interrupts the sequence of the Dominical Letters seven times in twenty-eight years, the same order of Dominical Letters cannot recur oftener than once in twenty-eight years. However, a new disturbance in the order of Dominical Letters arises from the fact that in the Gregorian calendar it was arranged that although each secular year—*i.e.* the first year of each century—would naturally be a leap-year, only the first of each of four seculars should be reckoned as such. Thus 1600, the secular year which followed the Gregorian reformation of the calendar, was reckoned as a leap-year—*i.e.* it had a day intercalated in February—but this was not the case with the years 1700 and 1800, nor with 1900. In showing how the Dominical Letter for each year may be ascertained (we restrict our calculations to the present century), first, we must ascertain the number which, *e.g.*, the year 1914 holds in the solar cycle of twenty-eight years. The first year of the Dionysian era is the ninth of the solar cycle. Hence by adding nine to 1914, and dividing the sum by twenty-eight, we get nineteen as remainder, so that we now know that the year 1914 is nineteenth in the solar cycle of twenty-eight. The following table gives the order of Dominical Letters for the solar cycle of twenty-eight years and will serve for calculating the Dominical Letter of any year in the twentieth century.

1 F E	8 D	15 B	22 G
2 D	9 C B	16 A	23 F
3 C	10 A	17 G F	24 E
4 B	11 G	18 E	25 D C
5 A G	12 F	19 D	26 B
6 F	13 E D	20 C	27 A
7 E	14 C	21 B A	28 G

We had already found that 1914 is the nineteenth year in the cycle; now we know that its Dominical Letter is D, or in other words that the first Sunday falls on January 4. When we have got so far, it is easy to ascertain the days of the month on which the Sundays of the year fall. The twelve months have letters assigned to them, contained in the following memorial verses,

Astra Dabit Dominus Gratisque Beabit Egenos;
Gratia Christicolæ Feret Aurea Dona Fideli:

i.e. A is the letter for January 1, D for February 1, &c. As D is the Dominical Letter for 1914, and as F is the letter which marks the first of December, the first of that month will be on a Tuesday, and the Sundays will fall on the sixth, thirteenth, twentieth, and twenty-seventh days.

Epacts (*ἐπακταὶ ἡμέραι, dies adjecti, adscititii*) are used because of the differences in duration between the lunar and solar years. Annual epacts determine the age of the moon on each new year's day. The lunar falls about eleven days short of the solar year. In the Gregorian calendar the new moon of the lunar cycle (see above) falls on January 1, so that the epact = 0, an asterisk (*) being sometimes used to mark the epact in this case. In the second year the epact or addition which must be made to the lunar year = XI.; in the third XXII. The epact of the fourth year would be XXXIII., but on the thirtieth of these thirty-three days a new moon has again appeared, so that the epact corresponding to the fourth year in the lunar cycle (or in other words to the Golden Number 4) is III.

The calculation of the monthly epact enables us to determine the days of the civil or solar month on which the new and full moons occur. The lunar month consists of twenty-nine days, eleven hours, forty-four minutes: so that the monthly epact in January, which has thirty-one days, is one day, six minutes; and the epact, of course, for each month increases, till in December it reaches eleven days. To shorten the process of calculation, the lunar months are reckoned at twenty-nine and thirty days. If we subtract the annual epact from thirty-one, we get the day on which the new moon of January falls: the new moon of February falls thirty, that of March twenty-nine, that of April thirty days later; and so with the rest of the months.

An example will illustrate the way in which these chronological determinations are

connected with and assist each other. Let us suppose that we have to ascertain the day on which Easter Sunday fell in 1879. If we add unity to 1879 and divide by nineteen we obtain as remainder eighteen, which is the Golden Number, corresponding, as our Epact Table shows us, to the Epact VII. Consequently on January 1, 1879, the moon was seven days old. By subtracting seven from thirty-one, we find that the new moon falls on January 24, then on February 21, then March 24, the full moon of the spring equinox falling fourteen or fifteen days later, *i.e.* on April 7 or 8; so that the Sunday following April 8 is Easter Sunday. We have now to find on what day of the week April 8 fell, and for this we need to know the Dominical Letter. The remainder of $\frac{1879 + 9}{28}$ is twelve, which is the number of the year 1879 in the solar cycle, and to this the Dominical Letter E corresponds, as may be seen from the table given above. April, according to the memorial verses, begins with G; April 2 then will be A, April 3 B; E, the Dominical Letter, falls on April 6, which was therefore a Sunday. April 8, then, was a Tuesday, and the Sunday following, viz. April 13, was Easter Sunday. ("De Anno et ejus Partibus" prefixed to the Roman Missal; Kiel in "Kirchenlex." *Zeitrechnung*; and Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles," i. 450 *sqq.*)

D

DALMATIC. A vestment open on each side, with wide sleeves, and marked with two stripes. It is worn by deacons at High Mass as well as at processions and benedictions, and by bishops, when they celebrate Mass pontifically, under the chasuble. The colour should conform to that of the chasuble worn by the celebrant.

The word is derived from Dalmatia, and first occurs in the second century. The dalmatic (*Dalmatica vestis*) was a long undergarment of white Dalmation wool corresponding to the Roman tunic. Aelius Lampridius blames the emperors Commodus and Heliogabalus for appearing publicly in the dalmatic. In the Acts of St. Cyprian (ed. Hartel, cxiii.) we are told that the martyr drew off his dalmatic and, giving it to his deacons, stood ready for death in his linen garment. In these instances the dalmatic was clearly a garment of everyday life.

According to Anastasius, Pope Silvester early in the fourth century gave the Roman deacons dalmatics instead of the sleeveless garments (κολόβια) which they had used previously. Gradually the Popes conceded the privilege of wearing the dalmatic as an ecclesiastical vestment to the deacons of other churches.[1] Such a concession was made by Pope Symmachus towards the close of the fifth century, to the church of Arles. In the same way, the use of the dalmatic as an episcopal vestment was first proper to the Pope and then permitted by him to other bishops. Thus Gregory the Great allowed Aregius, bishop of Gap in Gaul, to wear a dalmatic, and Walafrid Strabo testifies that in the seventh century this episcopal custom was by no means universal. But from the year 890 onwards ecclesiastical writers all speak of the dalmatic as one of the episcopal, and the chief of the deacon's, vestments. The use of the dalmatic, at least in the West, has never been conceded to priests as such. Hence only on attaining episcopal rank are they entitled to wear it under their chasubles. The sub-deacon's *tunica*, though now identical in shape with a dalmatic and called by that name, is in reality only the old κολόβιον (see above) adorned and developed. The dalmatic was originally always white, but Durandus speaks of red dalmatics, symbolizing martyrdom. The Greeks have a vestment, corresponding to our dalmatic, called στιχάριον or στοιχάριον from the στίχοι (lines or stripes), with which it is adorned; its colour varies, just as the dalmatic of our deacons does, with the colour of the φελόνιον or chasuble, worn by the celebrant. The Greek priests also wear a στιχάριον under the chasuble, but the former is always white.

Various mystical meanings have been attached to the dalmatic. When the arms are stretched it presents the figure of a cross; the width of the sleeves is said to typify charity; the two stripes (which were originally purple, and are probably a relic of the Roman *latus clavus*) were supposed to symbolize the blood of Christ shed for Jews and Gentiles. The dalmatic is not worn by the deacon on penitential days. He either wears no vestment over the alb, or the folded chasuble [*q.v.*] which before he sings the Gospel he either folds up over his left shoulder or replaces by a broad kind of stole representing the folded chasuble. (Rock, i. 307; "Hierurgia," ii. 241; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 247-302; Hefele, "Beiträge," ii. 204 *sqq.*)

DAMES ANGLAISES. [See INSTITUTE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.]

DANCING. The subject will be referred to here only so far as dancing is an adjunct of

[1] "Quando sacerdoti ministrant."—*Rubr. Gen. Miss.* tit. xix.

worship. In the Old Testament it was not merely a form of amusement but also an expression of piety. Thus Mary (Miriam) the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, "took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went after her with timbrels and dances; and she began the song to them, saying: Let us sing to the Lord, for he is gloriously magnified, the horse and his rider he hath thrown into the sea." (Exod. xv. 20, 21.) And David, on the recovery of the ark, "danced with all his might before the Lord" (2 Kings [2 Sam.] vi. 14), and defended his action when his wife Michal reproached him. It is also clear from many passages in the Psalms that dancing formed part of the liturgy in the Temple. (Ps. cxlix. 9, cl. 4; cf. Eccl. iii. 4; Jer. xxx. 4; Job xxx. 11; Cant. vii. 1.) Even in the present day, dancing before the high altar is permitted in Seville cathedral on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, at Shrovetide, and on Corpus Christi Day. The dancers are young choristers, and the dance is a species of minuet. Those who have witnessed the ceremony pronounce it entirely free from irreverence or frivolity, and expressive of deep devotion. Nevertheless, attempts have often been made to suppress the practice. It is said to have originated in the shouts and dances of some Christian boys on the taking of the city from the Moors in 1248. (Thurston, "On Dancing in Churches," in "Tablet," Mar. 13, 1909.)

A fanatical sect of men and women, called the Dancers, made their appearance in 1374 along the banks of the Rhine and in Belgium. They cannot be called heretics, but rather insane or possessed. (Ortolan and Bareille in DThC., *Danse, Danseurs*; Baronius, "Annales," 1374, n. 13; Hecker, "Die grossen Volkskrankheiten des Mittelalters.")

DATARIA. The office in the Papal Court whence are expedited the graces, accorded by the Pope, which have their effect and are cognisable *in foro externo*. The term is derived from a Low Latin verb *datare*, to date, formed doubtless from the "Datum" or "Datae," with following indications of place and time, with which the Romans commonly ended their letters. The Dataria, originally a branch of the Apostolic Chancery, attained to a separate organization in the thirteenth century, at which time, owing to the great number of benefices in all countries reserved to the Pope, mistakes were sometimes made in the appointments, and the same benefice was conferred upon or promised to two or more persons, whence complaints and unseemly contentions arose. The evil was effectually remedied by the appointment of an official whose special business it should be to register the *dates* of the appointments to benefices.

The Datary (who formerly was sometimes a simple prelate, sometimes a Cardinal, but is now always a Cardinal and is styled Pro-Datary) has in the course of time had many other duties laid upon him besides those connected with the grant of benefices. He had the charge of dispensations, the various kinds of which, and also licences for the alienation of church property, were issued from his office. His functions cease *ipso facto* on the death of a Pope, all applications reaching the office during the vacancy being sealed up and transmitted to the College of Cardinals to be dealt with by the future Pope. Pius X. made great changes in the Dataria, reducing its personnel and its competency. It has now only to investigate the fitness of candidates for Consistorial benefices reserved to the Holy See, and to deal with the administration of them. (See CURIA ROMANA; Ojetti in "Cath. Enc.")

DAUGHTERS OF THE CROSS. A Congregation of Religious Women founded in 1832 by the Ven. Mother Marie Thérèse (Jeanne Hare) aided by Canon Habets of Liége, in which city the foundress (herself a native of Liége) began her work and established the mother-house of the Institute. Its object was to carry on works of piety and charity, not excluding any by which spiritual or temporal help might be afforded to those in need. Hence its sphere of usefulness embraces education of girls from that given in high-class boarding-schools to the teaching in elementary schools, not only in European countries, but in India, Central Africa, &c., the service of seminaries, and the managing of hospitals, orphanages, and refuges. The congregation has a flourishing English Province of which the head house is at Carshalton, important high schools there, and in London; hospitals at Ramsgate, Cheam, and elsewhere; orphanages and convalescent homes for children at Margate and Totteridge, large schools in the North of England, and a most successful home and hospital for Epileptics in Hertfordshire. The cause of canonization of Mother Marie Thérèse the foundress (1781–1876) was introduced in Rome with the sanction of Pope Pius X. in December 1911.

DEACON. The word in itself (*διάκονος*) means no more than "minister" or servant, and so it is used in the LXX and in the New Testament (see Esther i. 10; 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 4). However, the word deacon received a more definite meaning in apostolic times, for the mention of deacons along with bishops in Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8, besides the qualifications which St. Paul requires of a deacon, clearly prove that the diaconate was a church office. According to the Pontifical it is the part of a deacon "to minister at the altar, to baptize and to preach." He is the highest of all whose office it is to serve the priest in the administration of the sacraments, and he is set apart for his work, not merely by the institution of the Church, but by the sacrament of Order which he receives

through the laying on of the bishop's hands. Just as the Levites were chosen by God Himself for the ministry of the tabernacle, so the diaconate is appointed by Christ's institution and strengthened by a sacrament of the new law for the service of the Christian altar. The constituents of a sacrament—viz. the sensible sign, grace given, divine and permanent institution—are all found in a deacon's ordination. The laying on of hands is the sensible sign; grace is given, for the bishop says, "Receive the Holy Ghost"; and the Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. can. 4) anathematizes those who hold "that the Holy Ghost is not given by sacred ordination, and accordingly that bishops say in vain 'Receive the Holy Ghost.'" There is divine institution, for what power had the Apostles to institute a sign which should infallibly convey grace? And besides, the Council of Trent (*loc. cit.* can. 6) defines that there is "in the Catholic Church a hierarchy divinely constituted, consisting of bishops, presbyters, and ministers," which last word must at least include deacons.[1]

Up to this point we have been arguing on Catholic principles, but it will be well (1) to consider more closely the grounds on which the Catholic idea of the diaconate rests, passing then (2) to the history of the office, and (3) to the rite of ordination.

(1) *The Catholic Idea of the Diaconate.*—The duties of a deacon will be considered more fully afterwards. Here it is enough to say that a deacon is ordained chiefly in order that he may assist the priest in the celebration of solemn Mass, and then, on certain conditions, to preach and baptize. In other words, he is the chief minister at the altar. Against this, Protestants have often alleged that the seven deacons whose ordination is mentioned in Acts vi. were chosen in order to administer the alms of the Church, and that the New Testament gives no hint of their duties at the altar.

Now certainly the "seven" mentioned in Acts vi. were appointed on occasion of disputes which arose between two classes of Jewish converts (viz. those of foreign and those of Palestinian origin) on the distribution of alms, and were entrusted with the administration of charitable relief. Further, the seven, though not called "deacons," have almost universally been regarded as the first who held the office.[2] Still, the sacred text indicates that they were to be chosen for some higher work than the administration of charity. They were to be "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom." We find Stephen, one of their number, preaching and instructing; Philip, another member of their body, baptizing (Acts viii. 38). St. Paul (1 Tim. iii. 9) requires deacons to "hold the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience," nor does he allude to this work of "serving tables"—*i.e.* of administering alms.

We can only guess the nature of the diaconate from Scripture, but the early and authentic tradition proves that the Catholic doctrine on the matter corresponds to the original teaching of the Apostles. St. Ignatius ("Ad Trall." 2) speaks of deacons as "ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ," "for they are not ministers (διάκονοι) of meat and drink, but servants of the Church of God." Here the mention of the "mysteries of Jesus Christ" in contrast with ordinary meat and drink, shows that St. Ignatius alludes to the service of the altar. Justin ("Apol." i. 65) tells us that the deacons gave Holy Communion to those present at Mass and carried it to the absent. Tertullian ("De Baptism." 17) says that deacons had the right to baptize, not, however, "without the authority of the bishop." This chain of testimony might easily be strengthened, but the testimonies given prove that the complete Catholic idea of the diaconate was accepted in the early Church.

(2) *History of the Duties*, &c.—With regard to the ministry of the altar, deacons, as we have seen, used to give the people communion under both kinds. In Cyprian's time, and in the following ages, deacons were only permitted to present the chalice to the people.[1] At present they are forbidden to give communion at all except in case of necessity, but they retain the essential part of their office as ministers of the altar by singing the Gospel at High Mass, and assisting the priest throughout the celebration. They can also, as in ancient times, preach with the leave of the bishop, and baptize solemnly with that of the parish priest.

Formerly the deacons had other and very important functions. They had to acquaint the bishop with the state of his flock, collect the offertory at Mass, to visit the confessors in prison, write the Acts of the martyrs, so that in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. 44) the deacon is said to be the "ear, eye, mouth, heart, and soul of the bishop." Nay, in certain cases even congregations in the country were committed to their care.[2]

In many churches, of which Rome was one, the number of deacons was limited to seven, in memory of the original institution.[3] It was not till the eleventh century that the number of Cardinal Deacons in the Roman Church was raised from seven to fourteen.

But the most important point in which the position of deacons has altered is that,

[1] That the sacrament of Order is received by deacons follows so plainly from the definitions of Trent, and is so universally held, that the contrary opinion of Durandus and Cajetan, though not heretical, could not be maintained without temerity.

[2] This, however, was denied by the Greek Council in Trullo, can. 16; and also, Petavius says, by "certain learned and Catholic theologians."—*Diss. de Cathol. quibusdam Dogm.* lib. ii. cap. 1.

[1] Cyprian, *De Laps.* 25, ed. Hartel, 255; *Apost. Const.* viii. 12. [2] Concil. Illib. can. 77.

[3] Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 43; Concil. Neocaesar. can. 15.

whereas in the ancient and even mediaeval Church a man often remained a simple deacon for the rest of his life, the diaconate is now regarded as a step towards the priesthood. Among the Cardinal Deacons at Rome a vestige of the ancient discipline was preserved to quite our own times.

(3) *The Ordination of Deacons.*—The following is the form given in the Roman Pontifical. The bishop questions the archdeacon on the fitness of the candidates, and then asks the clergy and the people to state any grounds they have for objecting to the ordination of the person about to be promoted. After a pause, the bishop lays down the duties and qualifications of a deacon, while the candidates kneel at his feet. The candidates then prostrate themselves on their faces while the Litany of the Saints and some other prayers are recited. Next, in a kind of preface, the bishop gives thanks to God for the institution of the sacred ministry, and the most important part of the rite begins. The bishop places his right hand on each of the candidates with the words "Receive the Holy Ghost for strength and for resisting the devil and all his temptations in the name of the Lord." Then, holding the right hand stretched out, he continues, "Send forth upon them, O Lord, we beseech Thee, the Holy Spirit, that they may be strengthened faithfully to perform the work of thy ministry by the gift of thy sevenfold grace," &c. The bishop then invests the new deacons with the stole on the left shoulder, and dalmatic, and finally makes them touch the book of the Gospels, while he says, "Receive the power of reading the Gospel in the church of God, both for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord."

The essence of the ordination, according to the most probable opinion, consists in the laying on of hands by a bishop with words which express the nature of the power given. This imposition of hands is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and in various early authorities—*e.g.* in Canon 4 of the early collection attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage. The present form of words which accompanies this imposition of hands is not older than the twelfth century. With regard to the other ceremonies, the questions put by the bishop to the people on the fitness of the candidates are in substance of Apostolic institution.[1] The recitation of the Litany of the Saints is found in the oldest Pontificals; the prayer "Exaudi, Domine, preces nostras," used after giving the book of the Gospels occurs in a MS. more than twelve hundred years old; and the practice of investing the new deacon with the stole was in use, according to Assemani, long before the time of Gregory the Great. In the Greek rite, as given by Goar, the bishop makes the sign of the cross on the head of the person to be ordained, and places his hand on his head, with the words, "Divine grace, which ever heals the infirm and perfects the imperfect, promotes the venerable sub-deacon N. to be deacon. Therefore let us pray for him that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon him." The bishop then makes on the head of the deacon the sign of the cross three times, uses two forms of prayer with fresh imposition of hands, puts the *orarium* or stole on his left shoulder, saying, "He is worthy," gives him the kiss of peace, and puts the fan for driving away flies from the holy sacrifice into his hand again, saying, "He is worthy." (The dogmatic theologians treat of the Diaconate under the heading of Order; see also Chardon, 872; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Forget in DThC; Morinus, "De Sacris Eccl. Ordinationibus"; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 610–4; Marriott's "Vestiarium Christianum" may usefully be consulted.)

[1] See Acts vi. 3.

DEACONESS. Many have supposed that St. Paul recognizes the existence of deaconesses when in Rom. xvi. 1 he speaks of Phoebe as the διάκονος or servant of the church at Cenchreae, and it has been suggested that the "widows" in 1 Tim. v. 9, were deaconesses. In any case, from very early times there was an order of women in the Church known as διακόνισσαι, πρεσβυτίδες, χῆραι, *diaconissae, presbyterae, viduae.* Pliny mentions two Christian *ministrae,* probably meaning deaconesses.

They were employed in assisting at the baptism of women,[1] which at that time was by immersion, and after the deacon had anointed the baptized person on the foerhead, the other unctions, in the case of a woman's baptism were given by the deaconess.[2] Deaconesses also gave private instruction to women, visited them in sickness and prison, kept order at the women's door and in the women's part of the church, assisted the bride at marriages, &c.

Originally widows were chosen for the office, though even St. Ignatius speaks of virgins who were called widows[3]—*i.e.* because of this office—and later, married women, if living in continence, might become deaconesses. For a long time deaconesses were required to be sixty years of age, but the Councils of Chalcedon and in Trullo[4] reduced the required age to forty years. Women who had been married twice were never admitted to the rank of deaconess. Deaconesses were strictly forbidden to marry.[5] They were ordained by laying on of hands ("Constit. Apost." viii. 19; Council of Chalcedon, can. xv.).[6] But they were servants of the

[1] *Constit. Apost.* viii. 27. [2] *Constit. Apost.* iii. 15.
[3] *Ad Smyrn.* 13, *PG*, v. 718. But this difficult passage may be corrupt. See Funk and Zahn, and especially Vizzini's note ("PP. Apost." vol. ii. 182).
[4] Concil. Chalced. can. 15; Concil. in Trull. can. 14.
[5] Concil. Chalced. *loc. cit.*
[6] See Hefele-Leclercq, i. 617 *sqq.*, and the references in Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie,* sub voc. "Diaconissa."

church, not *ministers of the altar*; indeed, the Fathers regard the exclusion of women from ecclesiastical office as a distinctive principle of the Catholic Church.[1]

In the fifth and sixth centuries abuses led to the abolition of the office in Gaul,[2] and in the tenth century the office was extinct in the West, though the words *diaconissa* and *archidiaconissa* were sometimes used for abbess. At Constantinople the office survived till 1190, and it is still preserved among the Syrians. (Chardon, 876 *sqq.*; Ferraris, *Diaconissae*; Forget in DThC, good bibliography; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

DEAD, MASS FOR. [See MASS, III.]

DEAN (*decanus*, one who has authority over ten; cf. *centurio*). Civil officials so called were known to the Roman law, and are mentioned in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian. They seem to have been in some way concerned with the management of funerals. The title was adopted for Christian use, and first among the monks. For every ten monks a *decanus* or dean was nominated, who had the charge of their discipline. (Rule of St. Benedict, c. xxi.) The senior dean, in the absence of the abbot and provost, governed the monastery. Since monks had the charge of many cathedral churches, the office of dean thus was introduced into them; custom gradually determined that there should be only one dean in a cathedral; with the increase of property the provost's time was largely taken with up temporal affairs; hence the dean gradually assumed the chief charge of the ecclesiastical and ritual concerns of the cathedral, especially in regard to the choir. When a regular observance was introduced among secular canons [REGULAR CANONS], the office of dean, borrowed apparently from the monastic chapters, came in along with it. By the common law the care of souls, but no jurisdiction *in foro externo*, is committed to deans of chapters; but by special and customary law they often enjoyed in France in former times, and still enjoy in Germany in certain cases, large powers of visitation, administration, and jurisdiction, so that their authority is almost equal to that of bishops. By the old canon law the right of electing the dean belonged to the bishop and archdeacon, though by custom it often became vested in the canons. But the fourth rule of the Roman Chancery has since reserved the appointment absolutely to the Holy See. In chapter-meetings the dean presides *ex officio*, and has a casting vote when there is an equal division; otherwise his powers do not exceed those of the canons. (Ferraris, *Decanus*.)

In England the head of the chapter is the Provost [*q.v.*]. (See also RURAL DEAN; VICAR FORANE.)

DEAN OF THE SACRED COLLEGE. The Cardinal Dean is the chief of the Sacred College; he is usually the oldest of the Cardinal Bishops, and succeeds his predecessor as bishop of Ostia. He presides in the consistory in the absence of the Pope. In all ecclesiastical functions which he performs he has the privilege of wearing the *pallium*; and it is he on whom the duty devolves of conferring on the newly-elected Pope those orders which he may not have already received, and also of presiding at his coronation. Ambassadors, on arriving in Rome, pay their first visits to the Cardinal Dean, and newly-elected Cardinals render to him their earliest homage. The oldest in the order of bishops, after the Cardinal Dean, is sub-dean of the Sacred College; prior to the reform made by Pius X. he was usually bishop of Porto.

DEANS, RURAL. [See RURAL DEANS.]

DECALOGUE. [See COMMANDMENTS.]

DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER, MARRIAGE WITH. A few words on the Catholic view of this vexed question may not be out of place here. A man and his deceased wife's sister are related in the first degree of affinity, and therefore any attempted marriage between them would be null and void. [See AFFINITY.] But the Church has the power of dispensing from this impediment; hence Catholics who have obtained such a dispensation are validly married in God's sight. The English law, of course, formerly refused to recognize the marriage. It is for this reason that some Catholics joined in the agitation in favour of the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage. The common view, however, is opposed to the act on the ground that the previously existing law was in accordance with the canons of the Church.

DECLARATION OF GALLICAN CLERGY. [See GALLICANISM.]

DECREE (*decretum*). This word has various meanings. In general, it is used for any legislative act of a superior, especially the Pope or any of the Roman Congregations. The Council of Trent calls its rules concerning faith and discipline "canons and decrees." [See CANON; Taunton.]

DECRETALS, THE. By this name is commonly understood the collection of laws and decisions made by St. Raymond of Pennafort at the command of Gregory IX. After the appearance of the Decretum of Gratian [CANON LAW] in 1151, many jurisconsults applied themselves to the task of collecting and commenting upon ecclesiastical laws. These collections being incomplete, it sometimes happened that a Decretal deciding a given case in a particular way would be found in one collection and not in another, whence much uncertainty arose. False decretals [*q.v.*] also were not unfrequently manufac-

[1] Tertull. *Praescr.* 41, *PL*, ii. 56.

[2] Or at least put an end to the blessing of women for the office. See Council of Orange (anno 441), can. 26; of Epaon. (anno 517), can. 21.

tured about this time, so that Innocent III. was obliged to employ severe measures to suppress the practice. In order that all Chupch tribunals might have a comprehensive and consistent authority to guide them, Pope Gregory IX. directed St. Raymond, who was his chaplain and penitentiary, to make a new and authentic compilation of Papal Constitutions and Decretals. This great undertaking was completed in 1234. The work opens with a letter addressed by Gregory IX. to the doctors and scholars of the university of Bologna, in which, after explaining the motives which had influenced its preparation, he states it to be his wish that the work should be used both in the courts and in the schools, and forbids the publication of any similar collection without special authority from the Holy See. The five books of the Decretals, the principal subjects of which are indicated by the memorial line

"Judicium, judex, clerus, connubia, crimen,"

contain 185 Titles or Rubrics. The first title, "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," founding Church law on revealed religion, is a short profession of faith, with a statement of the divine constitution and authority of the Church.

St. Raymond used abbreviation to the utmost, in order to compress his matter within the limits of one volume. Thus he frequently records in full the operative part of a Decretal containing the Pontifical decision, but suppresses the recitals containing the case or cases on which the decision was founded. The gloss-writers and commentators, from not referring to the earlier collections in which the Decretals were given in full, sometimes misunderstood these decisions; their glosses, however, were acted upon by the courts: hence not a little perplexity arose. A canonist named Contius published an edition of the "Corpus Juris Canonici" in 1570, in which Raymond's omissions were supplied; but the innovation did not succeed, the original text having been used by jurists for so long a period; and the Decretals are still edited and cited in the form in which Raymond left them. The last edition appeared at Leipzig in 1840, and was reissued in 1879. It is accurate and critical, but lacks a subject-index.

Among the chief commentators on the Decretals are Bernard of Parma, a canon of Bologna. and Sinibaldo Fieschi, afterwards Pope Innocent IV. For the most part canonists, ancient and modern, down to De Angelis and Wernz, publish their work in the form of a commentary on the Decretals: an inconvenient plan which will become obsolete on the promulgation of the new Codex of Canon Law. (Taunton.)

DECRETALS, FALSE. [See FALSE DECRETALS.]

DECRETIST (*decretista*). A general name for a doctor of canon law; the word seems to be derived from the "Decretum" of Gratian. The university of Oxford used to confer the degrees of "Baccalaureus" and "Doctor" Decretorum. The term "decretalist" signified a canonist who was specially versed in the Decretals of Gregory IX.

DECRETUM GRATIANI. [See CANON LAW.]

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES. These words mean, properly speaking, the act by which a church is solemnly set apart for the worship of God; and afterwards this event is commemorated by a feast of the dedication. We have to treat of both subjects.

I. *The actual Dedication of the Church.*—In the Jewish Church the tabernacle and Temple were dedicated by solemn rites (Exod. xxxix.; 3 Kings viii.; 2 Paral. v., vi.), and Cardinal Bona supposes that the practice of dedicating or consecrating Christian churches dates from Apostolic times, and was formally imposed by a law of Pope Evaristus. However this may be, we find the consecration of churches mentioned, just after the heathen persecution was over, by Euseb. (x. 3). In the "Peregrinatio Etheriae" we have an account of the feast of the dedication of the churches at Jerusalem. It was one of the charges made by the Arians against Athanasius that he had said Mass in an unconsecrated church. Many early councils—*e.g.* that of Orange in 441 (can. 10)—take the practice of dedicating churches for granted, and legislate concerning it. The present law of the Church forbids the use of a church for the celebration of Mass unless it has been first consecrated or at least blessed, for which blessing a less solemn rite is provided in the Pontifical. It is unlawful to alienate a church which has been once consecrated, according to the maxim quoted from the "Regulae Juris" appended to the sixth book of the Decretals—"That which has once been dedicated to God must not be transferred to common use."

The person who consecrates a church must be a bishop, and to him this consecration has always been and is still reserved, though a simple priest may be deputed to bless a church. Moreover, the consecrating bishop must be the bishop of the diocese or another bishop with leave from him, and this applies even to the churches of such religious as are exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, although in some cases special privileges in this matter have been granted—*e.g.* to the Friars Minor, who got powers from Honorius III. enabling them to invite another bishop to consecrate their churches, should the diocesan be unwilling to do so. In early times it was common for many bishops to assemble for the consecration of a church, and in those days many bishops might

actually take part in the consecration, though the principal part was assigned to one only. At present, a bishop can by virtue of his ordinary jurisdiction consecrate any church in his diocese, but this has not been the case always and everywhere. Thus it appears from a Constitution of Gelasius, and from a letter of Gregory the Great, that Italian bishops could not consecrate churches even in their own dioceses without the Pope's leave; while in the province of Toledo permission had to be obtained from the metropolitan. These restrictions no longer exist.

The ritual of consecration has of course been gradually developed. Originally, to judge from Eusebius (*loc. cit.*), churches were consecrated by preaching, prayer, and above all by the acceptable sacrifice of the new law. St. Ambrose mentions the custom of consecrating churches by relics as one which prevailed at Rome and was adopted by him; he also speaks of the vigil kept by the relics over-night before they were transferred to the new church. From a letter of Vigilius (A.D. 538) it is clear that in that age there was no special rite of dedication of churches in Rome. A church was consecrated by the fact that with intention Mass was solemnly celebrated in the building; but as a general rule this was preceded by the deposition of the relics of martyrs under the altar. Vigilius expressly lays down that it is not necessary even to sprinkle the building with holy water. (Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. xii. *n.* 2.) But from the ninth century we meet with the rite of consecration almost in its present form, and we may trace the minor changes introduced in the "Ordines" which Martène has collected from different ages and dioceses. The following are the chief points in the rite prescribed by the present Roman Pontifical, of which most of the details are of Frankish origin. The consecrating bishop, who should be fasting on the day before, sets apart overnight the relics to be used in the consecration. Lights burn before them, and matins and lauds are sung in honour of the saints whose relics have been procured. Twelve crosses are also marked on the walls of the church with candles attached to them. Next day these candles are lighted, and all things needful are prepared in the church, which is left in charge of a deacon duly vested. The bishop goes in procession round the outside of the church, three times sprinkling it with holy water, knocks three times at the church door with his pastoral staff, saying, "Lift up your gates, ye princes, and be ye lifted up, ye eternal gates, and the king of glory will enter" (Ps. xxiv.). Three times the deacon within asks "Who is the king of glory?" Twice the bishop answers "The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle," and the third time, "The Lord of armies, he is the king of glory." Thereupon the bishop enters with the clerics and others whose assistance he requires, leaving the rest of the clergy and the people outside, and again closing the door. He forms a cross with the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets, which he inscribes with his staff on ashes previously sprinkled upon the floor of the church—a rite which symbolizes the instruction to be given to catechumens in the elements of the faith.[1] Afterwards, he proceeds with the consecration of the altars, marking five crosses on each with his thumb, which he has dipped in a preparation of water, ashes, salt, and wine, specially blessed, and sprinkling them seven times with this mixture. He also goes three times round the inside of the church and sprinkles the walls, as well as the floor of the church. Later on, the relics are borne into the church, the bishop, clergy, and people taking part in the procession. An address is first made to the people on the event of the day, and the outside of the door is anointed with chrism. The sepulchres of the altars are also anointed with chrism, and the relics placed in them. The table of the altar is anointed in the same manner and incensed, and five crosses are made on it with the oil of catechumens, as well as with chrism. Chrism is used later on to anoint the twelve crosses which have been marked on the walls, and incense is burned on the five crosses which have been previously made on the altar with the blessed water, oil, and chrism. Finally, the bishop makes a cross with chrism on the front and four corners of the altar; the cloths, vessels, ornaments, &c., are consecrated or blessed; the altar is adorned; the candles lighted; and, with a final and specially solemn triple offering over it of incense, the dedication is complete.

The meaning and use of this consecration are clearly stated by St. Thomas (3ª, q. 83, a. 3). The rite, says the saint, signifies the holiness secured to the Church by Christ's passion, and required of its members. Moreover, in answer to the Church's prayers, God makes the church fit for His worship—*i.e.* He makes it a means of exciting special devotion in the faithful who enter it, if they do so with virtuous dispositions, and He drives far from it the power of the enemy. (From the Pontifical, with Catalani's commentary.)

II. The feast of the dedication ("festum dedicationis," "encaenia"; in St. Leo's sermon on the Machabees "natale ecclesiae") is kept in consecrated churches on the anniversary of the consecration, as a double of

[1] As was first observed by De Rossi, this curious ceremony is nothing more than the formal taking possession, according to Roman Civil Law, of an hereditament. The tracing of the letters (counting as numerals) is the part played by the surveyors and notaries assisting on the occasion (Cabrol, *Prière Antique*, ch. xxii.).

the first class with an octave. The bishop at the time of the consecration may for grave reasons fix a day other than the actual anniversary on which the feast of the dedication is to be kept, but after the consecration no change in the day can be made except by the Pope's leave. Here, too, the Christian has followed the use of the Jewish Church, which celebrated yearly the purging of the Temple and the rebuilding of the altar after Judas Machabaeus had driven out the Syrians in 164 B.C. (cf. Jn. x. 22). The observance of the anniversary of a church's dedication can be traced back at least to Constantine's time. As above mentioned the pilgrim Etheria describes vividly the dedication feast at Jerusalem in the fourth century. Besides the observance of this anniversary in the church itself, the feast of the dedication of the cathedral is kept throughout the diocese, also as a double of the first class with an octave.[1] Moreover, the dedication of certain Roman basilicas (S. Mariae ad Nives, Basilicae Salvatoris, Basilicae SS. Petri et Pauli) is celebrated throughout the whole Church, the feast being in each case a double of the second class or at least a greater double. (From Gavantus, P. II. sect. viii. cap. 5; Ferraris, *Ecclesia*, art. iv.; Schulte, "Consecranda.")

DEFECT. [See IRREGULARITY.]

DEFENDER OF THE FAITH (*Defensor fidei*). This title was conferred on our king Henry VIII. and his successors by Pope Leo X. in the year 1521. In that year Henry sent to the Pope his book in defence of the seven sacraments against Luther. The Pope received the book in full consistory, eulogized it in the strongest terms, and some days later consulted the Cardinals on the best means of showing how he felt Henry's services to the Church. After a long conference, it was resolved to bestow the title of Defender of the Faith on the English kings. Accordingly a bull (*Ex supernae*, Oct. 11, 1521) was sent conferring the title in question, and with it Leo despatched a brief thanking Henry for his book. The title was purely personal, and the Pontiff adds: "Quod si tali titulo ipsi quoque posteri tui insigniri optabunt, talia etiam opera efficere praeclaraque majestatis tuae vestigia sequi studeant." (See Pallavicini, "Hist. Concil. Trid." lib. ii. c. 1, quoted in the Continuation of Fleury.)

DEFENSOR ECCLESIAE (ἐκκλησιέκδικος). A functionary of whom frequent mention is made in the annals of the primitive Church; he was nominated by the emperor, on the presentation of the bishop, to protect the temporal interests of a particular church. In the East he was usually an ecclesiastic, in the West a layman. [See ADVOCATUS ECCLESIAE.]

DEFENSOR MATRIMONII. The law affecting official "defenders of the marriage" is laid down in the Constitution *Dei miseratione* of Benedict XIV. In all matrimonial suits a *defensor matrimonii* must take part, his function being to sustain the marriage of which it is sought to prove the nullity, by adducing every argument and consideration in its favour which the case admits of. His function may be compared to that of the King's Proctor in the English Divorce Court, who "intervenes" between the parties, if he deems that there is reason to suspect collusion, or that the party applying for the divorce is disqualified from obtaining it, the effect of such intervention being to stay the divorce and sustain the marriage. In the Roman Curia suits of nullity of marriage are within the purview of the Holy Office or the Congregation of the Sacraments, according to the nature of the impediment alleged; but the tribunal before which they are brought is the Rota (*q.v.*), one of whose officials is the Apostolic Defensor Matrimonii. In courts of the second instance—*e.g.* that of a metropolitan, or of a Papal nuncio—the judge is entitled, and also bound, to appoint a *defensor*; except where the hearing of a case has been deputed by the Holy See to a special commissary who has no ordinary jurisdiction, for under such circumstances the bishop of the diocese where the hearing is to take place nominates the *defensor*. The same Constitution directs that a *defensor* shall be appointed, if possible, from among the clergy of every diocese by the bishop, who shall attend all matrimonial suits. A *defensor* is to receive reasonable fees, payable either by the litigant supporting the validity of the marriage, or, if he is indigent, out of the fines of court or the episcopal treasury. He must be sworn to discharge his office faithfully; he must be cited at, and kept duly informed of, every stage of the case; and it is his duty always to appeal from the first sentence by which the nullity of any marriage is declared. (Ferraris, *Defensor*; Taunton.)

DEFINITION. [See POPE (4).]

DEFINITORS. Councillors of the general, or provincial, of a religious order. They are not mere advisers, but have a decisive vote equally with the general or provincial. In some orders they have the appointment of the local superiors. Again, in some orders, the name "Definitors" is given to the members of a Commission of their General Chapter deputed to distribute offices and other details better treated by a small committee than by a numerous assembly. (Permaneder in "Kirchenlex.")

DEGRADATION. Degradation is of two kinds, verbal and real. By the first a criminous clerk is declared to be perpetually deposed from clerical orders, or from the execution thereof, so as to be deprived of all order and function—*e.g.* the sacerdotal or episcopal—and of any benefice which he

[1] Religious are bound to the keeping of the festival, but celebrate it without the octave.

might have previously enjoyed. But the person degraded does not lose the *privilegium fori*—that is, he is not remitted for justice to the secular courts, but may still use the ecclesiastical. Nor does he lose the *privilegium canonis*, in virtue of which the assailant of a clerk incurs excommunication *ipso facto*. Neither this nor actual degradation causes a priest to lose the character of the priesthood, which is indelible. The consecration of the Eucharist by a degraded priest is therefore valid, as well as his absolution of a penitent given *in articulo mortis*. He is still bound to continence, and to the recitation of his office. The obligation as to the latter point would seem to be a doubtful matter in certain cases, according to decisions of the Congregation of the Council and Clement XI. in the case of clerks condemned to the galleys.

Real or actual degradation is that which, besides deposing a cleric from the exercise of his ministry, actually strips him of his orders, according to a prescribed ceremonial, and delivers him to the secular arm to be punished. The person thus degraded loses the *privilegium fori et canonis*.

The canon law specifies minutely the crimes on account of which the punishment of degradation may be legally inflicted, and leaves no jurisdiction with bishops of degrading except for the causes determined by the law and by the Roman Pontiffs.

For the ceremony of real degradation a form was laid down by Boniface VIII. The delinquent clerk was to be brought to some public place outside the church before the bishop (who is in cope and stole of red colour), habited in the dress of his order, and with a book or vessel, or some other instrument or ornament in his hands, as if he were proceeding to the performance of his clerical functions. The bishop was then publicly to take away from him the things, whether vestment, chalice, book, or anything else, that had been delivered to him at the time of his ordination, beginning with that vestment or ornament which he had received last, and ending with the vestment which he put on when he was first tonsured. Lastly, his head was to be shaved, so as to obliterate the mark of the tonsure. When the last of the clerical insignia was taken away, the bishop was to address him to the following effect: "By the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by our own, we take away from thee the clerical habit, and depose, degrade, and deprive thee of all order, benefice, and clerical privilege."

The above ceremony can only be performed by a bishop in person; but a verbal degradation can be carried out by the vicar-general, acting as the bishop's representative, or by the vicar-capitular, acting for the chapter, during a vacancy of the see.

The Church delivers to the lay power with extreme reluctance those who have once been her ordained ministers; and, in doing so, "is bound to intercede efficaciously for them, that moderate sentences, not involving the peril of death, may be passed upon them."[1] In ancient times the bishops endeavoured from this motive to shut up degraded clerks in monasteries rather than hand them over to the secular arm, as the former course seemed more likely to lead to their repentance and reformation.

Formerly the law required that a number of bishops, varying according to the rank of the delinquent, should concur to the degradation of a clerk; but since the Council of Trent[1] degradation of either kind may be carried out by a single bishop, assisted by as many abbots or other dignitaries as bishops would have been required under the old law.

The common opinion of the Fathers was that a degraded clerk could be reinstated, upon proof of sincere repentance and amendment of life. The judgment of Gregory the Great seems to have been that the degradation, once inflicted, ought to be irreversible. In modern times this question can seldom be raised, because a clerk is not now degraded excepting for a crime of great enormity, punished with the heaviest penalties by the civil power. A clerk degraded, if later his innocence is proved, has, according to the Roman Pontifical, the right to a solemn and public reinstatement at the hands of the bishop before the altar. (Ferraris, *Degradatio*.)

DEGREES (IN THEOLOGY, ETC.). The history of learned degrees—*i.e.* of the titles doctor or master, licentiate, bachelor—is closely connected with that of universities [*q.v.*]. We find the first traces of them in the legal school of Bologna. There the title of doctor or master was given first of all to any teacher, but about the middle of the twelfth century "doctor" was used as an honorary title, and was given specially to the four doctors, viz. Bulgarus, Martinus, Jacobus, and Hugo. As the university which had been founded about 1100, began to be duly constituted, the teachers formed themselves into a college, they acquired a certain jurisdiction over the students, and they subjected persons who wished to lecture to a previous examination. Those who were so examined and approved received the dignity of the doctorate. At first it was "legists" or professors of civil law, and these only, who obtained this title; but towards the close of the twelfth age canonists also were called doctors, as appears from a Decretal of Innocent III. addressed to the "doctores decretorum Bononiae," as well as the "doctores legum" at the same school. In the thirteenth century "doctors of medicine," of grammar, logic, philosophy, and the other arts were recognised. The jurists, however,

[1] Sess. xiii. c. 4, De Reform.

claimed the title of doctor as exclusively their own, and would only grant the title of "master" to the qualified teachers of theology and the arts. At Bologna a candidate for the doctorate had to swear before the Rector that he had gone through the regular course of studies—*i.e.* that he had studied civil law for eight, or the canon law for six, years. Next, the candidate was presented by a doctor to the archdeacon of Bologna, who had the right, grounded on a rescript issued by Honorius III. in 1219, of granting or refusing permission to graduate. This permission being given, the candidate was examined privately in civil or in canon law, or in each of them if he wished to graduate in each, by the doctors who were empowered to promote. The doctors voted after the examination, and if their votes were favourable the candidate became a *licentiate*. As a rule, this degree of licentiate was a mere step to the doctorate. Occasionally we find cases of persons remaining licentiates for years, but as a rule the licentiate passed on at once to the second and public examination for the doctorate. At this the licentiate made a speech on his promotion, gave a lecture on law, and held a public dispute with the scholars, all of which exercises took place in the cathedral. Thereupon the archdeacon or his delegate proclaimed him doctor, while the presiding doctor invested him with the book, with the doctor's ring and cap, and seated him in the doctor's chair. Both licentiate and doctor received a diploma; the earliest known is dated 1314.

The new doctor acquired very important rights. He had authority to teach in Bologna, and Papal decrees secured the recognition of this right throughout Christendom. He was called "doctor legens," or "non legens," according as he did or did not exercise the privilege, and it was when the doctors who did not lecture became common that the notion of the doctorate as an independent dignity became perfected. Next, the new doctor was qualified to be chosen member of the faculty for promoting others to the same degree. Lastly, the doctors had jurisdiction over their scholars, who, by concession of Frederick Barbarossa in 1158, might choose to stand their trial "coram domino vel magistro suo vel ipsius civitatis episcopo."

The degrees of doctor, &c., were of course conferred by other universities, such as Paris, Oxford, &c., when they came to be erected. Gradually also the degree of bachelor or baccalaureus became an independent degree. Originally, bachelor was the name given to a student who, having taken his oath that he had studied law for six years, was permitted by the Rector to teach an entire book of Roman or civil law. The origin of the degree of licentiate has been explained above. The word "magister," or master, designated first the master of a cathedral school, then the dignitary appointed to give free theological instruction in the cathedral churches. In universities "magister" was used at first vaguely as synonymous with teacher or professor; then it became a synonym of doctor in the technical sense, as the highest of the university degrees. If there was any distinction between magister and doctor it depended simply on local custom. Thus, in Italy, France, and Spain, and in the Dominican Order, those who had obtained the highest theological degree were usually called "magistri theologiae," the word "doctor" being reserved for graduates in the other faculties. In Germany, on the other hand, graduates in philosophy used to be called masters, those in the other faculties doctors.

By the law of the Church the dignity of doctor in theology and canon law cannot be given except by such theological faculties as have been confirmed by the Pope. The doctor on his promotion must make the profession of faith drawn up by Pius IV. According to the Council of Trent (xxiv. 12, De Ref.) it is desirable that all dignities and half the canonries in each chapter should be conferred on doctors or masters in theology or canon law, unless there are reasons to the contrary. Doctors in theology and canon law are also usually summoned to consult with the bishops in general and provincial councils. (See UNIVERSITY; Fleury, "Hist. Eccl." Cinquième discours; Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars," vol. ii.; Scheuffgen in "Kirchenlex." *Universitäten*, viii.)

DELEGATE, APOSTOLIC. [See APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.]

DELEGATION. A judge or administrator *delegates* his jurisdiction and power when he commits their exercise to another. A judge-delegate differs from a judge in ordinary in that the latter exercises his own jurisdiction, and decides cases in his own right, whereas the delegate relies on the right and jurisdiction of another. The delegate is bound to show his commission or credentials to the parties whose cause he is to try, to give them due notice of the time when they are to come before him, and to fix the place of hearing at a distance not exceeding twenty miles from the locality where the cause of action arose.

Not only supreme authorities, as Popes, emperors, and republics, but, by the canon and civil law, all ordinary judges can delegate their jurisdiction to another. The delegator is in such case responsible for all judgments given by his delegate, for "Qui facit per alium est perinde ac si faciat per se ipsum." But the delegating judge cannot divest himself of his whole jurisdiction without his sovereign's consent, and this for obvious reasons, especially because such delegation would be tantamount to an appointment, and so infringe

on the right of the superior authority. Moreover, a delegate may commit his jurisdiction to a sub-delegate, but only if he be commissioned by a prince or some sovereign authority, or if he be delegated not for one or other matter, but for all within the competency of the delegator—*ad universitatem causarum*. Hence the question has been raised whether the delegate of a Roman congregation can appoint a sub-delegate, and it has been answered in the affirmative.

All persons are capable of being appointed judge-delegates who are not hindered by nature, by law, or by custom. By *nature*, as the deaf, the dumb, or the insane, "quia tales carent judicio." By *law*, as those whom a judicial sentence has declared infamous. By *custom*, as slaves and women. Delegates of the Holy See, or of a Papal legate, ought to be dignitaries or canons of a cathedral church; but the delegate of a bishop may be any clerk whom he may see fit to appoint. The reason of the distinction is that the bishop, having complete personal knowledge of his clergy, may have a good reason for placing his confidence in an undistinguished clerk; but the Holy See, being without that personal knowledge, appoints delegates who may be presumed from their high position to be well qualified for the duty. Bishops and all ecclesiastical judges below the Pope cannot delegate their power in spiritual causes to a layman, or even to a layman jointly with an ecclesiastic. This rule applies also to criminal causes in which clerks are concerned; but not to purely civil causes, as about debts and money matters generally, for in regard to these a bishop can appoint a layman as his delegate. This, however, has been contested. The Supreme Pontiff can, out of his full and certain knowledge, delegate to a layman—*e.g.* to an emperor or king—the trial even of the criminal and spiritual causes of clerks. This right emanates from the plenary power of the Pope, in virtue of which he dispenses, when necessary, with the established law.

The Council of Trent[1] ordered that in every provincial or diocesan synod several persons should be elected who were qualified to act as Papal delegates, and that the bishops should notify such appointments to the Holy See. But as these notifications were seldom made, the decree fell into desuetude, and the Holy See was compelled to proceed as before in appointing delegates to try causes in distant countries, on the best information that could be obtained.

Since many powers are by Pontifical law delegated to bishops, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether, in a given case, a bishop is acting as ordinary or as delegate of the Holy See. If the former, the appeal from his sentence is to the metropolitan; if the latter, to the Pope. The canonists lay down many rules and testing circumstances, by means of which the necessary discrimination may be made.

Delegation may cease (1) by the death of the delegate, if the delegation was personal, not official;[1] (2) by the death of the delegator, at least if the cause was not yet commenced; (3) by his deposition from office, with the same proviso; (4) by revocation of powers; (5) by expiration of time; (6) by the discharge of the commission; and in several other ways. (Ferraris, *Delegare, Delegatus*; Taunton.)

DEMIURGE. [See GNOSTICISM, p. 383.]

DEMON. [See DEVIL.]

DEMONIACS, ENERGUMENI. [See POSSESSION.]

DENUNCIATION. An edict of the Roman Inquisition, dated in 1677 (but greatly modified by the bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, Oct. 4, 1869), orders all persons, in virtue of holy obedience and under the penalty of excommunication *latae sententiae*, to denounce to the Holy Office (or to the bishop of the place), within the term of one month, all persons whom they may know to be heretics, or suspected of heresy, and the abettors of such; also all persons whom they may know to be addicted to magic, witchcraft, and diabolic arts, or to keep without permission, or promote the circulation of, books teaching heresy or the black art, or to have broken their religious vows or canonical obligations by contracting marriage, or to have committed bigamy, or abused the sacrament of penance, or uttered heretical blasphemies, or treated holy images with disrespect and contempt, or frequented anti-religious conventicles, or perverted Christians to Judaism or any sect contrary to the Catholic faith, or been guilty of sacrilegious invasion, not being priests, of the priestly office.

It is inferred from this that anyone who teaches one of the condemned propositions [PROPOSITIONS, CONDEMNED] ought to be denounced to the Holy Office.

At the same time "Catholics are not bound to denounce heretics in those places in which heretics are mixed with Catholics, the inquisitors and bishops being aware of the fact, since no one is under an obligation to do what is useless."[2]

The probable risk of serious injury to person, property, and reputation does not release from the obligation of denouncing a formal heretic, though it does release from the obligation in the case of persons only suspected of heresy.[3]

The above legislation is the practical expression by the Church of her wish to enforce the law laid down by Christ Himself: "If thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between him and thee

[1] Sess. xxv. c. 10, De Ref.

[1] As when, for instance, Philip IV. and Edward I. committed the arbitration of their disputes to Boniface VIII., not as Pope, but as "Benedetto Gaetani."

[2] Ferraris, *Denunciatio*, § 18.

[3] *Ibid.* §§ 24, 25.

alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Mt. xviii. 15–17).

We take the following from the Catholic Encyclopaedia : "It is to be remarked that Denunciation is not supposed to take place until private admonitions have been tried fruitlessly. Denunciation in the strict sense of the law has practically gone into desuetude, and its place is taken by a simple statement to a superior who has the right of proceeding canonically against delinquents without subjecting the informer to the obligations incumbent on denouncers. Finally, as to the obligation of denouncing transgressors, every person is bound to do so when he can fulfil the duty without grave detriment to himself and with corresponding utility to society or individuals. In certain cases only is denunciation strictly prescribed, as in those relating to matrimonial impediments, to abuse of the confessional, and to the names of leaders of secret societies."

DEPOSING POWER. Few politico-religious questions have been more keenly argued than that which treats of the relations of control or otherwise between the Roman Pontiff and secular princes and governments. During the Middle Ages it was held everywhere in Christian countries with undoubting conviction that princes were amenable on the score of heresy to the ecclesiastical power, and that the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ could lawfully excommunicate, and after excommunication depose or procure the deposition of a sovereign who had fallen into heresy. This was no Ultramontane theory, but the common teaching of theologians everywhere. Thus we find Alexander Hales, an English Franciscan of the thirteenth century, saying "The spiritual power has to instruct the earthly power, and to judge whether it is good; it was itself first instituted by God, and when it goes astray it can be judged by God alone." And, "God has willed that some should have power over others, more in number; and then that a still smaller number should have power over the first; and so on by ascending degrees until one is reached, namely the Pope, who is immediately under God." The third canon of the Lateran Council (1215) ordains that if a secular ruler persists, after being warned, in letting heresy grow up undisturbed in his dominions, he is to be excommunicated by the bishops of the regions subject to him; if he contemn the excommunication, the Pope is to be informed, "so that he may declare the vassals of that ruler absolved from his fealty, and invite Catholics to occupy the country." No one, says Bellarmine, in those ages thought of making any objection to this canon; for "not yet in truth had the race of parasites to temporal princes appeared, who, that they may appear to establish their earthly kingdoms, take away the eternal kingdom from those whom they fawn upon."[1]

On the other hand, many theologians, while admitting the fact of the general belief in the Middle Ages that the power of the Pontiff was above that of all temporal sovereigns, and included, in extreme cases, the right of deposing them, account for this belief in various ways, but do not admit that it has any root in the *depositum fidei*. Some say that the influence of the feudal idea of suzerainty caused the Pope to be regarded as suzerain over all sovereigns within the limits of Christendom, but that, with the weakening or abolition of feudalism, this theory and all its consequences must be abandoned. Others ground the Papal claims in this respect on the received public law of those ages, that emperors and kings had to profess the true faith, and be in communion with the Pope, as essential conditions of their reigning lawfully; if these conditions were broken, of which the Pope was the judge, then, at the demand of the subjects, he could relieve them of their allegiance and declare their ruler unfit to reign. Here, again, a temporary basis only is allowed to the deposing power, as depending on a condition of opinion which in modern times has ceased to exist. Gerson, Duperron, and Fénelon go much further than this, but stop short of allowing any coercive jurisdiction to exist in the Pope, in right of his primacy, over sovereigns. "The Church," says Fénelon, "neither deprived nor appointed lay rulers, but only replied, when the nations consulted it, explaining what concerned the conscience in regard to the political contract or the oath [of allegiance]. This is not a juridical and civil, but only a directive and ordinative power." The power, he adds, consists only in this, "that the Pope as the chief of pastors —as the principal director and doctor of the Church in the greater causes of Christian moral discipline—is bound to instruct a people consulting him on what concerns their keeping the oath of fealty which they have sworn."[1]

The ordinary opinion of Roman theologians may be seen stated in full in the pages of Ferraris. "The common opinion teaches that the Pope holds the power of both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, which jurisdiction and power Christ Himself committed to Peter and his successors, saying (Mt. xvi. 19) 'I will give to thee the keys,' &c.; where doctors note that he did not say 'key' but 'keys,' thereby comprehending the temporal along with the spiritual power." The contrary opinion is held to savour of the heretical

[1] Soglia, *De Romano Pontifice*, § 33.

belief condemned by Boniface VIII. in the Constitution "Unam Sanctam" [q.v.]. "Accordingly, unbelieving kings and princes can be deprived by the sentence of the Pope, in certain cases, of the dominion which they have over believers; for instance, if they have forcibly seized upon Christian countries, or are endeavouring to turn their believing subjects from the faith, and the like." Barbosa and other canonists hold that "a king who has become a heretic can be removed from his kingdom by the Pope, to whom the right of electing a successor passes, if his sons and kindred are also heretics."[1] "There is nothing strange in attributing to the Roman Pontiff, as the vicar of Him whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, the world and all that dwell therein, the fullest authority and power to lay bare, a just cause moving him, not only the spiritual but also the material sword, and so to transfer sovereignties, break sceptres, and remove crowns." The canonists produce numerous instances where this has been actually done, as when Gregory II. deposed the Byzantine emperor Leo III.; Gregory VII. deposed the emperor Henry IV.; Innocent IV., in the Council of Lyons, deposed the emperor Frederick II., &c.

Bellarmine, in a sentence of great clearness and force, has clothed the doctrine of the deposing power in a philosophical form. After quoting the famous lines of the sixth Aeneid, "Excudent alii," &c., he says that, as the art of the sculptor is not included in, nor derived from, the art of government, and yet is subject to it, "so the ecclesiastical art of governing souls, which is the art of arts, and resides principally in the Pope, does not necessarily include the art of [secular] government, nor is it necessary that all governments should be derived from the Church; and yet, because its end is eternal life, to which all other ends are subordinated, the political art of ruling peoples is subject and subordinate to this art, and the Supreme Pontiff can and ought to command kings that they do not abuse their royal power, to the subversion of the Church, to the fostering of heresies and schisms—in short, to the eternal ruin of themselves and the peoples subject to them; and if they do not obey after having been admonished he can cast them out of the Church by the censure of excommunication, and absolve the peoples from their oath of fealty; finally, he can strip them of their realms and deprive them of the royal power."[1]

The state of Europe is so much altered since the time of Bellarmine that there is no longer any question, even at Rome, of exercising the deposing power. When, through the growth of heresy and unbelief, and the spread of opinions favourable to the absolute independence and unlimited authority of kings or States, the popular assent to the use of the deposing power had vanished, the power itself fell into abeyance; for without such assent it could not be effectively exercised. Accordingly Pius IX., in a sermon quoted by Cardinal Soglia, said "No one now thinks any more of the right of deposing princes, which the Holy See formerly exercised; and the Supreme Pontiff even less than anyone." (Ferraris, *Papa.*)

[1] Bellarm. *De Potestate Summi Pontificis*, cap. 5.

DEPOSIT OF FAITH (DEPOSITUM FIDEI). The word *depositum* (παραθήκη) is used by St. Paul: "Keep that which is committed to thy trust (τὴν παραθήκην), avoiding the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20); "Keep the good thing committed to thy trust (τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην) by the Holy Ghost" (2 Tim. i. 14). In both passages it is used in the sense of the sum of revealed truths committed by Christ to His Church. It is so explained by Tertullian ("De Praescr." c. xxv., PL, ii. 37) and Vincent of Lerins (Common. ii. c. xxii., PL, l. 667). And the Vatican Council defined that "the doctrine of the faith which God has revealed has been committed to Christ's Spouse as a divine deposit, to be faithfully guarded and infallibly expounded" (sess. iii. c. iv.).

1. The contents of the deposit are those truths which belong to the public revelation intended to be of obligation for all the faithful. Hence private revelations to individuals are no part of it. Further, there are truths indirectly contained in the deposit on account of their close connection with it, and over these the Church has the right to pronounce. [See DOGMATIC FACT.]

2. The Council of Trent (sess. iv.) defined that "the truth of Christ (the deposit) is contained in written books and in unwritten traditions." [See TRADITION.]

3. No addition or alteration can be made in the deposit, nor can its contents be interpreted in a sense other than that once declared by the Church. (Vat. Council, sess. iv.) This immutability does not, however, exclude the unfolding or development of the contents of the deposit. The successive additions to the creeds are not additions to the deposit itself, but rather a fuller realization of its contents. As B. Albert Magnus says: "It is rather the advance of the faithful in the faith than of the faith in the faithful" (*potius profectus fidelis in fide quam fidei in fideli*) ("Sent." 3, dist. 25, a. 1). [See DEVELOPMENT.] Hence in all controversies the one point for discussion was whether the disputed doctrine was or was not contained in the deposit. (See Franzelin "De Divina Traditione," thes. xxii.; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. p. 50 *sqq.*).

DEPOSITION in the strict sense (*depositio perpetua*) deprives a clerk of all right to exercise his orders, of his benefice, and jurisdiction. It is distinct, on the one hand, from mere privation, because deposition is

perpetual, and, on the other hand, from degradation, because deposition is inflicted by the mere sentence of competent authority without any such ceremonies as accompany degradation, and because a deposed, unlike a degraded, person still belongs to the clerical state, and enjoys the privileges of the canon and forum. The distinction between degradation and deposition dates from the twelfth century. Deposition, being an act of jurisdiction, can be inflicted by the bishop of the diocese, by the vicar-general acting in the bishop's name, and by the prelates of religious orders. Deposition is the punishment assigned in the canons for certain grave crimes, such as murder, perjury, robbery, adultery, &c. (Ferraris.)

DEPOSITION, BULL OF. Often as the celebrated bull of Pius V. is referred to, its exact terms are but little known; we therefore subjoin an abstract of its contents. The bull begins "Regnans in excelsis." After the opening passage, it proceeds: "But the party of the impious has become so powerful that there is now no place in the world left which they have not endeavoured to corrupt with their abominable doctrines, being supported by, amongst others, that flagitious woman, the pretended queen of England, Elizabeth; to whom, as to a safe asylum, all the most dangerous and mischievous characters have fled for shelter. This same queen, having seized the royal power, monstrously arrogating to herself the place of supreme head of the Church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction over it, has plunged again into a gulf of misery and ruin a kingdom which long ago was converted to the Catholic faith and to sound and moral living (*bonam frugem*)." After describing the forcible suppression of the true religion, Pius proceeds: "She has ordered that books containing manifest heresy shall be used throughout the kingdom, and that the impious rites and institutes modelled after the teaching of Calvin, which she herself has adopted and observes, shall be also conformed to by her subjects." Driving out the true bishops, the members of religious orders, &c., and forbidding all obedience to the Pope and any reference to Rome, "she has compelled the greater number [of her subjects] to submit to her nefarious laws, to abjure the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and the obedience due to him, and to recognize upon oath herself as their sole superior alike in things temporal and things spiritual; . . . she has cast into prison Catholic bishops and parish priests, where many, wasted away by long sickness and sorrow, have expired in utter misery." These things, he says, are "palpable and notorious in the sight of all nations." He has been informed that her "mind is so stubbornly fixed and hardened," that she not only despises the remonstrances of Catholic princes, "but will not even permit the nuncios of this See to cross into England to speak to her on this subject." The Pope therefore declares that "the aforesaid Elizabeth, as a heretic and a supporter of heretics, and those who adhere to her in the aforesaid proceedings, have incurred the sentence of anathema, and are cut off from the unity of the body of Christ; moreover, that she is deprived of her pretended right over the aforesaid kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatever." He releases her subjects from any oath of fealty they have taken to her, and from all obedience and submission to her whatsoever. Those who obey her and her laws are bound and implicated in "the like sentence of anathema." The date—April 27, 1570.

On this bull it may be remarked that the attempts of the Holy See to depose Elizabeth stand by themselves. After her death nothing similar occurs; and yet the condition of Catholics in England grew worse from reign to reign, and it is notorious that the doctrine on which the bull rests continued to be held at Rome. This seems to show that when no hope could any more be reasonably entertained that the decision of the Holy See would have weight with the English people, all thought of exerting the deposing power was laid aside. But in 1570 things had not gone so far; the bull speaks of Elizabeth as a tyrant as well as a heretic; the theory of it was, that the bulk of the nation, and the best part of it, were still attached to Catholicism, but were being dragooned by the Government into heresy against their will. Hence the Pope might believe that by throwing the whole weight of Church censures on the side of the oppressed he would encourage them to rise and restrain Elizabeth's tyrannical abuse of the royal power. And so perhaps it might have been but for several special circumstances: for instance, the dread entertained by Englishmen generally of civil war, after the long and terrible experience of the fifteenth century, the exceptional sagacity and energy of Elizabeth's ministers, the dislike and dread felt towards Spain, &c. ("Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae," vol. iv. 1737; Dodd, "Church Hist. of England," ed. Tierney, iii. 10 *sqq.*; Lingard, "Hist. of England," vi. ch. iii.)

DEPOSITION, DAY OF. The day, or the anniversary of the day, of the death of a saint, is called his "deposition," because the saint was laid in the earth or laid down his life on that day. In liturgical formulas the day of a Christian's burial is described as the "Day of his Deposition." (Ducange.)

DE PROFUNDIS. The opening words of Ps. cxxix. in the Vulgate. It is the sixth of the Penitential psalms, and it is used by the Church in her prayers and office for the dead.

DEROGATION. A partial revocation of a law. Total revocation is called *abrogation*. Both should be carefully distinguished from *dispensation* which affects the persons under the law and not the law itself. (See CANON LAW; DISPENSATION; Suarez, "De Legibus," vi. 26.)

DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL. [See LIMBO.]

DESECRATION OF CHURCHES, ALTARS, CHALICES, ETC. By consecration, churches and altars are solemnly set apart to God's service; by desecration they lose this sacred character, become unfit for the sacred uses which they were meant to serve, and need to be consecrated anew.

A church is desecrated if the greater part of it is demolished—*e.g.* if the outer walls are destroyed, or if the greater part of them is demolished at one and the same time. A church does not lose its consecration if the roof falls in, because it is the walls, not the roof, which were specially consecrated [see DEDICATION OF CHURCHES]: or, again, if parts of the church are replaced by a new structure at intervals, even if in the end the whole building is new.

An altar is desecrated (*execratur*) (1) if the consecrated table is removed from the lower structure (this only applies to a fixed altar); (2) if it is broken to such an extent that not enough of it is left entire to support the chalice and paten; (3) if the seal of the sepulchre is broken, or if the sepulchre with the relics is removed.

A chalice loses its consecration if so injured that it can no longer contain the consecrated wine; also, according to St. Alphonsus and many other theologians, if it is regilt.[1]

The English word desecration may also be taken as equivalent to the Latin word *pollutio*. A church or cemetery is desecrated in this sense (*polluitur*) (1) by culpable homicide; (2) by shedding of blood, provided the act be grievously sinful; (3) by certain acts of an immoral or indecent character; (4) by the burial of an unbaptized person or of a person excommunicated by name. If any of the cases cited above have occurred, and the fact is notorious, then the church or cemetery cannot be used till it has been purified or reconciled by the bishop according to a solemn form prescribed in the Pontifical. (Wernz, "Jus Decretalium," tit. xvii.)

DESPAIR. [See HOPE.]

DETERMINISM. [See FREE WILL.]

DETRACTION. Taking away another's good name by making known without just cause some fault or crime of which he is really guilty, or is believed to be guilty. A man has a right to his good name unless he has forfeited it by some notorious conduct. Thus, no sin is committed by those who speak of the crimes of one who has been openly convicted of these crimes. Calumny [*q.v.*] is a graver sin than detraction, for it is opposed not only to justice but also to truth. As both are sins against justice they involve the obligation of restitution as far as possible for the unjust damage which they cause. (St. Thomas, $2^a\,2^{ae}$, q. 73, 74; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. 458.)

DEUS, IN ADJUTORIUM MEUM INTENDE ("O God, come to my assistance"). The opening words of Ps. lxix., which are used at the beginning of each hour except compline, where they occur later. In matins they are preceded by the versicles "Lord, thou wilt open my lips," &c. We learn from Cassian (Coll. x. 10) that the words "Deus, in adjutorium," &c., were a common ejaculatory prayer with the ancient monks, but it is uncertain whether they were used, as at present, in the divine office before St. Benedict's time.

DEUTERO-CANONICAL BOOKS. [See CANON OF SCRIPTURE.]

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE. As stated in the art. DEPOSIT OF FAITH, the stock of divine revelation was completed with the Apostles, and no further addition can be made to it. Nevertheless, it is clear that there has not always been the same explicit knowledge of all points of doctrine. The creeds of the Apostles, of Constantinople, and of Pius IV. represent successive stages in explicitness of belief. In what terms is this progress to be stated?

1. The progress is not merely nominal; *i.e.* from vague and obscure terminology to what is precise and clear.

2. Some theologians have explained it as the unrolling of a scroll, or the gradual realization of the contents of a casket.

3. The more common view is that the later defined doctrines are contained in the earlier ones just as a conclusion is contained in the premisses. This is to admit a logical development in the Church's teaching. Such would seem to be the view of St. Augustine in the controversy concerning the re-baptism of heretics. He shows how though there was no explicit definition of the validity of heretic baptism, yet the practice of not re-baptizing heretics implied the validity of their baptism. ("De Bapt." ii. 12–124, PL, ix. 133; Franzelin, "De Trad." thes. xxiii.)

4. Some have gone further and have admitted what they call "organic" development. These maintain that there has been a real growth analogous to that which takes place in the world of plants and animals. They do not admit any alteration or corruption, no mere addition or accretion. "Let the soul's religion imitate the law of the body, which as years go on develops indeed and opens out its due proportions, and yet remains identically what it was. . . . Small are the baby's limbs, a youth's are larger, yet they are the same. . . . So also the doctrine

[1] This opinion is now certain from a decree of SS. Cong. Rit., June 14, 1845.

of the Christian religion must follow those laws of advancement; namely, that with the years it be consolidated, with time it be expanded, with age it be exalted, yet remain uncorrupt and untouched, and be full and perfect in all the proportions of each of its parts; that it admit no change besides, sustain no loss of its propriety, no variation of its definition. Wherefore, whatsoever in this Church, God's husbandry, has by the faith of our fathers been sown, that same must be cultivated by the industry of their children, that same flourish and ripen, that same advance and be perfected" (St. Vincent of Lerins, "Common." nn. 28, 29). "This analogy (of organic growth) may be taken to illustrate certain peculiarities in the growth or development of ideas. . . . It is otherwise with mathematical and other abstract creations, which, like the soul itself, are solitary and self-dependent; but doctrines and views which relate to man are not placed in a void, but in the crowded world, and make way for themselves by interpenetration and develop by absorption. Facts and opinions which have hitherto been regarded in other relations and grouped round other centres, henceforth are gradually attracted to a new influence and subjected to a new sovereign. They are modified, laid down afresh, thrust aside, as the case may be. A new element of order and composition has come among them; and its life is proved by this capacity of expansion, without disarrangement or dissolution. An eclectic, conservative, assimilating, healing, moulding process, a unitive power, is of the essence of a faithful development" (Newman, "Development," p. 185; cf. 300, 355; Labriolle, "Vincent de Lérins," pp. lxxxix., xc.). The Vatican Council placed a limit on speculation in this direction. "The doctrine which God has revealed has not been proposed as some philosophical discovery to be perfected by the wit of man, but has been entrusted to Christ's Spouse as a divine deposit to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. Hence sacred dogmas must ever be understood in the sense once for all declared by holy Mother Church and never must that sense be abandoned under pretext of profounder knowledge" (sess. iii., ch. 4). The following proposition (liv.) was condemned in the decree *Lamentabili sane*. "Dogmas, sacraments, hierarchy, both as regards the notion of them and the reality, are but interpretations and evolutions of the Christian intelligence which by external increments have increased and perfected the little germ latent in the Gospel." (See besides the works already quoted, the art. TRADITION, DOGMA; Vacant, "Constitutions du Concile du Vatican," ii. p. 281 *sqq.*; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 105; Scannell, "Priest's Studies,"[2] p. 67 *sqq.*)

DEVIL AND EVIL SPIRITS. Their personal existence is clearly taught both in the Old Testament and in the New. In the Hebrew Bible an "evil spirit" is said to have come on Saul (1 Sam. xvi. 14), and the sacrifices offered to idols are represented as really made to "demons."[1] In Job i. 6, 12, ii. 7, and two books written after the exile, viz. in Zach. iii. 1, 1 Paralip. xxi. 1, mention is made of "the adversary" or accusing spirit *par excellence* (הַשָּׂטָן, always with the article, except in the passage quoted from Paralip.[2]) This Satan slandered Job to God, incited David to number the people, and opposed Josue the high priest. Moreover, we know from the Book of Wisdom, and from the Apocalypse in the New Testament, that it was he who took the form of a serpent and seduced our first parents, so that he is rightly called "devil" (διάβολος), or "slanderer," because he not only slanders men before God, but also brings false accusations against God Himself. But the Hebrew Scriptures are far indeed from acknowledging a principle of evil able to offer any effectual opposition to God. The first chapters of Job represent Satan as impotent for evil except by God's permission, and the same dependence of the devil on God is clearly implied in Zacharias, and in other places where the agency of false and lying spirits is described.

We gain much fuller information from the New Testament. There we are told that the devil is a spirit (Ephes. ii. 2); that he is a prince with evil angels subject to him (Mt. xii. 24–26, xxv. 41); that the demons were not originally evil, but fell through sin (2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6); and it is at least a plausible inference from St. Paul's words, 1 Tim. iii. 6, "not a neophyte, lest, being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil," that Satan fell by pride. All spiritual evil and error (2 Cor. xi. 14, 15), all which hinders the Gospel (1 Thess. ii. 18, Apoc. ii. 10), is traced ultimately to him. Moreover, although Christ's death was intended to destroy the works of the devil, and has in fact done so to a great extent, still Satan has a terrible power over the world and its votaries, so much so that he is called the ruler and even the "god" of this world (Jn. xii. 31, 2 Cor. iv. 4); and hence St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 5) regards exclusion from the Church as tanta-

[1] These demons are called שֵׁדִים or "lords" (Vulg. *daemonia*) in Deut. xxxii. 17, Ps. cvi. (Vulg. cv.) 37. שְׂעִירִים or "hairy beings," like satyrs in Levit. xvii. 7 (Vulg. again "demons"). These "satyrs" are said to "dance" and to cry out to each other in waste places, Is. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 14 (the Vulg. in both places "pilosi," "pilosus"). The student interested in such matters may be referred to Baudissin's masterly treatise in the first volume of his *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, where the apparent identification of idolatry with demon-worship is fully discussed. Levit. xvii. 7, Deut. xxxii. 17, Ps. cvi. 37 (see also 2 Chron. xxviii. 23), are the strongest passages, though they are not perhaps conclusive. But this view is clearly expressed in 1 Cor. x. 20.

[2] Some would add Ps. cix. 6. See Wright on Zechariah, p. 543.

mount to a deliverance of the excommunicated person into the power of Satan. At last this power will be destroyed. Satan and his angels will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where their torments will be everlasting.

Such is the teaching which lies on the surface of Scripture, and little can be added to it from tradition or by theological induction. The history of the doctrine on the devil and his angels is stated by Petavius in the third book of his treatise on the angels, from which the following account is taken. Even after it was universally held that the angels were pure spirits, some still clung to the belief that the devils after their fall changed their nature and became "partly material." This opinion was defended by the Greeks at Florence, but is certainly false. The devil was the chief of these fallen spirits, and it is held by the greater number of authors that he was originally the chief of all the angels. The terrible description of the fall of the king of Tyre in Ezechiel xxviii. has been interpreted of the devil's fall, so much so, indeed, that the name Lucifer commonly given to the devil is derived from this passage. But the reference to the devil, as Petavius rightly argues, is not contained in the literal meaning of the prophet's words. Although condemned to the pains of hell immediately after their fall, still from time to time the devil and his angels wander in the air and over the earth. The common opinion among theologians is that wherever they go the demons are tortured by the fires of hell,[1] though they are by no means agreed as to the way in which the fires of hell exercise this power over them. On the other hand, it was commonly held by ancient writers that the demons will not be tortured by the fire of hell till the day of judgment, and Petavius says one who maintains "that the devil and his angels are not yet tortured by that extreme and utmost torture, that they do not yet feel the efficacy of that fire in which the chief part of their damnation, so far as feeling and suffering go, consists, is not to be accused of error, much less of heresy." On this theory the rebel angels will begin to experience the eternal torments of hell fire at the day of judgment. But in any case it is certain from the words of Christ, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," from the general teaching of the Fathers, and from the definition of the Fourth Lateran Council,[2] that the devil and his angels are condemned without hope of pardon. (See Mangenot-Ortolan, in DThC, *Démon*; St. Thom. 1ª, qq. 63, 64; and the various treatises *De Deo Creante.*)

[1] "Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell." (*Par. Lost*, iv. 75.)

[2] Caput i. *Adv. Albigenses*, where, however, only everlasting pains of the devil (not of demons) are expressly mentioned.

DEVIL'S ADVOCATE. The official of the S. Congregation of Rites, charged with the duty of moving objections and of opposing to the utmost the beatification and canonization of a Saint, is popularly so called. His proper style is "Promotor Fidei." [See CANONIZATION.]

DEVOLUTION. The *jus devolutionis* is that right by which, according to the canon law, when a patron has improperly exercised, or neglected to exercise, his canonical right of presenting to a benefice, he loses it for that time, and the right passes to the ecclesiastical dignitary of next higher rank. This is the bishop, when any patron under his jurisdiction, whether an individual or a corporation, is chargeable with the neglect; the archbishop, when the neglect is in one of his suffragans; the Pope, when the election of an archbishop, bishop, or abbot has been made uncanonically, or not made in time. The principle of devolution dates at least from the Council of Chalcedon (451); but was not formally promulgated before the twelfth century. By the Concordat of Vienna in 1448, the right of devolution for all benefices in Germany was attributed to the Pope both in these cases and in the event of the election being rejected for other defects.

DEVOTION, FEASTS OF. Feasts which were once holidays of obligation but are so no longer, the precept of hearing Mass and resting from servile works having been annulled by the Holy See, and the special observance of the feasts in question having been left to the devotion of the faithful.

DIACONICUM (*διακονικόν*). 1. A building attached to ancient basilicas, much the same as *secretarium* or sacristy. It was divided (1) into the reception-room (*salutatorium* or *receptorium*, *οἶκος ἀσπαστικός*) in which the bishop was received by the clergy and also gave audiences. It was in such a reception-room that Theodosius begged absolution from St. Ambrose. (2) The sacristy proper (*mutatorium*, *vestiarium*), where the deacons kept the sacred vessels to be used at Mass, &c., and the priests put their vestments on and off, before and after officiating. (3) A chamber (*γαζοφυλάκιον*) in which books, church-plate, vestments, &c., not required for immediate use, were kept. Councils were often held in a *diaconicum*; so were ecclesiastical courts. (Kraus, "Real-Encykl.")

2. In the Greek Church the "deacon's book" (*διακονικόν*) containing his part in the services. This is much more elaborate than in the Western rites. (See Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 117.)

DIATESSARON. "Tatian having formed a certain body and collection of gospels (*συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων*) . . . has given this the title Diatessaron, that is, the gospel by the four, or the gospel formed of the four (*τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων*),"

Euseb. "H.E." iv. 29. The original, now lost, was a gospel freely constructed out of the four Gospels. Harnack is of opinion that it was written in Greek; but Zahn and most other scholars contend that it was in Syriac. The date cannot be exactly fixed, but was probably about 172 (Zahn). From St. Ephraim's commentary and other sources, Zahn has attempted a reconstruction of the original text ("Tatian's Diatessaron," 1881). An Arabic version was published at Rome by Padre Ciasca in 1888, and a translation of this version by Hoog, "Ante-Nicene Lib., Suppl.," 1897. "We learn from the Diatessaron that about A.D. 160 our four Gospels had already taken a place of prominence in the Church, and that no others had done so; that in particular the Fourth Gospel had taken a fixed place alongside of the three synoptics" (Harnack, "Encycl. Brit." 1888, "Tatian"). In the fragments still extant there is hardly any trace of heresy. Nevertheless, Theodoret, about 453, says that he expelled it from his diocese on the ground that it omitted the human generation of Our Lord ("Hebr. Fab." i. 20). (Bludau in "Kirchenlex." *Tatian*; Duval, "La Littérature Syriaque," 1899; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," p. 34.)

DIDACHE. [See APOSTLES, TEACHING OF.]

DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM. The original Greek text is lost, but the Syriac version gives the full title "The Catholic Doctrine of the twelve Apostles and the holy Disciples of our Lord." It purports to have been written by the Apostles at the time of the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), but it probably belongs to the second half of the third century. It was afterwards incorporated in the Apostolic Constitutions [*q.v.*] from which attempts have been made to reconstitute the original text. (Funk, "Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolicae.") There is an incomplete ancient Latin version (4th cent ?), and a complete Syriac version (M. D Gibson, "The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac," London, 1903). The author is unknown, but he would seem to have been a Catholic bishop, probably a Jewish convert and formerly a doctor. The chief source is the Bible. For the Old Testament he uses the Septuagint. St. Matthew is the most commonly quoted of the Evangelists, St. John hardly at all. The Epistles are used, but not quoted textually. The Didascalia is not concerned with doctrine but with the public life of the Church in the third century, and hence is of great value to the historian. The bishop is the one great personage—all others are his servants or subjects. The subordinate hierarchy consists of presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, widows, and perhaps also subdeacons and lectors. Baptism, the Eucharist and Penance are often spoken of. Baptism is by immersion and is accompanied with anointings, though no distinct mention is made of Confirmation. The Eucharist is sanctified by the Holy Ghost [see EPICLESIS]; it is the image of the royal body of Christ; it is a sacrifice, and it should be offered for the dead. Various details are mentioned in connection with the liturgy. It is the bishop who reconciles sinners, by laying hands upon them after they have performed the penance enjoined them. The tendency is distinctly anti-Novatian; but Harnack looks upon this as an interpolation. St. Epiphanius is the first writer to mention the Didascalia ("Adv. Haer." xlv. 4; lxx. *sqq.*; PG, xli. 830; xlii. 356). (See, besides the works already referred to, M. D. Gibson, "The Didascalia Apostolorum in English"; Bardenhewer-Godet, i. p. 306; Nau in DThC; Chapman in "Cath. Enc." Funk's edition, Paderborn, 1905, is the best.)

DIES IRAE. [See HYMNS.]

DIMISSORIALS (*literae dimissoriae, seu reverendae*). In its most general sense, leave to be ordained, with testimony to fitness either expressed or implied. This licence may be given—

1. By the Roman Pontiff, who can grant letters dimissory to ordinands from any part of the world, authorizing their ordination by any Catholic bishop. The Pope can also confer orders on anyone whom he judges fit to receive them, without waiting for letters dimissory from any bishop.

2. By any bishop to his own subjects (*suis subditis*). There are four ways by which a clerk may be the *subditus* of a bishop, technically called *origo, domicilium, beneficium, triennalis commensatio*. That is—either his native place, or his present domicile, or the benefice which he enjoys, is within the bishop's diocese; or else he has lived in the bishop's family, and been supported by him, for at least three years.

3. By abbots, or other superiors of orders, authorizing and recommending their own subjects for ordination. Abbots may not give dimissorials to seculars.[1] The rule is, that the dimissorials of an abbot should be directed to the bishop of the diocese in which the monastery is situated; if, however, he be absent, or not about to hold an ordination, they may be addressed to any other bishop. A decree on this subject was published by Clement VIII. in 1595. By a Constitution of Gregory XIII., confirmed by Paul V., the rectors of Jesuit houses can grant dimissorials to clerks of their society addressed to any Catholic bishop whatsoever. Franciscans of the Observance enjoy the same privilege in the West Indies and the parts adjoining, by a grant of Urban VIII.

4. By a vicar-general, but only in the absence of the bishop, or, if he be not absent, by his express permission.

5. By vicars-capitular, *sede vacante*, but

[1] Concil. Trid. sess. xxiii. De Ref. c. 10.

only after the expiration of a year from the date of the vacancy in ordinary cases. If, however, the case of the applicant be one of urgency, on account of his having received, or being about to receive, a benefice, the vicar-capitular may grant him dimissorials within the year. (Ferraris, *Ordo, Ordinare*, art. iii. § 36; Taunton.)

DIOCESE (*διοίκησις*, administration). The name by which the tract of country with its population falling under the pastorate of a Christian bishop is now universally designated belonged originally to the civil hierarchy. The bishops, taking up from the Apostles the work of teaching and converting the world, exercised their jurisdiction for the most part over the Christians of a single city and a small district surrounding it. This was their *παροικία*, the abode of the Christian *πάροικοι* (1 Pet. ii. 11), who, few in number amidst the masses of the heathen, lived in the world as passing strangers and sojourners rather than as citizens. The word *διοίκησις* occurs several times in Cicero's letters to designate an Eastern province or district; but the widespread official use of the name seems to have been due to the organization of the empire begun by Diocletian and continued by Constantine. "The whole empire was divided into twelve *dioceses*, the smallest of which—Britain—consisted of four provinces, the largest—Oriens—of sixteen." [1] Each diocese was governed by a Vicarius, with the rank of *spectabilis*. The word gradually acquired an ecclesiastical use, but its meaning varied. In Africa, by the end of the fourth century, it seems to have meant nearly what we mean by it now, for the fifth canon of the Second Council of Carthage (390) provides for the appointment of new bishops, the consent of the bishop of the original "diocese" being first obtained. But in the East, as shown by the canons of Chalcedon, it for a long time signified a patriarchate or tract of country containing several *ἐπαρχίαι*, provinces. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, writing to Pope Nicholas, uses the term as equivalent to the modern province, the jurisdiction of a metropolitan having suffragan sees under him. In England it was not till the thirteenth century that the word came into common use. Bede speaks of an "episcopatus," or a "provincia," or an "ecclesia," but never of a "dioecesis"; nor can the term be found in the much later chronicles of Symeon of Durham and Henry of Huntingdon; it begins to occur, but not frequently, in the works of Matthew Paris, and then in the precise sense which we now attach to it. Ducange considers that this was an abuse of the term, and that the proper name for a bishop's diocese was Parochia. A much more strange abuse crept in in France in the Carolingian era, when, as we see from the canons of some French councils, and the capitularies of Charlemagne, "dioecesis" was used in the sense of "parish." After the thirteenth century the present signification of the word became firmly established.

The "Mappa Mundi" of Gervase of Canterbury gives the titles of about three hundred and fifty Catholic dioceses as existing near the end of the twelfth century; but the list is imperfect by his own confession. In England and Wales he enumerates two provinces and twenty dioceses; in Scotland, eleven dioceses; in Ireland, four provinces and thirty-three dioceses. The sees of Gloucester, Oxford, and Peterborough were erected by Henry VIII. with the authority of Parliament, but the arrangement was not confirmed by the Holy See. The sees of the ancient English and Scottish hierarchy having become Anglican or ceased to exist, after an interval of 300 years, during which England and Scotland were under Vicars Apostolic (see ENGLISH CHURCH) the hierarchy was restored in England by Pius IX. in 1850, and in Scotland by Leo XIII. in 1878. Ireland, having in spite of persecution adhered to Catholic unity, retains of course her ancient diocesan organization unimpaired, although the temporalities of the sees are lost, and some of them have been consolidated with others.

The total number of Catholic dioceses in 1914 was 1073, including 14 Patriarchal sees.

Diocesan statutes, passed by a bishop in synod, are a part of the *jus canonicum speciale*, which is defined as "that law which has been enacted only for a particular place, province, diocese, or community, and is not binding outside the limits of the same." [1]

DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE. The great theological importance of the works attributed to Dionysius makes it necessary to say something of them here, though literary and biographical articles do not enter into the plan of this Dictionary. We know from Acts xvii. 34 that Dionysius was converted by St. Paul during his visit to Athens. He is called "the Areopagite"—*i.e.* he was an assessor in the court which bore that name. The New Testament tells us nothing more about him, for there is no reason given to suppose that Damaris, a woman converted at the same time, was his wife. But another Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, and among the earliest of Christian writers, informs us that the Areopagite became bishop of Athens, and this no doubt may be safely accepted as fact.[2] Later writers say that he was martyred.[3]

It was long the general belief in the West that St. Dionysius the Areopagite became afterwards bishop of Paris and shed his blood there. But this belief cannot be reconciled

[1] *Roman Provincial Administration*, W. T. Arnold, 1879.

[1] Ferraris, *Jus*, § 22.

[2] *Apud* Euseb. iii. 4, iv. 23.

[3] Niceph. iii. 11, quoted by Meyer on the Acts.

with ancient evidence. There is no trace of it during the early centuries, and we have positive proof that St. Dionysius of Paris was a different person from the Areopagite. St. Gregory of Tours speaks of the former as coming to France after 250. The Martyrology of Usuard distinguishes the feast of St. Dionysius on October 3 from that of his namesake, Dionysius of Paris, on October 9. We need not give further reasons, easy as it would be to do so, against an identification once defended with great tenacity and great learning, but long since rejected by all competent critics.

The following works are attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite:—(1) a treatise "On the Heavenly Hierarchy"; (2) a treatise "On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy"; (3) another "On Divine Names"; (4) another "On Mystical Theology"; (5) ten letters addressed to John the Apostle, Titus, Polycarp, &c., &c.

The first historical notice of these works occurs in the contemporary account[1] of a conference held in 533 at Constantinople, between the Catholics on the one hand and the Severian Monophysites on the other, by the command of the Emperor Justinian. The heretics produced writings of the Areopagite in support of their errors. The orthodox replied that these writings could not be genuine, otherwise they would have been known to and used by the ancients, especially by Cyril, Athanasius, and the Nicene Fathers. However, these writings soon obtained general recognition in the East, and Gregory the Great had at least heard of them about the year 590. In 827 a copy of the supposed writings of Dionysius was sent by Michael the Stammerer to Louis le Débonnaire, son of Charlemagne. They were translated into Latin by Scotus Erigena, and there have been many subsequent versions. In the Middle Ages, Dionysius had immense authority with Catholic theologians; and in a work written to defend the authenticity of the works attributed to Dionysius, Darboy alleges that there is scarcely a passage in them which has not been quoted by St. Thomas Aquinas.

Still, historical scholars, such as Le Noury, Tillemont, Dupin, &c., have demonstrated the spurious character of the works in question. The objection made at Constantinople, viz. that Cyril and Athanasius (we may add Eusebius) are silent concerning them, admits of no satisfactory reply. Facts and institutions are mentioned by the pseudo-Dionysius which happened and arose long after the age of the Areopagite. When the forger, who was evidently a Christian imbued with the philosophy of the later Platonists, really lived, it is much harder to say. Pearson places the composition of the Dionysian writings before 340; the learned Dominican Lequien, at the end of the fifth century. Other scholars, such as Daillé and Westcott, put them later still. It need scarcely be said that mediaeval writers may well have found much that is true in these writings, mistaken as they were about their origin. (See Lequien's Dissertation in his edition of St. John Damascene; Pearson, "Vindic. Ignat."; Tillemont; Stiglmayr in "Cath. Enc."; Bardenhewer-Godet, iii., p. 11 *sqq.*)

[1] Or rather in a Latin version of the account. Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1122.

DIPTYCHS. The word "diptych" (*δίπτυχος*) was originally applied to anything folded double. Thus Homer speaks of a mantle "folded double" (*δίπτυχον*) round the shoulders (Od. xiii. 224). But the adjective diptych came to be used most commonly as an epithet of tablets (*δέλτος* or *δελτίον*), so that diptych signified two leaves or tablets bound together by a hinge. Sometimes several leaves were so fastened together and called *τρίπτυχα*, *πεντάπτυχα*, or *πολύπτυχα*. They were used for sending short letters, as memorandum books, &c. They were often made of costly material, worn partly as ornaments at the girdle, and sent as presents to friends, to clients, or to persons of distinction.

It is uncertain at what time the Christian Church began to make use of diptychs in the liturgy, but we know that in Chrysostom's time the custom was fully established. It was continued among the Latins down to the twelfth, among the Greeks down to the fifteenth century. They were called "holy tablets," "mystical tablets," "mystical diptychs," "ecclesiastical catalogues," &c. The "diptychs of the living" contained the names of the Pope, patriarchs, the bishop and clergy of the church, often also of neighbouring churches, those who offered the Eucharistic gifts, benefactors of the church, the Emperor and Empress, &c. The "diptychs of the dead" contained as a rule the names which had once been inscribed in the diptychs of the living—*e.g.* those of former bishops of the particular church, and also of other bishops, &c., specially revered there. The diptychs also contained the names of the Blessed Virgin, martyrs, and other saints. The insertion of a name always implied that the person bearing it was living or had died in Catholic communion; for heresy, schism, and other crimes which were punished by excommunication caused a name to be erased from the diptychs. Thus, exclusion from the diptychs was often equivalent to a decision that the person so disgraced was to be regarded as a heretic, while the reinsertion of the name implied that his case had been examined and his innocence proved.

The way in which the diptychs were used at Mass varied in different times and places. Originally, the deacon read out the names from the ambo [*q.v.*]; later the deacon or

sub-deacon read them in a low voice to the priest celebrating at the altar; later still, the diptychs were merely laid on the altar, and the priest in his prayer remembered the names inscribed without actually reciting them. Again, the time at which the diptychs were used at Mass varied. Often the diptychs both of the living and dead were read after the sermon or (more frequently) after the offertory. Sometimes, as in the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, the diptychs were used after the consecration. In the Roman liturgy the names of the living were read before, those of the dead after, the consecration; but both the use of the diptychs and the position of the corresponding *Mementos* in the early Roman Church is matter of dispute.

It is said that the diptychs led to the formation of Church Calendars, and these in turn gave rise to Martyrologies. It is still more important to observe that the diptychs have left their mark in the present Roman Missal. In the prayer of the Canon, "Te igitur," the priest mentions by name the reigning Pope and the bishop of the diocese. At the "Memento, Domine," he pauses and silently commends to God benefactors, friends, &c., who are still living. At the "Communicantes" he recites the names of the Blessed Virgin, the saints, &c. All this occurs before the consecration. After the consecration, in the fifth prayer of the Canon, the priest makes a memento of the dead. Both mementos in some MS. Missals retain the title "oratio super" or "supra diptycha." That, however, the primitive Anaphora, or Canon, had neither diptych reading nor memento is upheld with great erudition by Dom Cagin, "L'Eucharistie" (Rome, 1912). Besides the Verona palimpsest, on which he chiefly relies, the tenor of the Mozarabic and Gallican Liturgies furnishes strong arguments in favour of his view. (See Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie"; Benedict XIV. "De Missa," ii. 13 and 17; Leclercq, "Archéologie Chrét." ii. 364; Fortescue, "The Mass," 115; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," pp. 84, 180, 208.)

DIRECTORIUM. A list, drawn up by authority of the bishop, containing directions as to the Mass and office to be said on each day of the year. The number of feasts in the present calendar, and the frequent necessity of transferring some and commemorating or omitting others, make the Directorium or, as it is usually called, "Ordo," necessary for the clergy. In ancient times the bishop published orally the list of the feasts to be observed. The bishops had to follow the directions of their metropolitan, and he again conformed to the ordinances of the Roman bishop, who based his direction on the reckoning or "computus ecclesiasticus" of the Alexandrian Church. Very often in the ancient Church a list of movable feasts was hung to the Paschal candle.[1] Its solemn publication took place yearly on the feast of the Epiphany, and is still provided for in the Roman Pontifical. (Thurston in "Cath. Enc." *Directories.*)

DIRGE. The word has at the present day no technical, but only a literary sense, and means a solemn service, or part of a service, celebrated on behalf of a departed soul. Thus, Sidney has—

> Let dirge be sung and trentals rightly read,
> For love is dead.

And Gray, in the well-known Elegy—

> The next, with dirges due in sad array,
> Slow through the church-way path we saw him borne.

Originally the word was spelt "dirige," being the first word of the antiphon at the beginning of the opening psalm (the 5th) of the first nocturn in the Office for the Dead. The entire antiphon, adapted from the ninth verse of the psalm, is "Dirige, Domine Deus meus, in conspectu tuo viam meam." The Vespers in the same office begin with the antiphon "Placebo Domino," the last verse of Ps. 114. Clerks in minor orders, and even laymen, used to be commissioned by rich persons to sing psalms for the souls of their relatives, and, of course, received money for doing so. Thus, William Langlande says ("Vision of Piers Plowman," Passus vi. C text)—

> The lomes [limbs] that ich laboure with . and lyflode deserve,
> Ys *pater-noster* and my prymer . *placebo* and *dirige*,
> And my sauter [psalter] som tyme . and my sevene psalmes:
> Thus ich synge for hure soules . of suche as me helpen.

When the office had come to be called a dirige, the term dirige-money naturally arose for the payment made in respect of singing it. Thus Tyndale ("Obedience of a Christian Man," quoted in Skeat's "Specimens"), speaking of alleged clerical exactions, says "And he . . . . polleth on his parte, and fetteth here a massepeny, there a trentall, yonder dirige-money and for his beyderoule."

DISCALCED. Going without shoes—barefooted. Certain orders of friars practise this austerity, which was first introduced among the Friars Minors of the Strict Observance by the Blessed John of Guadalupe, about the year 1500. The Carmelite reform both of men and women, instituted by

[1] The *Catholic Directory*, familiar to English Catholics, contains besides the Ordo a list of clergy, churches, &c. The first number of the *Laity's Directory* seems to have appeared in 1759. It was followed a few years later by another directory published with ecclesiastical approbation, and this latter, after 1788, was the sole directory. In 1793 the list of Catholic churches in London was given for the first time. A book with the title *Catholic Directory* was published in 1837, and in 1839 became the sole English directory.

St. Theresa, is also discalced. (Hélyot, *Déchaussés.*)

DISCIPLINE. The word *disciplina* means, first, instruction; then that which is taught —*e.g.* science or doctrinal system; lastly, order or regulations maintained in a family, army, or the like. Usually, discipline in its ecclesiastical sense signifies the laws which bind the subjects of the Church in their conduct, as distinct from dogmas or articles of faith, which affect their belief.

Such disciplinary laws may be of divine institution, attested by Scripture or Apostolic tradition, and in that case they are inalterable. For example, the supremacy of the Pope over the whole Church, the government of the faithful by bishops, and many similar points of discipline were settled once for all by divine authority and cannot be changed. The Church, however, has power to add disciplinary laws according to the requirements of different times and circumstances, not only because this power belongs to any well-constituted community, but also because she speaks in the name of Him to whom all power has been given in heaven and on earth; and the Church, having the right to make such laws, has also the power to alter them. If they have been imposed by a Pope or council, or have become part of the general law of the Church, supreme authority may relax or annul them, and on the same principle bishops or other local superiors may change laws made by themselves or their predecessors. Thus the discipline of the Church may alter and has altered from age to age. At one time married persons were allowed to enter holy orders; this is no longer the case in the Latin Church. The ceremonies of Mass have been gradually perfected. New feasts have been introduced; the severity of fasts has been mitigated. At this day, the discipline of one place may differ from that which prevails in another. But the infallibility of the Church is our security that she will never sanction discipline contrary to sound faith or morals.

The word discipline is also used to mean various acts of mortification, especially scourging, and also the instrument with which this scourging is inflicted. This practice was prescribed in most religious orders, sometimes in punishment, sometimes as a voluntary satisfaction for sin and as a corrective of the evil motions of the flesh. (See Ducange, *s.v. Disciplina.*) The ill-regulated use of scourging led to the excesses of the Flagellants [*q.v.*].

DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET (*disciplina arcani*). The term first occurs in a German author, Meier, who made use of it in a treatise "De Recondita Ecclesiae Theologia," published at Helmstadt in 1677.[1] It has been in common use ever since, as a convenient name for the custom which prevailed in the early Church of concealing from the heathen and catechumens the more sacred and mysterious doctrines and rites of the Catholic religion, either by not mentioning them at all or by mentioning them only in enigmatical language, unintelligible or even misleading except to those who were initiated into its meaning. The reader will see on a moment's consideration the dogmatic and controversial importance of the matter. Little stress can be laid on the infrequent mention of the Real Presence, the mystery of the Trinity and the like in early writers, if the existing discipline restrained them from writing openly on such subjects in books which might fall into the hands of the general public; and the same discipline may help to explain the fact that they sometimes express themselves on the Christian mysteries in language which seems strange and inadequate to us.

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the fact that this discipline of the secret did exist in the early Church. It arose from several causes. In times of persecution the Christians were afraid to speak openly and frankly about their worship and doctrine, from the natural fear that such disclosures would expose them to further injury and interruption. Moreover, they regarded the truth as a sacred deposit, and they were afraid of communicating it to those who would misunderstand it or laugh it to scorn. They were mindful of our Lord's admonition not to cast pearls before swine (Mt. vii. 6) and of the Apostle's declaration that he fed the Corinthians with milk, not with strong meat, because they were not able to bear it (1 Cor. iii. 2). A few instances will be enough to prove the point and at the same time illustrate the nature of the discipline in question. "That it existed even as a rule," says Newman,[1] "with respect to the Sacraments, seems to be confessed on all hands." It is well known that the heathens and catechumens were not allowed to be present at the whole of the Mass, and that a distinction was made between the Mass of the faithful and the Mass of the catechumens.[2] Again, Minucius Felix, Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Arnobius, in their Apologies for the Christian religion, preserve an absolute silence on the holy Eucharist. The famous inscription discovered at Autun in 1839 exemplifies another mode in which this discipline was observed. "Take the food sweet as honey of the saviour of the holy ones, eat and drink holding the fish in thy hands"—words perfectly intelligible to Christians, among whom the "fish" meant "Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour" (Ἰχθύς=Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ υἱὸς σωτήρ), received first in the hands, then in the mouth of the communicant, but mere jargon to

[1] Probst, *Kirchliche Disciplin in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*, p. 306.

[1] *Development*, p. 27. [2] *Constit. Apost.* ii. 57.

those who were outside the Church. So, again, Origen[1] speaks of the soul on its conversion to the Church as initiated into the "mysteries of the faithful" (*sacramenta fidelium*, an expression which must include the sacraments), "which those know who are initiated"; and, again, "of those venerable and sublime mysteries which those know who may be permitted to do so."[2] Even when persecution was over, the secrecy with regard to the sacraments was still maintained. Chrysostom, in a letter to Pope Innocent I., tells him how "the Blood of Christ had been spilt" during a tumult in a church of Constantinople. In such a letter no caution in language was called for. But his biographer Palladius in a published book says "they overturned the symbols."[3] At a synod held at Antioch in 340 the Catholic bishops indignantly accuse the Arians of letting catechumens, and even heathens, hear the "mysteries" discussed.[4]

That this discipline existed "in other respects is plain from the nature of the case, and from the writings of the Apologists. Minucius Felix and Arnobius, in controversy with pagans, imply a denial that they, the Christians, used altars; yet Tertullian speaks expressly of the Ara Dei in the church. What can we say but that the Apologists deny altars *in the sense* in which they ridicule them, or that they deny that altars such as the pagan altars were tolerated by Christians? And in like manner Minucius allows that there were no temples among Christians; yet they are distinctly recognised in the edicts of the Dioclesian era, and are known to have existed at a still earlier date."[5]

It has been already shown incidentally that the discipline of the secret is based on Scriptural precept, and was in force at least from the close of the second century. Even Ignatius may perhaps have had it in view when he describes the Christians of Ephesus as "initiated along with St. Paul."[6] It was enforced with different degrees of strictness according to circumstances. Sometimes, to meet the calumnies of heathens and more particularly of heretics, it was necessary to speak out, so that it does not follow, because Justin and Irenaeus express themselves with considerable fullness on the Eucharist, that the discipline of the secret was unknown to them. After the sixth century the need for the old reserve passed away. (Schelstrate, "De Disciplina Arcani," Romae, 1685; Probst, "Kirchliche Disciplin," &c., part iii. c. 2). The recent attempt of Batiffol to cast doubt on the antiquity of the practice ("Etudes d'Histoire &c.," i. 1–42) has been answered by Funk, "Das Alter der Arkandisziplin,"[1] and Macdonald in "Am. Eccl. Rev."; Barnes in "Cath. Enc."

DISPARITY OF WORSHIP (*Disparitas Cultus*). A baptized person and an unbaptized person are said to be of "different worship or religion." Such persons are incapable of intermarrying unless a dispensation be obtained. (See IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE, p. 446.)

DISPENSATION. The relaxation of a law in a particular case. The necessity of dispensation arises from the fact that a law which is made for the general good may not be beneficial in this or that special case, and therefore may be rightly relaxed with respect to an individual, while it continues to bind the community. Dispensation must be carefully distinguished from the interpretation of a law, though the two are often confused with one another in common speech. Thus, a person so ill that he cannot fast without serious injury to his health needs no dispensation, because he is by the nature of the case excused from the law. On the other hand, though he may be able to fast, his health, occupations, &c., may make it suitable that the law should be relaxed in his favour; for this purpose a dispensation is required, and he must apply to some one possessed of authority to grant it. Anyone may interpret the law who has sufficient knowledge and impartiality to do so, but jurisdiction is needed in order to dispense.

The general principle is that the lawgiver, from whom the law derives its force, has power to relax it. So, again, a superior may relax the laws of his predecessors, because his power is equal to theirs, or of his inferiors, because his power is greater. But an inferior cannot dispense in the laws of his superiors unless by power delegated to him for that end.

God Himself cannot give a dispensation, in the strict sense of the word, from the natural law. "From the precepts of the decalogue," says St. Thomas, "no dispensation of whatsoever kind can be given," and to the objection that God, who made the ten commandments, can unmake them, he replies, "God would deny Himself if he did away with the order of His justice, since He is identical with His own justice, and therefore God cannot give a dispensation making it lawful for a man to neglect the due order to God, or exempting him from submission to the order of His justice even in those things which concern the relations of men to each other."[1] God, however, can change the circumstances in such a manner that the case no longer falls under the law. He could, for example, as supreme Lord and proprietor

[1] Hom. viii. n. 4, in Exod., *PG*, xii. 356.
[2] In Jos. Hom. iv. n. 1: "quos nosse fas est." *PG*, xii. 843.
[3] Döllinger, *Lehre der Eucharistie*, p. 15.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 13.
[5] Newman, *Development*, p. 27.
[6] *Ad Ephes.* xii., *PG*, v. 745.

[1] 1a 2ae, q. 100, a. 8. The opinion of Occam, D'Ailly, and Gerson that God could dispense from the precepts of the decalogue has long been abandoned. The Scotists held that God could dispense from the precepts of the second table except that against bearing false witness.

of all, make over the goods of the Egyptians to the Israelites, so that the latter could take them without committing robbery. He could, as the Lord of all that lives, deprive Isaac of life and make Abraham the executioner. Further, just as a man may remit a debt, so God may free a man from the obligation incurred to Him by oath or vow. Lastly, God can of course dispense from the positive law which He has imposed—*e.g.* He could have dispensed a Jew from the law of circumcision, the Sabbath, &c. We may now pass on to consider the actual law of the Church on dispensations.

The Pope can dispense from obligations to God which a man has incurred of his own free will—*i.e.* by oath or vow. This power belongs to him as the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ gave the power of binding and loosing. He can also dispense in all matters of ecclesiastical law. Bishops, by their ordinary power, can dispense from the statutes of the diocesan synods &c., and they can dispense individuals from the general laws of the Church, or from obligations under which they have placed themselves to God, in such cases as frequently occur—*e.g.* in most vows, in fasts, abstinences, observance of feasts, &c. But by reason of privilege, lawful custom or necessity, the dispensing power of the bishop is often extended. Custom has also given parish priests power to dispense individuals from fasts, abstinences, abstinence from servile work on feasts, and the like. As a rule, a person who has received power to dispense from a superior by delegation cannot sub-delegate.

A reason is always needed before a dispensation can be lawfully given. If a superior dispenses without cause in his own law or in that of an inferior, the dispensation, though unlawful, is valid. If, however, an inferior to whom dispensing power has been delegated uses it without reason, the dispensation is null and void. In all cases it is taken for granted that a dispensation is only given on the tacit condition that the statements of the person who petitions for it are true. Concealment or falsehood in an essential matter affecting the motive which induced the superior to dispense renders the dispensation null.

A dispensation ceases if recalled; if it is renounced and the renunciation is accepted by the superior; also, in certain cases, if the cause for which the dispensation was given no longer exists. What those cases are it is not so easy to determine. According to Suarez, a dispensation from one single obligation—*e.g.* a vow—continues even when the cause for which it was granted is there no longer, provided the dispensation has been accepted and used before the cause ceased. On the contrary, dispensations which virtually relax a series of obligations—*e.g.* from fasting each day in Lent—expire with the cause which induced the superior to grant them. (See Suarez, "De Legibus," lib. vi. x. *sqq.*; the subject is dealt with by the moral theologians in the treatise "De Legibus," *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, lib. i. tract. ii. dub. 4; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." i. p. 363 *sqq.*; Ferraris; Taunton.)

DISTRACTION. [See PRAYER.]

DISTRIBUTIONS. *Distributiones quotidianae* are personal stipends from the income of the church (over and above the prebend) which are paid to canons and *beneficiati* of a cathedral who are personally present at the public worship (Taunton). They are intended to ensure regular attendance at the services. Corporal presence as well as residence is required; and the corporal presence is required in the choir. To this condition there are, however, certain exceptions; *e.g.* sickness, the Penitentiary hearing confessions, &c. The law of distributions was decreed by the Council of Trent (sess. xxi. cap. 3, De Ref.) (See Ferraris; Taunton.)

DIVINATION. Inquiring after hidden things or things to come by undue means—that is, by means not instituted by God. To search after the unknown is in itself most laudable. But the vulgar and the wicked, not satisfied with the limits imposed by science and revelation, seek to discover what is beyond their reach, or make use of unlawful means to find out what may otherwise be known. Events which have not yet come to pass can be known beforehand only when they are the necessary effects of causes already known. Thus, an eclipse can be foretold because the motions of the earth, sun, and moon are necessary, and are known to us. Future free acts can be known with certainty only to Him in whose sight they are really present. We may, indeed, make fairly accurate calculations as to how an individual, and especially a number of individuals, will act; but we can do no more by natural power. God can reveal future free actions; any other mode of inquiry will savour of divination. The usual forms of such inquiry are either a direct or indirect appeal to diabolical agency, or attributing superhuman powers to animals or things. Necromancy (consulting the dead), chiromancy (palmistry), auguries, omens, and lots are familiar instances. We must, however, carefully note that what at first sight looks like divination may turn out to be a lawful form of inquiry. Thus St. Thomas points out that the behaviour of birds and other animals is often a natural sign of events to come, *e.g.* the cawing of crows is a sign of rain. As to lots, he observes that there is no harm in tossing (casting lots to decide a dispute), provided that no knowledge is attributed to the objects themselves and that no appeal is made to the Evil One. He says, too, that "if there is need, it is lawful with all due reverence to seek

judgment of God by lots" (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 95, a. 8; cf. Acts i. 26).

For ordeals, see JUDICIUM DEI. As to astrology, we should distinguish the natural action of the heavenly bodies from the action attributed to them by superstition. Indirectly these bodies exert great influence on human conduct. Although God has been pleased at times to make known His will through dreams, it is clearly not lawful to believe in them generally. (See DREAMS; SPIRITUALISM; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 95.)

DIVORCE, in its widest sense, signifies a separation made between man and wife on sufficient grounds and by lawful authority. It may dissolve the marriage bond altogether, so that the man or woman is free to contract a fresh marriage (*separatio quoad vinculum*); or it may simply relieve one of the parties from the obligation of living with the other (*separatio quoad torum et mensam*).

No human power can dissolve the bond of marriage when ratified and consummated between baptized persons. But

(1) The marriage bond may be dissolved, even between baptized persons, by Papal authority, if the marriage has not been consummated. Such at least is the common doctrine of canonists and theologians; nor does Billuart, who holds the opposite opinion, deny that such divorces have been granted by Martin V., Paul III., Pius IV., and Gregory XIII.

(2) It may be dissolved in similar circumstances by the solemn religious profession of either party. This point was defined at Trent (sess. xxiv. can. 6); the principle had been already laid down by Innocent III., who professed to follow the example of his predecessors, and it is justified by the example of ancient saints, who left their brides before consummation of marriage to lead a life of perpetual continence. The engagement by which they bound themselves to continence may be considered equivalent to a solemn religious profession in later times.

(3) If two unbaptized persons have contracted marriage, this marriage, even if consummated, may be dissolved, supposing one of the parties embraces the Christian religion and the other refuses to live peaceably and without insult to the Christian religion in the married state. This principle is laid down by Innocent III., and is founded on the "dispensation of the Apostle," or "Pauline privilege" as it is called, in 1 Cor. vii. 12–15.

In all other cases the marriage bond is indissoluble, and besides this, married persons are bound to live together, as man and wife. They may, however, separate by mutual consent (1 Cor. vii. 5); and, again, if one party exposes the other to grave danger of body or soul, or commits adultery, the innocent partner may obtain a judicial separation, or even refuse to cohabit without waiting for the sentence of the judge, provided always that the offence is clearly proved. If the innocent party has condoned the adultery, the right of separation on that ground is forfeited—unless, of course the offence is repeated.

Divorce must be carefully distinguished from a declaration of nullity; in the former case there is a dissolution of a valid marriage, in the latter there has been no valid marriage *ab initio*. Thus, in the so-called divorce of Henry VIII., the king did not contend for the dissolution of his marriage with Catherine; he asked for a declaration that his marriage with her had never been a true marriage at all, on account of the diriment impediment of affinity, as she was his brother's widow. Cases occur from time to time in the Roman courts which are popularly supposed to be divorces, but are really declarations of nullity. (See MARRIAGE; Ferraris; Taunton; St. Alphonsus, lib. vi. tract. vi. cap. 2, dub. 3; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vi. 317 *sqq.*)

DOCETAE (from δοκεῖν, "to seem," because they attributed to Christ an apparent but not a real humanity) were not a special sect. The name describes a feature common to the doctrine of many early heresies—viz. the denial that Jesus Christ was true man. The name occurs in Theodoret,[1] but the tendency which it describes dates from the heresies of Apostolic times. Thus Cerinthus distinguished between Christ and Jesus: the latter, he said, was a mere man, born in the natural way; the former, an aeon, or spiritual being, who descended on him at his baptism, but afterwards took flight and left Jesus to suffer alone. St. John, in his first Epistle (iv. 2), alludes to a heresy of this kind in the words, "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit which dissolveth Jesus is not of God." It is because the Church of his time was in conflict with this form of error that St. Ignatius insists so strenuously on the reality of the Incarnation in opposition to those who said Christ's "sufferings are visionary, being themselves visionary."[2] This Docetic tendency was further developed by Marcion, who maintained that Christ's body was a mere phantom.[3] The error of the Docetae, in a modified form, was revived by the Apollinarists, who denied the reality of Christ's human soul, and by the Eutychians, who represented His humanity as absorbed in the divine nature. [See GNOSTICISM; MONOPHYSITES; APOLLINARIANISM.]

DOCTOR. [See DEGREES.]

DOCTOR ANGELICUS. The name given to St. Thomas Aquinas. Ruysbroek was called Ecstaticus; St. Bernard, Mellifluus; Alexander of Hales, Irrefragabilis; Duran-

[1] See Petav. *De Incarnat.* ad init.

[2] τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν, αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν. *Ad Trall.* 10, *PG*, with different reading, v. 792.

[3] Tertull. *De Carne Christi*, cap. i, *PL*, ii. 764.

dus (de Sancto Porciano), Resolutissimus; St. Bonaventure, Seraphicus; Occam, Singularis; Henry of Ghent, Solemnis; Duns Scotus, Subtilis; Roger Bacon, Mirabilis.

DOCTOR OF THE CHURCH. Three things, says Benedict XIV., are required to make a Doctor of the Church. First, he must have had learning so eminent that it fitted him to be a doctor not only in the Church but of the Church ("doctor ipsius ecclesiae"), so that through him "the darkness of error was scattered, dark things were made clear, doubts resolved, the difficulties of Scripture opened." Next, he must have shown heroic sanctity. Thirdly—though, as we shall see presently, this last condition has not always been insisted on—the title of "Doctor of the Church" must be conferred by a declaration of the Pope or of a General Council. Four Doctors of the Church are named in the canon law: viz. Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great. Besides these, other saints enjoy the title and cultus due to a Doctor of the Church without a formal declaration of Pope or council. Under this class Benedict XIV. puts Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Anselm, Isidore, and Peter Chrysologus. He adds that a part of the cultus usually assigned to doctors is given to St. Hilary,[1] in whose office are the gospel and prayer but not the antiphon, and to St. Athanasius and St. Basil, who have only the antiphon but not the gospel and prayer, proper to doctors.

Since the Reformation the title of Doctor of the Church has been conferred more freely. Pius V. added St. Thomas Aquinas to the list; Sixtus V., St. Bonaventure. During the eighteenth century the title was conferred on St. Anselm, St. Isidore, and St. Leo. Pius VIII. gave the title to St. Bernard; Pius IX. to St. Hilary, St. Alphonsus Liguori, and St. Francis of Sales; Leo XIII. to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. John Damascene, and St. Bede. (Chiefly from Benedict XIV. "De Canoniz." lib. iv., p. 2, cap. 11, 12.)

DOCTRINE. Διδασκαλία, διδαχή, in the Vulgate *doctrina*, are often used in the N.T., especially in the Pastoral Epistles. In Acts ii. 42, the faithful are said to be "persevering in the teaching of the Apostles (τῇ διδαχῇ, *doctrina*)." As we might expect, St. Paul insists on "doctrine" as one of the most important duties of a bishop. Here it means the act of teaching; but usually in English it means what is taught—the body of instruction—or some particular dogma or tenet. [See DOGMA.]

DOGMA, in its theological sense, is a truth contained in the Word of God, written or unwritten—*i.e.* in Scripture or tradition—and proposed by the Church for the belief of the faithful. Thus dogma is a revealed truth, since Scripture is inspired by the Holy Ghost, while tradition signifies the truths which the Apostles received from Christ and the Holy Spirit, and handed down to the Church.

The word itself has an interesting history. In classical writers it has three distinct senses connected with its derivation from δοκεῖν, "to seem." It means, accordingly, that which seems good to the individual—*i.e.* an opinion; that which seems good to legitimate authority—*i.e.* the resolution of a public assembly, or, in other words, a decree; lastly, it acquired a peculiar sense in the philosophic schools. The mere word of some philosopher (*e.g.* of Pythagoras) was considered authoritative with his disciples; and so Cicero, in the Academic Questions, speaks of "decrees," or doctrines, "which the philosophers call dogmata, none of which can be surrendered without crime." In the LXX and N.T., the word retains the second of the two of the senses given above. Thus, in Daniel ii. 13, iii. 10, in Lk. ii. 1, xvii. 7, it is used of decrees proceeding from the State. In Ephes. ii. 15, Coloss. ii. 14, it signifies the Mosaic ordinances, and in Acts xvi. 4 (δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα) the disciplinary decrees issued by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. Nowhere in the N.T. does it bear the sense in which theologians employ it.[1]

This sense sprang from the third of the classical meanings given above—viz. that of a truth accepted on the authority of a philosopher. The Pythagoreans accepted tenets which, if true, admitted of proof, on the authority of their master. Christians, better instructed, accepted truths beyond the reach of unaided reason which had been revealed by Christ to His Church. These truths they called dogmas. We find the earliest trace of this technical sense, still imperfectly developed, in St. Ignatius, "Magn." 13: "Use all zeal to be established in the doctrines (ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν) of the Lord and the Apostles."[2] In later Fathers the word occurs in its precise theological meaning. Thus, St. Basil mentions "the dogma of Christ's Divinity" (τὸ τῆς θεολογίας δόγμα); Chrysostom, "the dogmas (δόγματα) of the Church"; Vincent of Lerins, "the ancient dogmas (*dogmata*) of heavenly philosophy."[3] This last illustrates the origin of the theological term.

From the definition with which we began it follows that the Church has no power to make new dogmas. It is her office to con-

[1] Pius IX. gave Hilary the title of Doctor, and now, of course, the antiphon "O Doctor" is recited in his office.

[1] The list of N.T. passages given in the text is exhaustive, except that Lachmann reads τὸ δόγμα τοῦ βασιλέως, the decree of King Pharaoh, in Heb. xi. 23.

[2] See also Barnab. *Ep.* 1, τρία οὖν δόγματά ἐστιν Κυρίου, where the old Latin version has "constitutiones." *PG*, ii. 729.

[3] Basil. Orat. iv. *In Hexaem.*: Chrysost. *In Galat.* cap. I, *apud* Kuhn, *Dogmatik*, vol. i. p. 191.

tend for the faith once delivered, and to hand down the sacred deposit which she has received without adding to it or taking from it. At the same time, the Church may enunciate fully and impose dogmas or articles of faith contained in the Word of God, or at least deduced from principles so contained, but as yet not fully declared and imposed. Hence with regard to a new definition—such, *e.g.*, as that of Transubstantiation—Christians have a twofold duty. They are obliged to believe, first that the doctrine so defined is true, and next that it is part of the Christian revelation received by the Apostles. Again, no Christian is at liberty to refuse assent to any dogma which the Church proposes. To do so involves nothing less than shipwreck of the faith, and no Catholic can accept the Protestant distinction between "fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith." It is a matter of fundamental importance to accept the whole of the Church's teaching. True, a Catholic is not bound to know all the definitions of the Church—but, if he knowingly and wilfully contradicts or doubts the truth of any one among them, he ceases to be a Catholic.

This arbitrary distinction between essential and non-essential articles has led by natural consequence to the opinion that dogmatic belief, as such, matters little provided a man's life is virtuous and his feelings are devout. A religion of this kind is on the very face of it different from the religion of the Apostles and their successors. St. Paul anathematizes false teachers, and bids his disciples shun heretics; St. John denounces the denial of the Incarnation as a mark of Antichrist. We may refer the reader to the striking discussion of the subject in Newman's "Development," ch. vii. sect. 1, § 5.

DOGMATIC FACT. An expression which came into vogue during the Jansenistic controversy [JANSENISM, p. 478]. There are certain facts which, though not divinely revealed, must nevertheless be held as infallibly true on account of their intimate connection with revealed truth. Unless these are admitted, revelation itself could not be accepted, explained, or defended: *e.g.* that a given passage in a book is opposed to the faith; that a given council was lawfully assembled; that a given Pope was the legitimate pontiff. (Franzelin, "De Divina Trad." p. 121; Scheeben in "Kirchenlexikon.")

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY is the science of Christian dogma. It treats of doctrine systematically, regarding the doctrine of the Church as a whole, and considering each article of faith in connection with others which are either allied to or seem to contradict it. It proves the doctrines of the Church from Scripture and tradition, illustrates them by natural analogies, and points out that, though they cannot be demonstrated from reason, they are in harmony with it. It answers objections drawn from philosophy and other sciences, and above all deduces theological consequences from the truths of faith. Controversial theologians defend the faith against infidels and heretics; positive theology investigates the proofs of Catholic doctrine in Scripture and tradition; but all this may be said of dogmatic theology also. The distinction between them seems to lie in the fact that, though dogmatic theology does occupy itself with these matters, they do not form the whole or even the principal part of its subject matter. The systematic presentation of doctrine, the exhibition of the relations between faith and reason, the application of philosophy to religion, so as to deduce conclusions from premisses given partly by philosophy, partly by revelation—this is the chief business of the dogmatic theologian.

In the early ages of the Church the chief doctrines of the faith were precisely stated and formally defined; but little was done directly for dogmatic theology. The early Fathers had to contend with persecution, and what leisure they had was mostly spent in attempts to recommend the faith to heathens. When the hand of the persecutor was stayed, the great controversies on the Trinity, on the Incarnation, on grace and predestination, began, and the champions of the faith were as a rule much too busy in stating and defending the great verities of revelation to think of expounding them systematically. Then came the barbarian incursions in the West, the Mahometan conquests in the East; and the Latin Church was occupied in the work of converting and civilizing the new masters of Western Europe. It was in the latter part of the Middle Ages, when the faith, already defined and fixed, enjoyed a supremacy such as it has never known before or since, that the great dogmatic theologians lived. After the fall of Constantinople Greek learning spread in the West. Christian antiquity was more studied and better understood, and by all this, of course, theology gained immensely. But to a great extent dogmatic theology suffered by the diversion of interest to Scriptural and historical criticism; and a century later the great Protestant revolt gave an increasing importance to controversial as distinct from dogmatic theology.

We have already indicated the division which we shall observe in this article. We shall begin by tracing the first essays at dogmatic theology in the Patristic period, passing next to the theologians of the Middle Ages, and concluding with those of modern times.

I. *Patristic Period.*—As has been already hinted, there is no dogmatic theology, pro-

perly so called, during this time, so that it need not detain us long. Many, however, among the Fathers treat the Christian religion in a philosophic spirit, and address themselves to some at least among the various problems of dogmatic theology. Thus the Apologists of the second and third centuries try to show—often, it is true, in a very fanciful way—that the Christian religion is in agreement with the best results of Greek philosophy, and in particular with the teaching of Plato. Justin, *e.g.*, explains the supposed fact that Christian doctrines are found in Greek heathen writers partly on the theory that all men participate in the illumination of the Word,[1] partly on the assumption that the Greeks had borrowed from the sacred books of the O.T.[2] Clement of Alexandria reaches a higher and more accurate notion of the relations between dogma and science. The most important of his works, the "Stromata," is meant to show that a Christian may do more than believe the faith and keep the commandments. Beyond the ordinary faith, he says,[3] we may reach by instruction and the perfect observance of God's law a knowledge which is the "perfection of man as man." To a certain extent, this perfection is a moral one, and so far does not concern us here. But Clement also makes it consist in knowing truth with peculiar accuracy,[4] in the ability to "demonstrate" it[5] and to fathom the hidden meanings of Scripture, in the power of using all science and learning as a means of refuting error and conveying to others exact notions of the truth.[6] The great Origen, in his book "De Principiis," makes a further advance, and really sketches out the plan of a dogmatic system. Speaking of the Church's dogmas he says:[7] "These must be used as elements and foundations by everyone who desires to form a certain order and system, by considering them all together, so that he may form evident and necessary propositions, discover the truth on each point, and, as we have said, make one system out of the examples and propositions which he finds in the Holy Scriptures, or discovers by following out things to their logical consequences." It is to be observed, however, that Origen never worked out the plan which he put before himself; and, besides, there were inherent defects in his method, which would have kept him from doing so successfully. Nor did later Fathers realize the ideal which Origen had before him. Of course, the great Doctors of the Church, in defending Catholic doctrine on the Trinity and Incarnation, incidentally supplied abundance of matter for the furtherance of systematic and speculative theology. Indeed, St. Augustine's writings had an extraordinary and enduring influence on every department of theological science, and the study of them was the great means of theological education, and gave the strongest impulse to scientific progress during the Middle Ages. But as a rule the Fathers supplied the stones which the Schoolmen built together.[1] Still, one exception at least must be noted. In his treatise "De Trinitate," St. Augustine sets himself to resolve the historical and the speculative difficulties of the doctrine. He proves the Nicene doctrine from Scripture and tradition; tries to reconcile the belief in a Trinity of Persons with the belief in the unity of God; and confirms the truth of the Catholic doctrine by natural analogies. In the opinion of competent judges no writing of the early ages deserves to be compared with it for fullness and thoroughness.

II. *The Scholastic Period.*—Dogmatic theology in the strict sense of the word, began to be in the East long before it was known in Western Europe. Zacharias Scholasticus and John Philoponus, in the sixth century, discussed Christian doctrine in a philosophic spirit, and in the first half of the following century John of Damascus brought dogmatic theology to the highest level which it ever reached among the Greeks. He was acquainted with the logical writings of Aristotle, and so acquired the philosophic training necessary for a theologian. He was well read in the Greek Fathers and familiar with the speculations of Pseudo-Dionysius. Thus equipped, he summed up all the theological learning of his day in his great work entitled "The Fountain of Wisdom" (Πηγὴ Σοφίας). The first part contains the dialectic, which since the Arian controversies had been the object of increasing attention in the Church, and was afterwards zealously studied by the Arabs. The second part gives a history of heresies; the third, "an accurate exposition of the orthodox faith" (ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως). The third part treats (*α*) of God in his essence, attributes, and Trinity of Persons; (*β*) of the creative act by which invisible spirits and visible things were made, of the Divine foreknowledge, and of free will; (*γ*) of the Incarnation, and the economy of salvation; (*δ*) of the means by which this salvation is appropriated, and generally of such matters as concern practical piety—*i.e.* of faith and baptism, the cultus of the saints, use of images, &c.; of Scripture, the origin of sin in the abuse of free will, the law of God, the Sabbath, circumcision, virginity, &c.; and lastly, of Antichrist and

[1] *Apol.* ii. 8, *PG*, vi. 457.
[2] *Apol.* i. 44, *PG*, *ib.* 396.
[3] *Strom.* vii. 10, p. 864, *PG*, ix. 477.
[4] *Ib.* vii. 16, p. 891.
[5] *Ib.* vii. 10, p. 865.
[6] *Ib.* vi. 10, pp. 780–781.
[7] *De Princip.* Præf. n. 10, *PG*, xi. 121. The work, except a few fragments, only exists in the translation of Rufinus.

[1] Of course this comparison must not be pressed. It would be absurd to attribute to the Schoolmen a general superiority over such a writer as St. Augustine. If much was gained, much also was lost by the scholastic love of system.

the resurrection. Here we have something like a complete system of theology, but with John of Damascus the theology of the Easterns reached its highest point. Further advance was to be made, not in the East, but in the West.

There, even after the shock of the barbarian conquests was over, a long period of preparation was needed before dogmatic theology could arise, and for this very reason when it did arise it manifested extraordinary strength, possessed a singular vitality, and did its work with wonderful completeness. These preparations consisted in the study of the Aristotelian logic, much furthered by Boethius in the earlier part of the sixth century. Again, the dogmatic teaching of the Fathers was summarized by such authors as Isidore of Seville, who in his "Originum seu Etymologiarum Codex" furnished an encyclopaedia of sciences, including theology, while his "Libri Sententiarum" is a kind of anthology from the Fathers, particularly from St. Augustine. Alcuin did much to encourage the foundation of monastic schools and so to keep the lamp of learning alive. To this movement our own Venerable Bede, encyclopaedic in his knowledge, contributed largely. Still, although the writings of St. Gregory the Great exercised a wide and strong influence, although the living interest in dogmatic controversy was kept up by the disputes on the Adoption of the Son of God, on the Eucharist, on Predestination, and by those occasioned through the rationalism and pantheistic tendencies of Scotus Erigena, the period which elapsed between the sixth and eleventh century was one of learning rather than of speculation. The men of that age gathered in peace the fruits of the past; they seldom began to till new ground. Nor had they as yet the instruments to hand which were indispensable for the advance of theology. They knew the positive teaching of the Fathers; they did their best to master the natural and mathematical sciences, grammar, logic, rhetoric, &c., and to make themselves at home in the wisdom of the Greeks and Romans. But they had no philosophy, and philosophy is a necessary basis for theological speculation. In the eleventh century this desideratum was supplied. Then the monastic schools, which had sunk into comparative insignificance after the death of Charles the Bald, became more celebrated than ever for learning (those of Tours and Bec deserve special mention), and in Anselm of Canterbury produced a man, not only of learning, but of speculative ability. Some time later these schools were cast into the shade by the universities, and that of Paris in particular was the fostering mother of dialectical theology throughout the rest of the Middle Ages. Better translations of Aristotle came into use, and not only his logical, but also his metaphysical and physical treatises were studied with enthusiastic appreciation. True, philosophy was regarded as the handmaid of faith. The Catholic religion was accepted as the absolute truth, and although the philosopher proved from reason the truths of natural religion, such as the being of God, the spirituality of the soul, and the like, yet even on his own ground he had to bring his work into agreement with the teaching of the Church. Still, philosophical questions in themselves awakened the most intense interest, and theology chiefly consisted in drawing conclusions from principles furnished partly by the faith, partly by philosophy; it followed naturally that the whole of a man's theology was coloured by his philosophical opinions. The great philosophical question debated during all the scholastic period was about the nature of universals. There were the extreme Realists, like Scotus; the moderate Realists, like St. Thomas; and the Nominalists, such as Occam. All these names represent different schools of theology, and it is often easy to trace the direct influence which the theory they held on universals had on their theology. Of course, we do not mean to say that every difference—*e.g.* between Scotus and St. Thomas—can be traced to a philosophical source, but many among these differences certainly can be so traced. So well was this understood that as long as Scotism kept its ground in the Franciscan schools, the Scotist philosophy, and that alone, was looked upon as the necessary preparation for theology. The mutual interpenetration of philosophy and theology is the great distinguishing mark of the scholastic period.

We can only mention the most distinguished names among the Schoolmen, and say a few words about one or two among them. St. Anselm was the great light of the eleventh century, towards the end of which he lived. In the twelfth century the great names are those of Roscelin, Abelard, and Peter Lombard; in the thirteenth, those of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas, Bonaventure, John Duns Scotus.

Anselm did not construct a complete corpus or sum of theology, but he treated of its principal parts—viz. the existence and nature of God and the Trinity in his "Monologium," "Proslogion," "De Fide Trinitatis," and "De Processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos"; the freedom of the will, origin of evil, and the fall, in "De Concordia Praescientiae et Praedestinationis non Gratia Dei cum Libero Arbitrio"; "De Casu Diaboli"; "De Conceptu Virginali et Peccato Orginali"; of the Incarnation and redemption, in "Cur Deus Homo." Peter Lombard's four Books of Sentences were for centuries the basis of theological instruction. St. Thomas, Scotus, nay

even so late a writer as the famous Estius, commented on them. Peter Lombard sets out with the principle—borrowed from St. Augustine—that Christianity is a doctrine concerning realities and signs, the principal signs being the sacraments. He subdivides the realities into such as we are to enjoy (*frui*)—*i.e.* such as are ends; such as we are to use (*uti*) as means; and considers lastly the subjects or rational creatures intended to use these means. Accordingly, the first Book of the Sentences treats of God and the Trinity (realities which are ends in themselves); the second, in its first part, of the world, in its second of rational creatures, in its third of free-will and grace, virtues and vices (of things to be used as means, of those who use them, of use and abuse); the third, of the Redemption, by which man is again enabled to see things aright; the fourth, of the resurrection, and of "signs"—*i.e.* chiefly of the sacraments. A moment's thought will enable anyone to see some at least of the patent defects implied in such an arrangement. St. Thomas adopted a different one in his "Sum of all Theology," which for method, scientific precision and depth, for purity of doctrine, has nothing like it or near it in the productions of the scholastic theologians. The "Summa" is divided into three parts. The first treats of God in Himself, and as the Creator. The second treats of God as the end of creatures, and of the actions which lead us to Him or separate us from Him. In the former subdivision of the second part these actions are discussed in general; the latter subdivision explains them in detail. The third part treats of the Incarnation, the sacraments, and the last things. It must be added that the subdivision of Part II. was made, not by St. Thomas, but by his disciples, and that St. Thomas left the third part incomplete, the conclusion of the treatise on Penance, with those on Extreme Unction, Holy Order, Matrimony and the last things, having been appended from his commentary on the Sentences. St. Thomas himself points out the connection of parts in the "Summa." The first is concerned with God; the second, with the movement of rational creatures to Him; the third, with the Incarnation, Redemption, and sacraments, which open the way to God, and with eternal life, to which this way leads.

III. *Modern Period.*—Scholastic theology is best represented by St. Thomas and Scotus. After their time there was a marked decadence, and if at the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation scholastic theology was unjustly attacked and contemned, the fault must be partly laid at the door of the later Schoolmen themselves. Melchior Canus, a Catholic bishop and theologian of undoubted orthodoxy, describes the degeneracy of some among the later Schoolmen, their frivolous and sophistical spirit, their ignorance of Scripture and tradition, in the forcible language of a man who evidently speaks from personal experience.[1] No doubt other causes helped to bring scholastic theology into disrepute. The new learning absorbed attention; controversialists, such as Bellarmine, were busy defending the decrees of Trent against Lutherans and Calvinists, so that the interest in scholastic theology abated. Besides, there was on the part of Protestants and even of Jansenists, a distinctly heretical opposition to the theology of the schools. It was held that truths of revelation were contrary to the dictates of reason, and that, to use the words of Melanchthon, "Christian doctrine was utterly discordant with philosophy and human reason."[2] This, of course, was to cut at the root of scholastic theology, and the opinion of Melanchthon on faith and reason was that of the Reformers in general. Still, scholastic theology was pursued with ardour, and valuable additions were made to it. The old Thomist and Scotist theologies were still maintained, and though the latter as a distinctive system was passing away, it influenced the eclectic theology of many Jesuit writers, and so has left a permanent mark on the theology of the Church. Moreover, a fresh impetus was given to scholastic disputes by the controversies on grace in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and a new division of theologians into Thomists, Congruists, Molinists, and Augustinians came to be recognized. The following are among the principal theologians since the Reformation. We put aside great controversialists, like Bellarmine and Stapleton, and positive theologians, such as Petavius and Thomassin. Petavius, indeed, may justly be considered a dogmatic theologian. His unequalled learning included a thorough knowledge of the Schoolmen, and he does discuss the most important questions raised by them. But the chief merit of this extraordinary man, great in his many-sided and accurate learning, great in the command which his genius gave him over the stores of classical, Scriptural, patristic, and scholastic learning which he had accumulated, lay rather in his contributions to the history of dogma than to dogmatic theology itself. Confining ourselves, then, to dogmatic theologians in the strict sense, we may name, from the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century: Bañez ("In Prim. Part. Angel. Doctoris," 2 tom.; "In Secund. Secund. Angel. Doctoris"); Molina ("In Prim. Part. D. Thom."; also "Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis Concordia"); Medina ("In Prim. Secund. Thomae Aq.; In Tert.

[1] Canus, *Loc. Theol.* viii. 1, ix. 1. The eloquent and weighty words of Canus on this matter are well worth reading.

[2] Melanchthon, *Loci Theol.* ed. 1, p. 86, apud Kuhn, *Dogmatik*, vol. i. 472.

Part."); Gregory of Valentia ("Comment. in Summ. Thomae Aq."); Suarez ("Commentationes et Disputat. in Thomae Summam"); Cardinal de Lugo (separate treatises on dogmatic and moral theology: *e.g.* "De Sacramentis," "De Eucharistia," "De Incarnatione," &c., collected in seven folios); Vasquez ("Commentarii in Thomam"); Estius ("Comment. in IV Lib. Sentent."); Tanner ("Theolog. Scholast.," "Disputat. Theol. in omnes Summ. S. Thom. Partes"); Becanus ("Theolog. Scholast."); Viva (on the Condemned Propositions and a brief course of dogmatic theology). Prominent among the theologians of a later date are the Scotists, Frassen ("Scotus Academicus, sive Universa Doctoris Subtilis Theologia," Paris, 1672), and L'Herminier ("Summa Theolog. Scholastic. Dogmat." Paris, 1721); and the Thomists Gonet ("Clypeus Theolog. Thomist. contra Novas ejus Impugnat." Burdigal. 1659), Contenson ("Theologia Mentis et Cordis," Colon. 1722), Witasse ("Tractat. Theolog." Paris, 1722), and Billuart ("Cursus Theolog. juxta Ment. S. Thom." 1745). We may also notice Tournely ("Praelect. Theol." Venet. 1739); Gotti ("Theolog. Scholast. Dogm." Venet. 1750); Berti, the best known representative of the Augustinian School ("De Theolog. Disciplin." Venet. 1776); Hubert ("Theolog. Dogmat. et Moral," August. Vindeb. 1751).[1]

In the latter part of the eighteenth century scholastic theology almost died out, or if the study of it was maintained in Italy and Spain, at all events few books of this kind were written. The dogmas of the Church were of course still carefully studied by clerics in their course of preparation for the priesthood, but scholastic philosophy was neglected, no other philosophy permanently replaced it, and hence theological speculation was impossible. This element is almost entirely wanting in works like those of Liebermann and Perrone, valuable as they are in many respects. Some sixty or seventy years ago the interest in scholastic philosophy, and, as a natural consequence, in scholastic theology, revived. Cardinal Franzelin's treatises, though full of Scriptural and patristic learning, do not by any means omit the consideration of the speculative questions raised by the Schoolmen. Scheeben was perhaps the profoundest, if not the clearest, speculative theologian of recent times. The short treatises of Jungman, the dogmatic theology of the Jesuit Hurter, and that of Dr. Murray of Maynooth, also deserve mention. Pope Leo XIII. did much to encourage the study of the Schoolmen, and this study is not likely to fall again into disrepute or even to be neglected. Experience has proved that no scientific knowledge of the Catholic doctrine can be gained without the study of dogmatic theology, so that when this foundation has been laid, then and not till then other branches of theological inquiry may be pursued with safety and advantage. At the present time, while the historical method of treating dogmatic theology is much in favour, the scholastic method is not neglected. The great theologians are careful to state that they follow St. Thomas Aquinas (*ad mentem S. Thomae*). To enumerate even a portion of the writers would not be possible within the limits of our space. We content ourselves with referring the student to Bellamy, "La Théologie Catholique au XIX. Siècle."

[1] The editions quoted are not always the first which appeared.

DOLOURS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. St. John mentions that the Blessed Virgin, with other holy women and with St. John, stood at the foot of the cross when the other Apostles had fled. At that time the prophecy of Simeon, "a sword will pierce thine own soul" (Lk. ii. 15), was most perfectly fulfilled; and very naturally the sorrows of Mary have been a favourite subject of contemplation with the Saints, among whom St. Ambrose and St. Bernard deserve particular notice. They dwell specially on the intensity of her mental suffering, and on the supernatural constancy with which she endured it. The famous hymn "Stabat Mater" celebrates Mary's sorrows at the foot of the cross in sublime language. The seven founders of the Servite order, in the thirteenth century, devoted themselves to special meditation on the Dolours of Mary, and from them the enumeration of the Seven Sorrows (*i.e.* at the prophecy of Simeon, in the flight to Egypt, at the three days' loss, at the carrying of the cross, at the crucifixion, at the descent from the cross, at the entombment) is said to have come. The feast of the Dolours was instituted at a Provincial Council of Cologne in 1423, at a time when the Hussites were destroying crucifixes and images of the Mother of Sorrows with fanatical zeal. Benedict XIII., in 1725, caused this feast to be celebrated in the States of the Church on the Friday after Passion Sunday. This feast is now observed as a greater double throughout the Church. Pius VII., in 1814, directed that a second feast of the Dolours should be kept, on the third Sunday of September, now transferred to September 15. In allusion to her seven sorrows, the Blessed Virgin is represented in art transfixed by seven swords. (Benedict XIV. "De Festis"; "Manuale Decret.")

DOM. A title applied to the Benedictine monks, as *Dom* Guéranger, etc. It is a contraction of "Dominus," first applied to the Pope, latterly to bishops, and finally to monks of various orders. In Italy in the form of "Don" it is applied to all clerks (secular and regular alike), Mendicant Friars and Regular Clerks only excluded. In mediaeval English it was written "Dan."

Thus the Host says to the Monk in the Canterbury Tales:

"Whether shall I call you my lord, Dan John,
Or Dan Thomas, or elles Dan Albon?"

It was rendered "Sir" ("Sir Hugh Evans," Shakespeare), and in French it has always been "Monsieur." In fine it appears in the familiar "Jube Domne benedicere" of the office.

Benedictine nuns were similarly called *Domna*, whence the modern "Dame."

DOMICILE is the place in which a person is living, or to which he has actually come with the purpose of remaining there for good —*i.e.* until some fresh reasons call him away. Thus, as Zallinger points out, two things go to constitute domicile: (1) the external fact of habitation in a place; (2) the internal intention of fixing the abode there. Quasi-domicile is acquired by a person who has moved to a place with the intention of remaining there for a considerable time—*e.g.* for several months. There is a third class of persons known as *vagi*—*i.e.* who at the time have neither domicile nor quasi-domicile. It is possible for a person to have two domiciles—if, that is to say, he has two abodes in different places and spends about equal portions of the year in each.

The question of domicile enters into the regulations (1) on orders. In ordinary cases a candidate must be ordained by the bishop of the diocese in which he was born ("episcopus originis"). However, if he has fixed his domicile in another diocese he may be ordained by his new bishop, the "episcopus domicilii," provided that he has lived in his new abode for ten years, or has transferred to it the greater part of his goods, having lived there "for a considerable time, and is, moreover, ready to swear that he intends to remain there for good" ("perpetuo"). So Innocent XII., Constit. 96. (2) Persons (where custom has not been established to the contrary) are obliged to make their Easter Communion, to have their banns proclaimed, to have their children baptized, to receive Extreme Unction, from the parish-priest of their domicile or his deputy. If persons to be married live in different parishes, the banns must be proclaimed in the parish church of each. By the recent decree *Ne Temere* [*q.v.*] the valid assistant at marriage is no longer the parish-priest of the parties, but the priest of the church in which the ceremony takes place. For the lawfulness of the marriage, however, a declaration of the free *status* of the parties must be obtained from their parish-priest, and also his permission to assist. (The canonists and moral theologians treat of Domicile in connection with Holy Order and Matrimony, *e.g.* Ballerini, "Theol. Mor," v. 732 *sqq.* and vi. 618 *sqq.*)

DOMINE, NON SUM DIGNUS. "Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof, but only speak with a word, and my soul shall be healed." Words used by the priest before communicating, and again before giving communion to the people. They are adapted from the prayer of the centurion (Mt. viii. 1). The custom of employing this prayer before Communion is alluded to by Origen and Chrysostom (Bona, "Rer. Lit." II. xvii. 1.) "St. Augustine (Serm. lxvii. 1, PL, xxxviii. 415), and many other writers point out how suitable it is for Communion. But it does not occur in the official text of many mediaeval missals; it was definitely authorized in 1570." (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 383.)

DOMINICAL LETTER. [See CYCLE.]

DOMINICANS. The founder of this celebrated order, St. Dominic, was born in 1170, at Calaroga, a small town in the diocese of Osma, in Old Castile. He was educated at the university of Palencia, which afterwards was removed to Salamanca. After leaving the university, he preached with great power in many places. The Bishop of Osma at this time, whose name was Diego, was a prelate of great earnestness and piety; the laxity and tepidity which prevailed among a portion of the Spanish clergy were a serious grief to him, and he pondered how he might introduce the type and germ of a better state of things. He wished to introduce a regular and quasi-conventual life among the canons of his cathedral, and the young Dominic appeared a fit instrument for his purpose. Appointed a canon, and strenuously aiding in the introduction in the chapter of the rule of St. Austin, Dominic more than answered every expectation that had been formed of him. In 1204 and 1205 the Bishop of Osma was sent into France on the affair of a contemplated marriage between King Alfonso IX. and a princess of the house of La Marche. Dominic accompanied him as his chaplain. The southern provinces of France were then teeming with the heresies of the numerous sects which pass under the general name of Albigenses [*q.v.*], and the peril seemed imminent that large numbers of persons would before long, if no restraining influence appeared, throw off the bonds of religion, social order, and morality. The bishop, his mission having come to an end by the death of the French princess, earnestly desired to remain and combat heresy in Languedoc. With Dominic he went to Rome (1205) to obtain the necessary permission from the Pope, who was then Innocent III. The Pope, although strongly approving the enterprise, would not sanction Diego's absence from his diocese being prolonged beyond two years, at the end of which time he was to return to Osma. Returning to Languedoc, Diego and his companions found there two Papal legates, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, contending with the heretics with but small effect. The bishop suggested that the words

of exhortation would be more effectual if the legates came unattended by a splendid retinue. He himself set them an example, going barefoot, and practising great abstinence. The legates took his word in good part, and to some extent acted upon them; moreover, the abbot of Citeaux and several other Cistercian abbots came to their assistance, to take part in the religious campaign, which now began to be prosecuted with much zeal and fruit. But after a time Peter of Castelnau was assassinated by the heretics, and the other legate took his departure; the abbots returned to their monasteries; the bishop was obliged to return to Osma, where he soon after died; and Dominic was left alone. Some years passed; he was joined from time to time by earnest men, who aided him in that work of continual preaching which he felt to be the great work of his life; but many of them, after the novelty of the work had worn off, abandoned him without scruple, and he felt that in order to give stability to his efforts he must bind his followers to himself and their work by a tie stronger than could be supplied by enthusiasm and the voluntary system. Such a tie could only be supplied by the establishment of a new order, and to this consummation he now bent his energies. In 1215 he had gathered round him sixteen men, of whom eight were Frenchmen, six Spaniards, one an Englishman, and one a Portuguese—all prepared to embrace any way of life that he might prescribe to them. The Pope (Innocent III.), when his sanction was sought, hesitated. The Council of the Lateran, then concluding its sittings, had declared that it was not desirable to add any new orders to those already existing. The Pope refused his assent several times, but at length—influenced, it is said, by a vision similar to that which he had had before the confirmation of the Franciscan order—he yielded. It was, however, upon the understanding that the founder should choose for the new institute some rule already sanctioned by the Church, and that the statutes of the order should be submitted to the Pope for his approval. Dominic selected the rule of St. Austin [AUGUSTINIAN CANONS] for the use of his order; many of the statutes were borrowed from those of Prémontré. [See PREMONSTRATENSIANS.] "The chief articles enjoined perpetual silence, there being no time when conversation was permitted without leave from the superiors; fasts almost without intermission, at least from September 14 to Easter Day; complete abstinence from meat, except in serious illness; the use of woollen garments in the place of linen; a rigorous poverty, and many other austerities."[1] The dress which St. Dominic gave to his religious was that of regular canons, such as he had himself worn at Osma—viz. a black cassock and rochet. Some years afterwards this was exchanged for the dress which has been ever since retained in the order—a white habit and scapular, with a long black cappa or mantle. Hence they came to be known as Black Friars. When everything had been settled, and the first monastery was being built at Toulouse, Dominic went to Rome to obtain the final confirmation of the Holy See. Arriving in the autumn of 1216, he found Honorius III. occupying the Papal chair, and obtained from him in the following December a bull fully legalizing and confirming his institute, under the title of the "Preaching Brothers," or friars, "Fratres Praedicatores." He made his solemn profession before Honorius, as the first member of the order, and then returned to Toulouse. Houses under his direction soon arose in different places—*e.g.* at Paris, Metz, and Venice, and in 1221 a general chapter was held at Bologna, at which—perhaps in imitation of the Franciscans—a constitution was adopted renouncing all rents and possessions. The effect of this, of course, was to make the Dominicans a mendicant order, wholly dependent for their subsistence and advancement on the charity and zeal for religion of the Christian people. At this same chapter-general it was found that the order already numbered sixty convents: these were now distributed into eight provinces (England being one), each under a provincial. St. Dominic, therefore, dying in this year, had the happiness of leaving his order firmly planted in Europe. Under subsequent master-generals it extended itself far and wide; the white robe of St. Dominic became a familiar object in Poland, Denmark, Greece, and the Holy Land; their missioners were found in the Canaries in the fifteenth century, and after the discovery of America preaching friars took a prominent part in spreading the Gospel among the natives of Mexico, New Granada, and Peru. Las Casas, who first introduced the African negro into the West Indies, with the benevolent intention of thus saving from destruction under their Spanish task-masters the feebler Carib Indians, was a Dominican friar. This order has contributed Popes to the roll of the Roman Pontiffs: Innocent V. (1276), Benedict XI. (1303–4), St. Pius V. (1566–72), Benedict XIII. (1724–30). The Master of the Sacred Palace in the Pontifical Court has always been a religious of this order since St. Dominic was first invested with the office by Pope Honorius in 1218.

In England, at the time of the dissolution, there were fifty-seven Dominican friaries. From an examination of the names of these, given below,[1] it is evident that they settled

[1] Hélyot.

[1] *List of Dominican Houses, taken from Tanner's 'Notitia.'*

Arundel	Bliburgh (Suff.)
Bamborough	Boston
Bangor	Brecknock
Berwick	Bristol
Beverley	10 Cambridge

by preference in towns, where their primary vocation of preaching could most easily be exercised. The memory of their great friary in London is preserved in the name of Blackfriars Bridge; the building stood between Ludgate Hill and the river; Playhouse Yard [1] marks the exact site. Of their great and famous house at Oxford, though the site is well known, no traces now remain.

Into the intellectual movement of the age, of which the foundation of many universities, and the rapid development of others were the chief outward signs, the Dominicans eagerly flung themselves. They opened schools, and commissioned able lecturers at most of the universities, awakening thereby a fierce opposition on the part of the authorities, who perhaps dreaded in part lest crudities and novelties should issue from the lips of these enthusiastic mendicants, but whose concern for their own vested interest in and monopoly of teaching was much more real. The saintly Albertus Magnus, entering the order in the time of the second general, Jordan of Saxony, lectured in the university of Paris on the philosophy of Aristotle, which, according to Möhler he had the honour of first making thoroughly comprehensible to the European intellect. His fame has been eclipsed by that of the still larger and stronger mind of him who was his ardent disciple, and also a Dominican, St. Thomas Aquinas. The "Summa Theologiae," at which the sciolists of the eighteenth century affected to sneer, has been anew commended to the respect of all Christians, and the careful study of the clergy, by Leo XIII. The system of St. Thomas was so vast as to afford scope for the labour of many commentators and explicators, and a school hence arose, consisting chiefly of Dominicans, named Thomists. Franciscan theologians, among whom the chief was Duns Scotus, raised objections to portions of the teaching of St. Thomas; the problems of Realism and Nominalism were imported into the controversy; and the contentions of Scotists and Thomists, taken up often by men of inferior mental calibre, tended at last to make men weary of the scholastic philosophy altogether. [See DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.]

Among the numerous writers and thinkers produced by this order may be mentioned first that group of ethereal-minded men, sometimes called the "German mystics," among whom the Master Eckhardt († 1329), Johannes Tauler († 1361), and the Blessed Henry Suso († 1365), were all sons of St. Dominic. St. Raymond of Pennafort, the third general of the order, will be celebrated to all time as the codifier of the canon law. In France arose Peter of Tarentaise, and Vincent of Beauvais, author of that vast repertory of all knowledge then accumulated, the "Speculum Majus." England produced Richard Claypole, Robert Holcot, and Robert Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury. Melchior Canus and Cardinal Cajetan belong to the period of the Reformation. Dominic Soto († 1560), Francis a Victoria, and Dominic Bañez († 1604), were eminent in theology and public law. Las Casas, already mentioned, and Peter of Montesino, belonged to the illustrious band of Spanish Dominicans who followed at the heels of the conquerors of the New World, and strove to shield the Indians from their rapacity, and to open the minds of their new fellow-subjects to the light of Christ.

With regard to the present condition of the order, it may be said that in spite of the injustice and violence of the revolution, which in all the principal countries of Europe has at one time or other expropriated its convents and silenced its doctors, it is not altogether unprosperous or unpromising. In France the order was restored about seventy years ago by the devoted Henri Lacordaire, whose burning words, preached from the pulpit of Notre Dame, convinced an unbelieving Paris that a friar's cowl, in the nineteenth century no less than in the thirteenth, may cover a robust and teeming brain and an indomitable courage.

As early as 1206, before the foundation of his order for men, St. Dominic had established a convent of nuns at Prouille, under a modified form of St. Augustine's rule. Honorius III. gave his approval, in 1218, to the extension of the order to women. The Second Order of St. Dominic (or Dominicanesses, as they came to be called) was one of the strictest in the Church. Besides the austerities which they practised in common with their brethren of the First Order, they were bound to rigid cloister and to long hours of prayer. They were intended to be contemplatives, but they afterwards undertook the education of young girls. Many canonized Saints have belonged to this order, the most famous being St. Agnes of Montepulciano.

Canterbury
Cardiff
Carlisle
Clerkenwell
Chester
Chichester
Derby
Doncaster
Dunstable
20 Dunwich (Suff.)
Exeter
Gloucester
Guildford
Haverfordwest (Pemb.)
Hereford
Hull
Ipswich
Ivelchester (Som.)
Lancaster
30 Langley (Herts)
" (Surrey)
Leicester
Lincoln
London
Lynn
Newcastle (Staff.)
Newcastle-on-Tyne
Newport (Monm.)
Northampton
40 Norwich
Oxford
Pontefract
Rhuddlan (Flint)
Salisbury
Scarborough
Shrewsbury
Stamford
Sudbury
Thetford
50 Truro
Warwick
Wilton
Winchester
Worcester
Yarm. (Yorks)
Yarmouth
York

[1] So called from the theatre (of which Shakespeare was co-proprietor) patched up out of some of the ruinous buildings of the friary.

The Third Order of St. Dominic, called also the Brothers and Sisters of the Penance of St. Dominic, grew out of the institution of the "Soldiery of Jesus Christ," which St. Dominic founded in his lifetime, for married men who should desire to undertake the work of protecting the Church, reclaiming her ancient rights, recovering property of which she had been despoiled, and repressing heresy; and for the wives of these men. To this Third Order belonged the canonized saints Catherine of Siena and Rose of Lima, and the beatified Colomba of Rieti, Ingrida of Sweden, Sibylla of Pavia, Margaret of Hungary, and many others. (Hélyot; Möhler's "Kirchengeschichte"; Touron, "La Vie de S. Dominique Guzman, Fondateur de l'Ordre des Prêcheurs avec l'Hist. abrégée de ses premiers Disciples"; Malvenda, "Annales Ordinis Praedicatorum"; Drane, "Life of St. Dominic"; Lacordaire, "Vie de S. Dominique" and "Mémoire pour le Rétablissement des Frères Prêcheurs"; Guiraud, "Saint Dominique.")

DOMINUS VOBISCUM ("The Lord be with you") is, with the "Pax vobis" (among the Greeks *εἰρήνη πᾶσι*), the common salutation in the Mass and office. It was adopted from the Jews, who used it in daily life (Ruth ii. 4). The Oriental liturgies, except the liturgy of St. Mark, have no "Dominus vobiscum." In the West, on the other hand, its use is very ancient. A Council of Hippo in 393 [1] forbids "readers" (*lectores*) to use it, and at this day no minister of the Church below the rank of deacon may do so. A bishop, after the "Gloria in excelsis" on feast days, says "Pax vobis" instead of "Dominus vobiscum," a custom mentioned in a letter of Leo VII., anno 937. These salutations are used even in private Mass or office, and are addressed to the Church, in whose name her ministers speak and with whom they are united in spirit. (St. Peter Damian, "Dominus vobiscum," PL, cxlv. 231 *sqq.*; Fortescue, "The Mass," 246 *sqq.*)

DONATION OF CONSTANTINE. [See STATES OF THE CHURCH.]

DONATISTS. Heretics and schismatics who held (1) that the validity of the sacraments depended on the moral character of the minister; (2) that sinners could not be members of the Church and could not be tolerated by a true Church, unless their sins were secret. The former of these errors was an exaggeration of Cyprian's erroneous belief that baptism depended for its validity on the faith of the minister: the latter was allied to Novatianism, though the Donatists did not deny the Church's power to readmit repentant sinners.

Mansurius, Bishop of Carthage, allowed the heathen during Diocletian's persecution to destroy heretical books which he left in the church instead of the sacred books which they sought. Thereupon, a party of zealots, with Donatus of Casanigra at their head, charged him with "traditio"—*i.e.* with the crime of surrendering the sacred books, and so practically denying the faith. Mansurius died in 311 and his archdeacon, Caecilian, was chosen and consecrated Bishop of Carthage. Seventy Numidian bishops protested, asserting, among other things, that Caecilian had been consecrated by a "traditor" or betrayer of the sacred books, and so invalidly. In his place they chose Majorinus, and on his death, in 313, Donatus, from whom, and from the other Donatus named above, the sect took its name. The Bishop of Carthage being Primas of North Africa, the schism affected the whole of that territory and the Donatists were specially popular with the peasants. Constantine, fearing for the unity of the empire, declared himself against the schismatics. Their case was examined by Pope Melchiades, with a commission of three Gallican bishops, at Rome, in 313; in the following year, at the Council of Arles; and by the emperor himself, to whom the Donatists appealed, at Milan, in 316. All these decisions were adverse to the new sect; still it spread, and in 330 no less than 270 Donatist bishops met in council, although out of Africa they had only two congregations—one in Rome, another in Spain. Their fanaticism rose to such a pitch that crowds of Donatists carried devastation through Africa, uniting the coarsest vices with a morbid desire of martyrdom, which sometimes led to suicide. Down to 429, the date of the Vandal invasion, the Christian emperors restrained the Donatist fury by severe enactments, but without complete success. Towards the close of the fourth century St. Optatus of Milevi wrote his seven books, "On the Schism of the Donatists, against Parmenianus," the successor of Donatus; from 400 onwards the new Bishop of Hippo, St. Augustine was active in opposing them, and in 411 he met 279 of their bishops in conference at Carthage. The Donatists split up into many sects. They sank into comparative insignificance after the Vandal invasion, and are heard of no more after that of the Saracens in the seventh century. (From Kraus, "Kirchengeschichte.") The story of the Donatist schism is of great importance on account of its bearing on the Anglican position at the present time. "When a doubt first crossed my mind," says Newman, "of the tenableness of the theological theory on which Anglicanism is based, it was caused in no slight degree by the perusal of a controversial paper (by Wiseman) on the schism of the Donatists" ("Apologia," p. 211). (The ninth vol. of St. Augustine's works, PL, xxxiii.; Tillemont, "Mémoires," vol. vi.; Wiseman,

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 86.

"Essays," ii. 203 *sqq.*; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," ii. 101 *sqq.*)

DOORKEEPER. [See OSTIARIUS.]

DORSAL, DOSSAL. A curtain suspended at the back (*dorsum*) of the altar, and also at each side of it.

DOUAY BIBLE. A name commonly given to the translation of the Holy Scriptures current among English-speaking Catholics. The name is misleading, for, as we shall presently see, the Bible was not translated into English at Douay, and only a part of it was published there, while the version now in use has been so seriously altered that it can scarcely be considered identical with that which first went by the name of the Douay Bible.

We begin with a history and criticism of the original version. The English College of Douay was founded in 1568 by the exertions of Cardinal Allen, and, owing to political troubles, its members a few years after its foundation took refuge at Rheims. There they set to work at an English version of the Bible, made from the Vulgate, but with diligent comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts. The divines chiefly concerned in the translation of the New Testament were—Dr. William (afterwards Cardinal) Allen, Dr. Gregory Martin, Dr. Richard Bristow, and John Reynolds, all of them bred at the University of Oxford. Martin translated, the rest revised, Bristow and Allen wrote the annotations. Martin also translated the Old Testament, Dr. Worthington furnishing the notes. The publication was delayed by lack of means, but in 1582 the New Testament was published at Rheims, the Old in 1609–10 at Douay, both in quarto. There was a second edition (quarto) of the Old Testament in 1635, of the New (quarto), with some few changes, in 1600; a third edition of the New (16mo) in 1621, a fourth (quarto) in 1633, a fifth (folio) 1738, with the spelling modernized and a few verbal alterations a sixth (folio) at Liverpool in 1788. In 1816–18 an edition of the whole Bible appeared in Ireland, in which the Rhemish text and notes were mainly adopted for the New Testament. An eighth edition of the Rhemish New Testament, text and notes, was published by Protestants at New York (octavo) in 1834. Thus there have been two editions of the Old Testament, eight of the New, according to the original Douay and Rheims version. This version comes to us with the recommendation of certain divines in the College and cathedral of Rheims and of the University of Douay. It never had any episcopal imprimatur, much less any Papal approbation.

What was the value of this translation of the Vulgate? It certainly had great faults, for it is disfigured by uncouth and sometimes scarcely intelligible language, but it had also great merits, which we prefer to state in the words of the celebrated Protestant scholar, Dr. Westcott. Martin he says (and Martin had the chief share in the work), was "a scholar of distinguished attainments, both in Greek and Hebrew." "The scrupulous or even servile adherence of the Rhemists to the text of the Vulgate was not without advantage. They frequently reproduced with force the original order of the Greek, which is preserved in the Latin, and even while many unpleasant roughnesses occur, there can be little doubt that this version gained on the whole by the faithfulness with which they endeavoured to keep the original form of the sacred writings. . . . The same spirit of anxious fidelity to the letter of their text often led the Rhemists to keep the phrase of the original when others had abandoned it. . . . When the Latin was capable of guiding them the Rhemists seem to have followed out their principles honestly: but whenever it was inadequate or ambiguous, they had the niceties of Greek at their command. The Greek article cannot, as a rule, be expressed in Latin. Here, then, the translators were free to follow the Greek text, and the result is that this critical point of scholarship is dealt with more satisfactorily by them than by any earlier translators. And it must be said that in this respect also the revisers of King James [*i.e.* the Protestant Authorized Version] were less accurate than the Rhemists, though they had their work before them." Dr. Westcott also observes that the Douay Bible "furnished a large proportion of the Latin words which King James's revisers adopted."[1] The editors of the Revised Version (1880) observe that the Authorized Version (1611) "shews evident traces of a Version not specified in the rules, the Rhemish, made from the Latin Vulgate, but by scholars conversant with the Greek Original."

In the eighteenth century two independent translations of the New Testament appeared as substitutes for the Rhemish, one by Dr. Cornelius Nary (1718), priest of St. Michan's, Dublin; the other (1730) by Dr. Witham, president of Douay.

A new epoch was made by Dr. Challoner, who revised the Rheims and Douay text, making alterations so many and so considerable that he may really be considered the author of a new translation. His chief object seems to have been that of making the English Catholic Bible more intelligible, and in this he has succeeded, but, "undoubtedly," says Cardinal Newman, "he has sacrificed force and vividness in some of his changes." He approximates, according to the same authority, to the Protestant version. Dr. Challoner, then coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic of London, published the first edition of his new Testament in 1749, of the whole Bible in 1750. In 1752 he pub-

[1] These extracts are from Dr. Westcott's *History of the English Bible*.

lished the New Testament again; in 1763–4 the Bible, in 1772 and 1777 fresh editions of the New Testament. Early in 1781 he died, being then in his ninetieth year. In these editions many variations occur. The notes are Challoner's own.

Challoner's text was itself revised, and fresh alterations were introduced by McMahon, a Dublin priest, who published the New Testament in 12mo anno 1783, and the whole Bible (quarto) in 1791. This edition of the whole Bible was undertaken at the request of Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, and by his name this text is generally known. In 1803 and 1810 the New Testament, and in 1794 the Bible, were reprinted according to the revision of Challoner, which was also adopted in the Philadelphian edition of the Bible, anno 1805. Mention should be made of an edition published in 1815, professing to be "stereotyped from the edition published by authority in 1749" (Challoner's first ed.). The preliminary "Address" is anonymous, but was from the pen of Bishop Poynter. On this edition, and the troubles to which it gave rise, see B. Ward, "Eve of Cath. Emancipation," ii. ch. xxviii.

However, McMahon's alterations are mostly confined to the New Testament: the text of the Old, in Newman's words, "remains almost verbatim" as Challoner left it. But subsequent editions of the New Testament vary very much, because the editors have had to choose between this or that of Challoner's three texts of the New Testament and Dr. Troy's text.

We need not follow the history of our English Bible further, for subsequent editions are mere reprints of texts already mentioned. Challoner's second edition of the Bible (1763) was reprinted at Philadelphia in 1790, and this was the first Bible printed in America for English-speaking Catholics. We have, however, still to mention an independent revision of the Rhemish and Douay texts by Archbishop Kenrick (Gospels, 1849; rest of New Testament, 1851; Psalms, Wisdom, Canticles, 1857; Job and the Prophets, 1859).

(Chiefly from Newman's Essay on the Rheims and Douay versions in "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical." But Dr. Westcott on the English Bible, and Shea's Bibliographical account of Catholic Bibles, &c., printed in America, have also been used.)

DOUAY, ENGLISH COLLEGE AT. Founded in 1568 by Dr. William Allen, who had been a fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and Principal of St. Mary Hall. A university had recently been founded (1562) by Philip II. at Douay (Doway, Douai), and the chief posts in it had been conferred upon Oxford exiles. The first chancellor, Dr. Richard Smith, had been regius professor of divinity, and another regius professor was Dr. Owen Lewis, who had also been regius professor at Oxford. The number and influence of English scholars in the university suggested to Allen that Douay would be a suitable place to provide a succession of Catholic clergy now that schools and colleges in England were lost. The new college began to flourish immediately. The numbers soon reached 150. Funds were provided by Gregory XIII. and Philip II. In 1578, however, the English were all expelled from Douay, and took refuge at Rheims, where they remained until 1593, when they were allowed to return to Douay. It was during this sojourn at Rheims that the English translation of the New Testament was published. The publication of the translation of the Old Testament was delayed by want of funds until some years after their return (DOUAY BIBLE). Much good controversial work was done by Allen himself and his colleagues (notably by Stapleton, Bristowe, Martin &c.), and was issued by the Douay press. Meantime the hope of a cessation of the persecution passed away. The only means of preserving the faith in England was to send over Catholic missionaries in defiance of the law. By the end of the sixteenth century more than three hundred 'seminary priests' from Douay were thus sent. Of these many died on the scaffold or in prison. From first to last under the Penal Laws more than 160 Douay priests suffered martyrdom. During the seventeenth century, though the stream of missionaries was constantly kept up, the work of the college was hampered by the unhappy disputes of the regular and secular clergy [ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 311]. Under the presidency of Dr. Witham (1715–1738) the college was rebuilt on a substantial scale, and a fresh period of prosperity was entered upon. This came to an end with the French Revolution. In 1793 such of the members as had not already escaped to England were cast into prison and the whole property was seized by the government. A portion of the escaped collegians found their way to Old Hall Green, in Hertfordshire, and the rest to Crook Hall near Durham. Early in 1795 the imprisoned ones were set at liberty, and rejoined their companions either in the north or in the south. Hence arose the two colleges of St. Edmund at Old Hall, and St. Cuthbert at Ushaw (removed from Crook Hall in 1808), between which the Roman pension granted by Gregory XIII. was equally divided until the occupation of Rome by the French in 1799. "After the restoration of the Bourbons," says Mgr. Ward, "a large sum of money was paid to the English government to indemnify those who had suffered by the Revolution; but none of this ever reached Catholic hands, for it was ruled that as the Catholic colleges were carried on in France for the sole reason that they were illegal in England, they must be considered French, not English, establishments." The actual

buildings, however, were restored, but were for the most part sold. One of these, belonging to the English Benedictine community of St. Gregory, was transferred to the community of St. Edmund the Martyr, which had formerly been located in Paris (1818). Under these monks the work of educating English boys was continued at Douay until the iniquitous Law of Associations confiscated the college and expelled its members (1903). They retired to Woolhampton in Berkshire, where they took over an already existing school, since known as "Douai Abbey." (See Dodd, "Church Hist. of England"; *id.* Tierney's edition; Knox, "Douay Diaries" and "Letters of Card. Allen"; B. Ward in "Cath. Enc.," "The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England," and "Eve of Cath. Emancipation"; Guilday, "English Cath. Refugees on the Continent," ch. iv. and ch. ix.)

DOUBLE. [See FEASTS.]

DOVE is frequently used as a symbol of the Holy Ghost, who appeared at Christ's baptism under that form (Lk. iii. 22).

1. The custom of depicting the Holy Ghost in this form is mentioned by St. Paulinus of Nola, and must have been familiar to Eastern Christians in the sixth century; for the clergy of Antioch in 518, among other complaints made by them to the see of Constantinople against the intruded bishop Servius, accuse him of having removed the gold and silver doves which hung over the altars and font (κολυμβήθρα) and appropriated them, on the ground that this symbolism was unfitting.[1] The dove as a symbol of the Holy Ghost is often placed in the pictures of certain saints—*e.g.* of Fabian.[2] Hilary of Arles, Gregory the Great, Medard of Noyon, &c. It is also a figure of innocence, and so, *e.g.*, the souls of SS. Eulalia and Scholastica are represented as flying to Heaven in the form of a dove. Lastly, the dove serves as a figure of peace and reconciliation (see Gen. viii. 11);

2. A vase in the form of a dove (περιστήριον, *peristerium*) was in the East and in the West suspended over the altar and used as a repository for the Blessed Sacrament. This custom is mentioned by the author of an ancient Life of St. Basil, by St. Gregory of Tours, and in several ancient French documents. Martène mentions that even in his time such a tabernacle was still in use at the church of St. Maur des Fossés. (See Rohault de Fleury, "La Messe," tome v. pp. 78–83; Rock, "Hierurgia," ii. 318 *note*; Leclercq in DACL, *Colombe Eucharistique.*)

DOWRY OF MARY. "The contemplation of the great mystery of the Incarnation," wrote Thomas Arundel, Abp. of Canterbury, in 1399, "has drawn all Christian nations to venerate her from whom come all the first beginnings of our redemption. But we English, being the servants of her special inheritance and her own Dowry, as we are commonly called, ought to surpass others in the fervour of our praises and devotions." (Wilkins, "Concilia," tom. iii. p. 246.) How England in olden days deserved and obtained this title is set forth in such works as Bridgett, "Our Lady's Dowry"; Waterton, "Pietas Mariana Britannica"; Rock, iii. 142–156, 196–286. [See also ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH; ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 303.]

DOXOLOGY. I. *The greater doxology* or "ascription of glory" is usually called, from its initial words, the "Gloria in excelsis." It is not mentioned by the earliest writers, but it is found nearly, though not quite, as we now have it—under the title of "A Morning Prayer"—in the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 47), so that it can scarcely have been composed, as is asserted in the "Chron. Turonense," by St. Hilary of Poictiers, and the real author is, as Cardinal Bona says, unknown. It was only by degrees that it assumed its present place in the Mass. In Gaul, according to St. Gregory of Tours, it was recited *after* Mass in thanksgiving. The Celtic monks chanted it daily after the psalms of Lauds, a position corresponding to its place in the offices of the Greek Church (see for interesting particulars, and also for the various versions of the hymn, "Antiphonarium Benchorense," Bradshaw Society, ii. p. 75), while it was also recited on occasions of public joy—*e.g.* in the Sixth General Council. It was sung at Mass according to the use of the Roman Church first of all on Christmas Day—during the first Mass, in Greek; during the second, in Latin. It was of course on Christmas night that the first words of the "Gloria in excelsis" were sung by the angels (Lk. ii. 14). Afterwards bishops said it at Mass on Sundays and feasts, priests only at the Mass of Easter Sunday, as appears from the Gregorian Sacramentary. This rule lasted till the eleventh century. At present it is said in all Masses, except those of the dead, of ferias which do not occur in the Paschal season—(it is said, however, on Maundy Thursday)—the Sundays in Advent and those from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday inclusive. It is not said in votive Masses, except those of the Angels, and the B. Virgin on Saturday. (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 239 *sqq.*)

II. *Lesser doxology—i.e.* "Glory be to the Father," &c., recited as a rule after each psalm in the office and after the "Judica" psalm in the Mass. Forms resembling it occur at the end of some of the Acts of the Martyrs—*e.g.* those of St. Polycarp. St. Basil ("De Spiritu Sancto ad S. Amphilochium," which work, however, is of doubtful authenticity) defends the formula "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," and contends that its antiquity

[1] Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1152.
[2] For the origin of this see Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 39.

is attested by early Fathers, Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, &c., and that it is at least as ancient as the Arian form, "Glory be to the Father in" or "through the Son," &c. Anyhow, the former part of the Gloria must date as far back as the third or fourth century, and arose, no doubt, from the form of baptism. The concluding words, "As it was in the beginning," are of later origin. The Gallican Council of Vaison, in 529, ordered their use, adding that they had been already introduced in Rome, Italy, Africa, and the East against heretics who denied the Son's eternity.[1] The Mozarabic form is "Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto in saecula saeculorum. Amen." And the rule of St. Benedict contains directions for the recital of the Gloria after each psalm. The custom of closing a psalm with a doxology is derived from the tradition of the Synagogue. We ourselves chant the Jewish Doxologies, or "Benedictions," as part of the psalm itself. They are the concluding verses of Pss. xl., lxxi., lxxxviii., cv.; that is, one has been inserted at the end of each of the first four books of the Hebrew Psalter. The Ps. cl., terminating the fifth and last book, is regarded as wholly a Doxology. It will be sufficient here to cite that placed after both Books I. and IV: "Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel a saeculo et usque in saeculum. Fiat, Fiat." In Ps. cv. there is even inserted the rubric that "all people shall say" the double Amen, "Fiat, Fiat." A further rubric is given after the Doxology of David's psalm on placing the Ark in the Tabernacle (1 Paral. xvi. 36). The people are not only to answer Amen, but to follow up the psalm with a "hymn" now represented by the responsories, versicles, and the like that follow the Christian liturgical psalmody. (Benedict XIV. "De Missa"; Kraus, art. *Doxologia*; Filion, "La Sainte Bible commentée"; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc.")

DREAMS arise, according to St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 95, a. 6), from interior or exterior causes. Among the former he enumerates the thoughts which occupied the mind in waking hours, and the state of the body. Among the latter, the effect produced on the bodily organs by material things—*e.g.* cold and heat, sound or light, &c.—and also the influence of good or evil spirits. It is reasonable to believe that God may speak to the soul through dreams, for the influence of God extends to sleeping as well as to waking hours; and that God has used dreams as a means of revealing His will is fully attested by the Old and the New Testament (see Gen. xx. 3, 7, xl. 5, Num. xii. 6, Mt. ii. 12, xxvii. 19). Accordingly, to regard dreams proceeding from merely physical causes as indications of a future with which they have no natural connection, is superstitious and therefore sinful. It is also, of course, unlawful to seek or accept signs of future events in dreams from demons. But, on the other hand, if there are grave reasons for doing so, we may lawfully believe that a dream has been sent by God for our instruction. But it is to be noted that a disposition to trust in dreams is always superstitious, for in the Christian dispensation there is a strong presumption against their use as means of foretelling the future. Even in the Old Testament the greater number of predictive dreams were given to those outside the Jewish covenant. If given to God's servants, they were given to them, as a rule, in the period of their earliest and most imperfect knowledge of Him.[1] In the New Testament, often as we read of ecstasies and visions, dreams are never mentioned as a vehicle of revelation, and they rarely occur in the lives of the saints. (Souvay in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Hefele-Leclerq, ii. 1114.

DUEL. A fight between two persons (or several pairs of persons), the place, time, and weapons having been previously settled by mutual agreement. In one case such an agreement is lawful—viz. when in time of war such a contest is arranged between two or more soldiers of the opposing armies. In such a case the duel may be considered part of the war, and such duels, when the issue of the war has been made to depend on them, may even be regarded as a merciful way of settling a public quarrel (2 Kings xvii.).

In all other cases duels are strictly forbidden by the Church. It was the custom among the German nations to permit accuser and accused to settle their dispute by duel, and this mode of decision was looked upon as an appeal to the judgment of God. It was long before the Church could eradicate this superstition, and for a time provincial councils seem to have contented themselves with moderating it.[2] However, the Council of Valence (855) absolutely prohibited duels, imposing penance for homicide on the man who killed his antagonist, and depriving a man slain in duel of the Church's prayers.[3] Among modern nations it was long the common practice to settle affairs of honour by duel, and against this custom the Church has vigorously protested. Julius II. published a bull strongly condemning it in 1510[4]; while the Council of Trent excommunicated all who engaged in duels, and those who counselled or promoted them, besides depriving persons who died in a duel of Christian burial (sess. xxv. c. 19, De Ref.). The Holy See has condemned the excuses which have been made for this detestable practice. Thus Benedict XIV., in 1752, censured those who taught that a man might accept a duel to save his reputation for courage, or to keep

[1] In Joel ii. 28, it has been thought that dreams mark the decay, visions the flower of strength.

[2] See the decrees of Dingolfing and Reuching in the eighth century. Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 962, 966.

[3] Fleury, livr. xlix. 23.

[4] *Ibid*, Contin. livr. cxxi, 81.

his post as an officer in the army. Moreover, theologians teach that such excuses do not save a man from sin against the natural law, or from incurring ecclesiastical penalties.[1] The moral theologians treat of duelling under the Fifth Commandment. (See also Fourneret in DThC; V. Cathrein in "Cath. Enc.")

DULIA. [See CULTUS.]

DUPLICATION (*Binatio, Binage*). The celebrating of two Masses by a priest on the same day. [See MASS, p. 567.]

DYING, PRAYERS FOR. [See COMMENDATION OF SOUL.]

E

EASTER DUTIES. [See COMMUNION, p. 209.]

EASTER, FEAST OF. The feast of our Lord's resurrection. The word Easter is derived from that of the Saxon goddess Eástre, the same deity whom the Germans proper called Ostarâ, and honoured (according to Grimm, in his "German Mythology") as the divinity of the dawn. Bede ("De Temp. Rat." xv.) tells us that the Anglo-Saxons called the spring month Eosturmonath, and similarly Eginhard ("Vit. Car. Mag." 29) calls our April, Ostarmanoth. Naturally, therefore, the Teutonic nations called the great Church-feast which fell at the beginning of spring Easter, and the name continued among us, like such names as Thursday, long after the heathen goddess had been forgotten.[2] All other Christians call the feast of Christ's resurrection by some modification of *pascha*, the term which the Church herself uses in her liturgy. This term is of Jewish origin, and therefore we must begin with a few words on the feast of Pasch, or Passover, from which the Christian feast is in a certain sense derived.[3]

Passover is a literal translation of the Hebrew name for the feast—viz. פֶּסַח; from this we get the Chaldee פַּסְחָא and from the last the πάσχα[4] or pasch of the New Testament and of Christian writers. The Passover, then, or Pasch, was the feast celebrated on the 14th of Nisan, instituted in commemoration of the wonderful deliverance which God wrought for the Jews on the night of their exit from Egypt. The destroying angel smote the first-born of Egypt but passed over (פָּסַח)[5] the houses of the Hebrews. This deliverance was granted on a certain condition. Each head of a Hebrew house was to slay a lamb or kid without blemish on the evening of Nisan 14. He was to sprinkle its blood on the lintel and side-posts of the door. Afterwards, the lamb was to be roasted, no bone being broken, and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs by all the family, no uncircumcised person, however, being allowed to partake of it, and the feast was to be observed year by year as a perpetual ordinance of the Jewish people.

It is certain that Christ observed the Passover the night before He died, that He made it the occasion of instituting the Eucharist, and that He, in His Passion, was the true paschal lamb prefigured by the lamb of the old Hebrew feast. Thus St. John calls special attention to the fact that not a bone of our Lord was broken on the cross; and St. Paul, writing probably just before the Passover of A.D. 58, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, v. 7, 8, says "Purge out the old leaven that you may be a new lump, as you are unleavened; for also our πάσχα or passover Christ has been sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast . . . in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Christ, St. Paul argues, is the true paschal lamb, and the life of Christians is to be a perpetual feast of thanksgiving for the deliverance they have obtained by Christ's blood. As the Jews removed leaven from their houses at the time of Passover, so Christians are to purge away once for all the leaven of malice and wickedness.

The celebration of a special Paschal or Easter feast among Christians goes back to the earliest days, though it is impossible to determine the date of its introduction. When St. Polycarp came to Rome, about 160, there were two modes prevalent among Christians of celebrating the Easter, and apostolic precedent was pleaded on each side. The Roman Church and the great majority of Christians celebrated the Pasch on the Sunday after Nisan 14—*i.e.* on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, because on that day Christ rose again, finished the work of redemption, and accomplished our deliverance from the Egyptian bondage of death and hell. But besides this feast they also celebrated on the previous Friday the memory of Christ's death, and for a long time this latter day also was called Pasch. Thus, Tertullian, about the year 200, distinguishes between the Pasch on which there was a strict obligation of fasting, and on which, too, the usual kiss of peace was omitted—*i.e.* our Good Friday—and the other Pasch, between which and Pentecost Christians stood at

[1] St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.* lib. iii. 399 *seq.*
[2] Hefele, *Beiträge*, ii. p. 285.
[3] Smith's *Dict. Christ. Ant.* "Easter."
[4] Many among the early Christians, being ignorant of Hebrew, derived it from πάσχειν, to suffer. This derivation, worthless of course in itself, deserves notice, for it influenced their language and ideas of the feast.
[5] See Exod. xii. 13, 23, 27, and cf. Is. xxxi. 5. Philo in his *Life of Moses*, iii. 29, translates it διαβατήρια. Of course the account of the Jewish is merely meant as an introduction to that of the Christian feast.

prayer instead of kneeling—*i.e.* our Easter Sunday.[1] Later writers distinguish these two days from each other as the Pasch of the crucifixion and resurrection (*πάσχα σταυρώσιμον καὶ ἀναστάσιμον*).

The Roman Church claimed to follow the practice of St. Peter and St. Paul on this matter. On the other hand, the Churches of Asia Proconsularis (part of Asia Minor), appealing to the authority of St. John, ended this time of fasting and kept the feast of Passover or Pasch at the same time as the Jews—viz. 14 Nisan—on whatever day it might fall. On this day, as they maintained,[2] our Lord kept the Pasch and instituted the Eucharist. On the same day, therefore, they celebrated the memory of the institution and of our joyful deliverance by Christ's death. As they kept the Jewish day, though not the Jewish feast, they were called "Observants" (*τηροῦντες*), and as this day fell on Nisan 14, they were also called "Quartodecimani." Polycarp and Pope Anicetus (167–175) discussed the matter, and though no agreement was reached each party was allowed to continue its own custom in peace. The matter, however, led to sharp discussion, about 190, between Pope Victor and Polycrates of Ephesus, and Victor was near excommunicating the Asiatics. The intercession of Gallic bishops, especially Irenaeus, kept matters from coming to this pass.[3] The Quartodeciman practice was finally set aside by the Nicene Council (325). The same council settled further the way in which Easter Sunday was to be reckoned, as has been shown in the article CYCLE. (See Hefele-Leclercq, i. 133, 450.)

As is well known, the question of the date of Easter was one of those agitated between St. Augustine and the British bishops, and in regard to which for a long time afterwards the Celtic use differed from that of the Universal Church. This does not mean that the Celts were Quartodecimans. They loyally accepted the decision of Nicaea and always celebrated Easter on the Sunday following the March full moon, and in cases of doubt modelling their practice on Roman usage in preference to that of Alexandria.[4] (See the "Annales Cambriae.") The trouble arose because to ensure greater accuracy Rome, after the invasion of the Barbarians, and when intercourse with the Britons had become difficult, had adopted an improved cycle (*which see*) and thus the *particular* Sunday appointed for Easter was not always identical in the calculation newly introduced and in that retained out of a spirit of conservatism by the British and Irish Churches. The controversy is best illustrated by supposing the Catholics of Russia to insist on keeping to the Old Style with the rest of their countrymen in place of antedating festivals as is correctly done by other Europeans—a question manifestly of discipline and not in itself bearing upon doctrine at all.

Easter is, as St. Leo calls it, the "feast of feasts," the greatest of Christian solemnities. Down to the twelfth century each day in Easter week was a holiday of obligation. Afterwards this was the case only with the first three days, and now even Easter Monday and Tuesday are only days of devotion. All moveable feasts are calculated from Easter. The joyful character of the time is marked in the services of the Church—*e.g.* by the chanting of the "Vidi Aquam" instead of the "Asperges" before Mass; by the constant repetition of the "Alleluia" in Mass and office all through the Paschal season—*i.e.* till Trinity Sunday. On Easter Sunday the office is very short, because in old times the services were prolonged far into the night of Holy Saturday, so that little time was left for the matins and lauds of Easter Sunday. The short office is continued during the week, probably, as Benedict XIV. and Martène say, because the first day determined the office for the days that followed, and because there would have been a special inconvenience in changing it in a week when so many neophytes had just been baptized and were taking part for the first time in the full service of the Church. (See Benedict XIV. "De Fest."; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," ch. xi.)

EASTERN CHURCHES. Those bodies of Christians, whether uniat or schismatical, which do not form part of the patriarchate of the West. This definition, which is not altogether satisfactory, is the best that can be given. Thus, the Greek Orthodox Church (schismatical) and the Greek Melchite Church (uniat) are "Eastern" Churches because they are no part of the Western (Roman) patriarchate; but the Church in India is not an "Eastern" Church because, though it is situated in the East, it does form part of the Western patriarchate. The Eastern Churches, both uniat and schismatical—have rites of their own, distinct from the Western rites; and the uniats and schismatics of each Church, though differing in faith, use much the same rites. The Eastern uniats, with the members of the Western patriarchate, together form the Catholic Church, holding the same faith in union with the successor of St. Peter, notwithstanding differences of rite.

In classifying the Eastern Churches it is best to consider the historical circumstances under which they broke away from Catholic unity. We shall find that they are eight in number:

[1] Tertull. *De Orat.* 18, *PL*, i. 1176; *De Coron.* 3, *ib.* ii. 79.

[2] The point, however, is very doubtful. *Primâ facie*, the first three Gospels appear to imply this. St. John seems to say that Christ died on the day of the Passover—*i.e.* on Nisan 14, the Passover beginning on the evening of that day.

[3] Euseb. *H.E.* v. 24.

[4] Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i. p. 152.

1. The Orthodox Greek Church, or rather group of Churches, due to the heresy and schism of Photius and Caerularius in the ninth and eleventh centuries. [See GREEK (SCHISMATIC) CHURCH.] The Greek Uniats are called Melchites [*q.v.*].

2. The Nestorian Church arose from the Nestorian heresy, its members refusing to accept the definition of the Council of Ephesus. [See NESTORIANS and EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF.] Those who have returned to the faith and unity of the Church are called Christians of the Chaldean Rite. [See CHALDEAN RITE.]

3. Coptic Church. [See COPTS.]

4. Abyssinian Church [*q.v.*].

5. Jacobite Church. [See JACOBITE CHRISTIANS.]

6. Malabar Church. [See THOMAS, ST., CHRISTIANS OF.]

7. Armenian Church. [See ARMENIAN CHRISTIANS.]

These last five Churches are all connected with the Monophysite heresy. [See MONOPHYSITES.] At different times a number of them have returned to the Catholic Church as mentioned in the articles referred to above.

8. Maronite Church. [See MARONITES.] This Church, which once professed the Monothelite heresy [see MONOTHELITES], has been entirely converted to the Catholic Church.

(On the whole subject see Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," "The Lesser Eastern Churches," and "Cath. Enc." *Eastern Churches*; Duchesne, "Églises Séparées"; Kattenbusch, "Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionalkunde"; Lequien, "Oriens Christianus.")

EBIONITES. Judaizing Christians, and the direct successors of the Judaizers whom St. Paul opposed so strenuously—*e.g.* in the Epistle to the Galatians. As a distinct sect the Ebionites seem to have made themselves first known in the reign of Trajan. Although they were connected by origin with the Church of Jerusalem, and had their headquarters near the Dead Sea, they were not confined to Palestine, but were found in Rome and probably also in the other great cities of the empire. They held that the Jewish law was still binding on all Christians; and, consequently, they rejected the authority of St. Paul, whom they treated as an apostate. Christ, they said, was a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, distinguished by his strict observance of the law. It is a probable conjecture that after the final destruction of Jerusalem the Judaizing Christians received large accessions from the Essenes; and, in any case, it is certain that Ebionitism became mixed up with ascetic and mystical elements foreign to its original character. According to this mystical Ebionitism; still existing in the forged homilies and Recognitions of Clement, the law of Moses had been corrupted, and by a capricious process they continued to remove from it all that was distasteful to them, specially the law of sacrifice. They held that the Word of God had been incarnate in several Christs, of whom Adam was the first, Jesus the last. Early in the third century, one of the Ebionites brought to Rome the book of Elchasai, or "hidden wisdom," in which the same mystical Ebionitism was propounded. In the fourth century the Ebionites were still pretty numerous in eastern Palestine, but in the following age they had almost disappeared. Carefully to be distinguished from the Ebionites are the Nazarenes whom Jerome mentions as living in his time on the east of Jordan. These latter, probably the descendants of the old Jewish Christians of Jerusalem, though they observed the law, did not lay it upon others, admitted St. Paul's authority, and possibly held orthodox doctrine on the divinity of Christ.

The name Ebionite means "poor" (Heb. אֶבְיוֹנִים), and most likely was adopted to indicate the Apostolic or Essene poverty which they professed. A founder called "Ebion" is an uncritical fiction which appears very early. (Justin, "Dial. c. Tryph." 47; Iren. i. 26; Euseb. "H.E." iii. 27; and, among modern books, Lightfoot on Galatians, p. 311 *sqq.*)

ECCLESIASTIC (PERSON). [See CLERGY; CLERK.]

ECSTASY (ἔκστασις). A state in which a man passes out of himself—*i.e.* out of that state of cognition which is natural to him. Ecstasy is usually taken as equivalent to rapture, though the word rapture, unlike ecstasy, implies distinctly that the person subject to it is carried out of his own control and placed in a state which he does not reach by natural inclination. Such rapture or ecstasy, St. Thomas says, may proceed from bodily causes; as, for example, if a person is alienated from his senses by disease; or it may be wrought by the agency of devils; or, lastly, it may come from the Spirit of God. In this last state, St. Thomas continues, a man, being withdrawn from the senses, is raised to the contemplation of supernatural things (*spiritu divino elevatus ad supernaturalia cum abstractione a sensibus*).

Such ecstasies or raptures are, of course, frequently mentioned in the Old and New Testaments, and have occurred in the lives of many saints. In ecstatic prayer, according to a mystical writer (Antony a Spiritu Sancto), the body seems as if dead, and the senses are suspended; but the will, as St. Theresa points out, retaining full power, is absorbed in God. True rapture unites the soul to God, increases humility, &c. If these effects are not present or are not lasting, a director may generally conclude that the rapture is not supernatural. Still more may

he do so if he sees in the person who pretends to ecstasy a love of extraordinary gifts rather than of solid virtue. (St. Thomas, 1ª 2æ, q. 28, a. 3; 2ª 2æ, q. 175; St. Theresa, "Autobiog." Engl. transl. ch. xx., in which useful extracts from the mystics are given.)

ECTHESIS. [See MONOTHELITES.]

EDICT OF MILAN. [See PERSECUTIONS.]

EDUCATION. The moral and intellectual discipline by which the human faculties are trained and unfolded, in subordination to a certain end. If no end or object is proposed to himself by the educator beyond that of making the most of his pupil's faculties, he does not educate, but merely informs. For the domain of knowledge extends in every direction to infinity; and the pupil who simply learns all that his faculties enable him to learn necessarily becomes, unless of a very marked idiosyncrasy, a *dilettante*, a sciolist—one who knows a little of everything, but is not truly educated. Something like this is said to be the observed effect of the training given in the common schools of the United States, in which no dominant idea, or one wholly inadequate—such as that of the greatness of the Republic, or the excellence of democracy—supplies teachers and pupils with a compass to steer by.

Education, however, may, and must, be directed to several ends simultaneously; for, as man is a complex being, and has himself various ends—*e.g.* as a subject of God, as a subject of Caesar, as a member of a family, &c.—so the education of man must propose to itself several ends. Of these some one must be chief and paramount, and must direct the form and measure in which the other ends are to be pursued; otherwise the school would be the battle-ground of independent forces, each struggling for the mastery; and the result would be confusion. Now, since the object of education is to form man, the prime end, in subordination to which it must be conducted, must be identical with the prime end of man himself. What this is we learn from the Catechism: it is to know and serve God in this life, and to enjoy Him for ever in the next. In subordination to this main end all educational processes are to be carried on. Human beings ought to be so educated that they may know God here, and through that knowledge possess Him hereafter. How, then, are they to obtain this necessary knowledge? The Catholic answer is, that they must seek and receive it at the hands of the one divinely-appointed and infallible witness of the revelation by which He has made Himself known to mankind—the Catholic and Roman Church. It thus appears that, in the logical order, the first and highest authority in all that regards education is the Church. With her sanction it should be commenced, and under her superintendence it should be continued; for were her intervention to be excluded at any stage, there would be danger lest those under education came to mistake one of the subordinate ends of man for his main end, to their own and others' detriment.

At the same time, it must not be forgotten that man is a social being. The opinion of the best writers (see, for instance, De Maistre's examination of Rousseau's "Contrat Social") is, that man was originally created and adapted for society, not that society arose out of a compromise between the warring cupidities of originally isolated savages. If human society be aboriginal, then power in that society—*i.e.* government—is also aboriginal, since without it—man being what he is—we cannot conceive it possible for society to subsist. This power, St. Paul tells us,[1] is "from God." Its main object is, to secure the permanence and temporal welfare, so far as the circumstances admit, of the society itself and of each member of the society. For this the power exists; and it is therefore entitled to take all measures required to enable it to fulfil its functions. Now, one of the conditions without which these functions could not be effectively discharged is a control over education. The organized power in society—in other words, the State—may reasonably require that all its citizens should early receive that mental and moral training which may dispose them to restrain anti-social passions, to obey the laws, and by industry to promote their own and the public welfare. Whatever control over the machinery of education may be necessary to secure the attainment of this end, that control the State may reasonably pretend to. Its claims only become unjust and oppressive when, ignoring the still more sacred right of the Church to secure in education the attainment of man's highest end, it compels or tempts Catholics to place their children in schools which the ecclesiastical authority has not sanctioned. The end pursued by the Church is primary; that pursued by the State is secondary. Each may justly demand that its authority be recognized; but the injury caused by disallowing the authority of the Church is more serious than in the contrary case, by how much that which affects man's eternal interest is more important than that which affects his temporal interest only.

A third authority in education is that of the family, the head of which is under a moral obligation to see that all its members receive such a training as may fit them to maintain their place in the social hierarchy of their country, keep up all sound family traditions, and—should that be necessary, as in most cases it is—earn their own living. Catholic parents are, of course, bound also to see that the teaching in the schools to which they send their children has ecclesi-

[1] Rom. xiii. 1.

astical sanction, and to resist all attempts to make them patronize schools without that sanction.

It thus appears that education has three principal ends—the first religious, the second political, the third domestic; but that among these the religious end takes the lead and dominates over the other two, on account of its intrinsically greater importance. And since, as explained above, we cannot walk securely in religion one step except in union with and obedience to the Church, every well-instructed Catholic understands that the Church must preside over the education of Catholics at every stage and in every branch, so far as to see that they are sufficiently instructed in their religion. With regard to non-Catholics, who in modern times are often mixed with Catholics in the same school, the Church accepts in practice what is called the "Conscience Clause." [See the articles SCHOOLS and UNIVERSITY, in which the practical means of reconciling the concurrent authorities of Church and State in the work of education are considered.]

ELECTION. (1) [See PREDESTINATION.] (2) In canon law, the act of choosing a fit person for a vacant post. The form to be observed is as follows. All who are entitled to vote must be summoned, under pain of nullity if a third part of the electors are passed over. Those who are unable to attend may send a procurator. The actual choice may be made in one of three ways: by inspiration [see ACCLAMATION], by scrutiny, or by compromise. The second, which is that most commonly used, must be conducted according to fixed rules. Three members should be nominated to act as scrutineers, to collect the votes and to publish the result. The votes are given secretly by word of mouth or on slips of paper, and must be absolute. The candidate who has obtained the votes of the majority present is considered to have gained. It should be noted that a mere majority is not enough. Thus, if one candidate obtains eight votes, another seven, and another three, no one has the requisite majority; but the voting must be renewed until one of them obtains at least ten votes. When at length the number has been reached, the choice is made in the name of the whole body. Should no candidate after repeated scrutinies succeed in getting the requisite number of votes, the choice passes to the Prelate or Superior to whom pertains the confirming of the election. An election by compromise is effected by selecting, in the first instance, an arbitrator or compromiser, to whom the electoral body gives the power of choosing. Papal elections are governed by special regulations. [See CONCLAVE.] (Ferraris; Taunton; Roland and Ortolan in DThC.)

ELEVATION. The Church has adored the Blessed Sacrament from the time of its institution. St. Ambrose says "We adore in the mysteries the flesh of Christ, which the Apostles adored." "No one eats that flesh," says St. Augustine, "without first adoring it."[1] But the outward signs by which the Church has expressed this adoration have not always been the same.

In the Greek liturgies the elevation of the Eucharist takes place shortly before the communion. Ancient authors tell us how at the elevation the curtains which concealed the sanctuary during the rest of the canon were drawn aside and the sacred mysteries presented by the priest for the adoration of the faithful. Formerly in the Latin Mass the Blessed Sacrament was elevated only at the words "*omnis honor et gloria*" just before the "Pater Noster." This is now usually known as "the little elevation." The elevation of Host and chalice immediately after consecration was introduced in detestation of the denial of transubstantiation by Berengarius. It seems to have begun about 1100, for the ancient Ordines Romani and the liturgical writers Amalarius, Walafrid, and the author of the "Micrologus" are silent concerning it. Even after 1100 it was the Host only which was elevated in some churches, and, indeed, the Carthusians even now have no real elevation of the chalice. The further custom of ringing a small bell at the elevation began in France during the twelfth century, was introduced into Germany in 1203 by Cardinal Gui, legate of the Holy See, and is enjoined in several English Councils. About the same time the ringing of the large bell at the conventual Mass was ordered in the statutes of some monastic orders. Ivo of Chartres, who died in 1115, congratulates Maud, Queen of England, on having presented the church of Our Lady at Chartres with bells which were rung at the consecration. (Le Brun, "Explication des Cérémonies de la Messe"; Benedict XIV. "De Miss."; Rock, iv. 180 *sqq.*; Thurston, "Cath. Enc."; Mangenot in DThC; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 337 *sqq.*)

ELVIRA, COUNCIL OF. The first of the Spanish councils was held at Elvira (*Illiberis*), an ancient city of Andalusia, now in ruins. The exact date is a matter of controversy among the critics. Some have placed it as late as 324, others (*e.g.* Morinus as early as 250. Hefele places it in the autumn of 305–6; Leclercq about 300. The acts of the council are a proof of the wonderful extension of the Church in Spain at the opening of the fourth century, and also of the corruption which had found its way among her adherents. The canons, eighty-one in number, deal with matters of discipline—*e.g.* baptism, marriage, the relations of Christians with pagans, Jew and heretics, and especially also with the clergy. Canon 33 contains the

[1] Ambros. *De Spir. San.* iii. 12, *PL*, xvi. 794 August. *In Ps. xcviii.*, apud Le Brun.

earliest ordinance as to the celibacy of the clergy. Canon 36, forbidding pictures in churches, has been explained in different ways. De Rossi was of opinion that there was no question of the absolute prohibition of pictures, seeing that we have numberless examples of works executed in Spain in primitive times; but what the council condemns is the painting of pictures on the walls (*in parietibus*) of the upper churches, as opposed to the catacombs, on account of their being exposed to profanation or caricature by the pagans. This view was accepted by Hefele, but seems far-fetched. Turmel (followed by Leclercq) takes the canon in its natural sense of prohibiting pictures altogether, but solely as a disciplinary measure on account of the danger to recent converts from paganism, without any dogmatic bearing on the question of the lawfulness of the practice itself. The canons are given in full in Hefele-Leclercq, i. 221–264. Baronius looked upon them as Novatian in their tendencies, but Mendoza and Natalis Alexander strenuously defend their orthodoxy. (See Hefele-Leclercq, i. 212; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," i. 502; Funk, "Theol. Quartal." 1883, p. 270 *sqq.*; De Rossi, "Roma Sotterranea," i. 97, iii. 475; Turmel, "Rev. du Clergé Français," t. xlv. p. 508; Bareille in DThC.)

EMBER DAYS[1] (*quattuor tempora*). The Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday which follow December 13, the First Sunday in Lent, Pentecost, and September 14 (Exaltation of the Cross), are days of fasting, and are called in English Ember Days, in the Breviary and Missal "Quattuor Tempora," because these days of fasting recur in each quarter of the year. The Ember Days were observed at Rome in St. Augustine's time—nay, so ancient was the practice of observing them in that city that St. Leo ascribes an Apostolic origin to the fast. The same Pope says the object of the fast is that we may purify our souls and do penance as we begin each quarter of the year. The fast was introduced here by St. Augustine, the Apostle of England. At first the weeks in which the Ember Days occur were not definitely fixed, and even in the eleventh century a German council speaks of the Ember fast as *jejunium incertum*. Special fasts before Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost may be regarded as always having been of universal observance; but of the Ember Days, or fasts of the four seasons as such, there is no trace in the Eastern Church. According to ancient custom the clergy are ordained only on the Saturdays of the Ember weeks, while the whole Church fasts and prays. (See Acts xiii. *ad init.*; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. vii. 2.)

[1] It may be regarded as nearly certain that the English word is not derived from "ember," in the sense of ashes. It may come from the Anglo-Saxon *ymbren*, a revolution or circuit. But more probably it is a corruption of the Latin *quattuor tempora*. The Dutch *Quatertemper*, German *Quatember*, Danish *Kvatember*, exhibit the corruption in its process. (From Smith and Cheetham.)

EMBOLISMUS (also *Embolis* and *Embolum*). Literally a prayer "thrown in" or "intercalated." It consists in an extension of the last clause in the Lord's Prayer, "Libera nos a malo," and occurs in most of the liturgies, Roman, Mozarabic, Gallican, Coptic, Armenian, &c. In the Eastern liturgies it occurs immediately before the Communion; in the Roman Mass, the embolismus ("Libera nos, quaesumus, Domine") is followed by the breaking of the host, the Pax with the accompanying prayer, two prayers in preparation for Communion, and then by the Communion itself. In the Mozarabic rite the two *mementos* are embodied in the "Libera nos" or Embolismus, possibly their primitive position in the West. In the old Gallican rite the formula of the Embolismus varied from Mass to Mass. (Fortescue, "The Mass," 362.)

Embolismus is also used by some mediaeval writers instead of Epact. (Kraus, "Real-Encykl." [*q.v.*].)

EMINENCE (title of a Cardinal). Before 1630 the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church were addressed by the titles of "Most Illustrious" and "Your most illustrious Lordship" (*dominatio*); but in that year Urban VIII., by a consistorial decree, ratified and confirmed the report of the Congregation of Rites, recommending that the titles "Most Eminent" and "Your Eminence" should for the future be substituted for the above, and strictly confined (with the sole exception of the Master of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem) to the Cardinals; so that, on the one hand, if anyone, however highly placed (those of imperial and royal rank excepted), should address a Cardinal by any other title, no notice should be taken of his letter, and, on the other, any prelate of whatever rank, assuming these titles, was to be under the displeasure of the Roman Pontiff, and liable to various severe penalties. (Ferraris, *Cardinales*, art. 2.)

EMPIRE, THE HOLY ROMAN. The empire founded by Charlemagne with the aid of the Roman Pontiffs had come to nothing through the degeneracy of his descendants. In 962 it was revived, through the coronation of Otho I., King of Germany, by Pope John XII., and this was called the transfer of the empire from the Franks to the Germans (*translatio imperii a Francis ad Germanos*). The institution so founded lasted for eight centuries and a half, and in the course of ages German publicists meditating upon its theory and its powers invented for it the above designation. It was the *Roman* empire, for it represented and revived the empire of Charlemagne, which again, according to the ideas of Latin Christendom, represented and replaced the old Byzantine empire, which had fallen into heresy. It was also the *Holy* Roman

empire, and this not merely because it was erected with the benediction of the Roman Pontiff, but also because, whereas the old Roman empire was Pagan, this was Christian, and was bound to use that universal dominion which it had inherited in theory from Pagan Rome for the extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ—that is, of the Catholic Church. As the Church was one, not many, and knew but one head on earth, the successor of St. Peter, to whom all nations and all individuals were *de jure* subject in their spiritual concerns, so, according to these reasoners, all temporal dominion was of right summed up in the one empire, governed by the one emperor, under whom, as his viceregents, the kings of the nations ruled in their respective countries. It is needless to remark that this brilliant generalization scarcely emerged out of the region of theory; that it was never countenanced by the Popes; and that the kings of the Franks, the Normans, and the Spanish Goths, whose ancestors had never been subjugated by the Romans, were not likely to surrender an atom of their independence in deference to this figment of Ghibelline lawyers. Yet, so captivating was the idea to the mediaeval mind, that special protests were sometimes deemed necessary, as in the case of the Emperor Sigismund's visit to England in 1416, when as his ship lay off the shore at Dover, and he was preparing to land, the Duke of Gloucester, by Henry V.'s order, rode into the water with his sword drawn and "inquired whether the imperial stranger meant to exercise or claim any authority or jurisdiction in England." [1] The answer being in the negative, he was allowed to land,

The crown of the Holy Roman Empire was elective, this being deemed, probably from the example of Papal elections, a more august mode of appointment than hereditary descent. The electors for a long period were seven in number, four secular princes, and three ecclesiastical; afterwards they became eight, and finally nine. Nevertheless the imperial crown tended to become hereditary, and from the accession of Albert in 1437 to the end the only emperors not of the house of Hapsburg were Charles VII. and Francis I. An important Papal right was that of crowning the Christian Roman Emperor. This was first exercised by St. Leo III. who crowned Charlemagne in St. Peter's on Christmas Day A.D. 800, and last by Clement VII. who crowned Charles V. at Bologna, February 23, 1530. The latter's successor, Ferdinand I., and those who followed him, ignored the Papal claim altogether; and hence in Ecclesiastical Law were always designated as "Imperatores Electi" (see Missal rubrics). The first Napoleon, aiming at reviving in his own person the empire of Charlemagne, insisted after Austerlitz on the suppression of the ancient title; this was done in 1806, the reigning emperor taking the title of Emperor of Austria.

The new German Empire, founded by William I. in 1871, has no pretension to be the successor of the ancient empire. The official style of the present sovereign is "German Emperor," that is "Emperor in Germany," instead of "Emperor of Germany." (See Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire.")

ENCLOSURE (*clausura*). Enclosure is that rule of the Church which separates a convent from the world by the prohibition or restriction of intercourse with persons outside its walls. From the nature of the case, since preaching and other active ministerial duties are incompatible with enclosure, only a certain proportion of the orders of men observe it; and in the case of these it relates principally to the admission of women to the interior of the monastery. Hence the term is commonly used of nunneries rather than of the convents of men. The Church desires that the entrance of any person into religion should be his or her free and voluntary act, done with a pure intention; and she enjoins that a postulant of whatsoever age or condition be twice (with a year's interval) closely examined on these points by the bishop.[1] She will not allow a postulant of either sex to be professed before the completion of the sixteenth year, and at least a year of probation, after taking the habit, must precede the profession.[2] Having thus provided, so far as possible, that persons of weak resolution and unstable character shall not be professed, she surrounds them, when once professed, with rigorous safeguards, with a view to minimize to the utmost that peril of inconstancy to which frail human nature is ever liable. The Council of Trent ordered that where the enclosure of nuns had been broken, it should be restored by the bishops, who were for the future to maintain it most strictly. "Let it not be lawful for any nun after her profession to go out of her convent, even for a short time, on any pretext whatever, except for some legitimate cause to be approved by the bishop, notwithstanding any indults and privileges whatsoever. And let no persons, whatever be their rank, condition, sex, or age, be allowed to enter within the enclosed part of the convent unless with the leave of the bishop or superior, given in writing, under pain of incurring excommunication *ipso facto*." [3] The "legitimate cause" was interpreted to extend only to three things—fire, leprosy, or some epidemic disease; but according to Barbosa other grounds are admissible: for instance, the danger, in time of war, of a convent falling into the hands of an undisciplined soldiery. The prohibition against anyone entering the convent prevents

[1] Lingard, vol. iii. p. 505.

[1] Concil. Trid. sess. xxv. De Reg. et Mon. c. 17, 18.
[2] *Ibid.* c. 15.
[3] *Ibid.* c. 5.

the chaplain or any other priest from entering the part of the church where the nuns sing, and requires that even the bishop, when the nuns are electing an abbess or other functionary, shall take their votes at the grate and not elsewhere. But there are certain cases of necessary exception: as when a nun is too ill to go to the confessional in the church, in which case the confessor must go to her cell and the sacraments must be taken to her; medical men and surgeons have also to be admitted, and some persons of the tradesman class; but these must always be accompanied by two of the older nuns. A bishop has power to order that no one shall go to a nunnery, even for the purpose of conversation at the grille, unless with his or his commissary's permission. (Ferraris, *Clausura.*)

It is, however, important to note that the legislation of the Church on enclosure applies, in its full strictness, only to the monasteries of real "*moniales*," and not to the numerous modern congregations of women bound by *simple* vows, whose convents are more properly called *conservatoria.* [See CLOISTER.]

ENCRATITES (*ἐγκρατεῖς, ἐγκρατῖται*). A Gnostic sect founded by Tatian in the latter part of the second century. Tatian was by birth an Assyrian, taught rhetoric at Rome and became a Christian under the influence of Justin Martyr. After Justin's death his exaggerated theories on the evil inherent in matter led into definite heresy. According to Irenaeus (i. 28), he adopted a fanciful system of "aeons" similar to that of Valentinus and Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." iii. p. 548, ed. Potter); he belonged to the class of anti-Jewish Gnostics —*i.e.* he denied the divine origin of the Mosaic law. He denounced marriage as impurity, and made his followers abstain from animal food. Hence the name Encratites or "Continent." This false asceticism, which had its origin in the East, was widely diffused in early times, so that we need not be surprised to hear of "Encratites" or false ascetics who may really have had no connection with Tatian. Such were the Aquarii or *ὑδροπαραστάται*, so called because, regarding wine as evil, they would use water only in the celebration of the Eucharist. (Neander, "Kirchengeschichte," ii. p. 157; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," i. 51, 510; Bareille in DThC; Salmon in "Dict. Chr. Biog.")

ENCYCLICAL (*literae encyclicae*). Originally a circular letter. In the ecclesiastical sense, an encyclical is a letter addressed by the Pope to all the bishops in communion with him, in which he condemns prevalent errors, or informs them of impediments which persecution, or perverse legislation or administration, opposes in particular countries to the fulfilment by the Church of her divine mission, or explains the line of conduct which Christians ought to take in reference to urgent practical questions, such as education, or the relations between Church and State, or the liberty of the Apostolic See, or instructs and exhorts them in their duties as children of Holy Church. Encyclicals are published for the whole Church, and addressed directly to the bishops, under circumstances which affect the entire Catholic body; while briefs and bulls are determined by circumstances more particular in their nature, and have a more special destination. Encyclicals are not necessarily *ex cathedra* pronouncements, though the Pope could, if he so willed, issue definitions in this way. The faithful are bound to give them a religious assent, interior as well as exterior, and obedience and respect.

In early times the use of the term was not restricted as at present; thus the well-known letter of the Church of Smyrna, describing the martyrdom of Polycarp, is headed Ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκυκλικός, a circular letter; and the same designation was given by St. Cyprian to his letters on the Lapsi. (Ferraris, *Epistolae*, § 15.) [See POPE; CATHEDRA (3); Mangenot in DThC.]

END OF MAN. [See BEATITUDE.]

END OF THE WORLD. [See LAST THINGS.]

ENDOWMENT (Fr. *dotation*, Ger. *Begabung*). Any property permanently set apart, in order that its annual profits may contribute to the support of some institution of public utility or recreation, is an endowment of that institution. An *ecclesiastical* endowment is such property set apart for the support of a church, or of some institution the management of which is in ecclesiastical hands. From the fifth century the Church began to be richly endowed, chiefly with lands; at a later period lordships and jurisdictions were showered upon her, especially in Germany, where the three Prince Bishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves were Electors of the German empire. Our own forefathers, alike in Saxon and Norman times, were full of a generous zeal to secure by endowments the services of a permanent priesthood, and to provide for the competent or splendid celebration of the divine worship. A considerable part of the provision thus made was confiscated and squandered during the Reformation; what remained was, by the effect of the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, transferred to the Anglican body, and is still enjoyed by them. The calamities and oppressions under which English Catholics have existed during the last three centuries, have, till recent times, thrown great obstacles in the way of a renewed flow of endowments. Yet such instances are not quite unknown; we could mention a pious couple near Kendal, who bequeathed a good estate two or three generations ago to found a permanent mission in order to "evangelize the dales"; and

there must be similar cases in other countries. In Scotland and Ireland, no less than in England, the old endowments belonging to the Catholic Church have been either lost or diverted from their original destination. In Scotland, through the extraordinary influence of Knox in the sixteenth century, the greater part of the population embraced the heresy of Calvin, and the Presbyterians of the "Established Kirk" still enjoy what is left of the ancient endowments. In Ireland, the Protestant Church, to which the power of England transferred the tithes and Church lands at the Reformation, was disestablished and nominally disendowed by the Act of 1869; but the compensations were calculated on so liberal a scale as almost to amount to re-endowment. (Ferraris, *Fundatio*; see SUPPRESSION OF MONASTERIES.)

ENERGUMEN (*ἐνεργούμενος—i.e.* worked upon, as by a demon). A word of frequent occurrence in early Christian literature. The energumens correspond to the persons "possessed by a demon" (*δαιμονιζόμενοι*), "tormented" (*ἐνοχλούμενοι*), "overpowered by the devil" (*καταδυναστευόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*), "with an unclean spirit" (*πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχοντες*), who are mentioned in Mt. iv. 24, Lk. vi. 18, Acts x. 38, Acts viii. 7, and elsewhere in the New Testament. In ecclesiastical language the energumens are also called "demoniacs," "possessed of the devil" (*δαιμονιόληπτοι*); and, among the Latins, "arrepti" and "arreptitii," *sc.* "a daemone." We also find (*e.g.* in "Constit. Ap." viii. 12) the word *χειμαζόμενοι—i.e.* "the storm-tossed." The Church derived her belief in demoniacal possession from the words of Christ, who (*e.g.* in Mt. xii. 22 *sqq.*) expressly appeals to the fact of His driving out the devil from the possessed as a proof of His divine mission. The Apologists generally prove the divinity of the Christian religion by the power which the Church had to heal the possessed; and among these Apologists, Tertullian, "Ad Scap." 2, speaks of the healing power as a fact generally recognized and of daily occurrence.

The number of possessed persons, or energumens, in the early Church originated a regular discipline with regard to them. This discipline began in the third century, died out in the East in the course of the following, while in Spain it continued in force till the seventh century. The energumens were divided into baptized and catechumens,[1] the former being examined (to ascertain the reality of the possession) at the altar, the latter outside of the church. Their names were put in a register, they were maintained at the expense of the Christian community, and had dwellings assigned them near the church.[2] They were set to work—*e.g.* in sweeping the church[3]—and led a penitential life. Sometimes the exorcist, with the bishop's approval, exorcized them privately[1]; sometimes the ceremony was performed by the bishop himself assisted by his clergy, after the "Mass of the Catechumens," with prayer, the sign of the cross, and laying on of hands. Other means of exorcism—*e.g.* application of blessed water and salt, of spittle, breathing upon them (*exsufflatio, insufflatio*), in some places anointing, were also used.

The older practice was to debar energumens, except at death, from all the sacraments till they were cured,[2] but the Council of Orange, in 441, admitted them to the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, if they behaved peaceably.[3] They were of course excluded from ordination, or, if ordained, from exercising their orders till their recovery was thoroughly proved. It is impossible to say for certain where they were placed in church; probably those who were violent were placed outside the church, those who were peaceable in the narthex, both classes being called up by the deacon nearer to the altar for the exorcism. When healed, the former energumen fasted for a period varying from twenty to forty days. He was dismissed by the priest, after prayer, and his name was entered in the list of the cured.

The Church, in the Roman Pontifical, still recognizes the possibility of demoniacal possession; but cases of possession are infrequent or infrequently recognized, and the energumens no longer occupy the position and attract the interest which belonged to them in the early Church. [See EXORCISM; POSSESSION.]

ENGLISH CHURCH. *Anglo-Saxon Period.*—The Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, who successively settled in England, unlike the German invaders of Gaul and Italy, did not mix with the conquered race, and appropriate to themselves the higher civilization of their new country. The Britons were either exterminated or driven into the mountains of the West. The conquerors kept their own language almost entirely free from Celtic elements, preserved their German institutions unaltered, and continued their idolatrous worship for a century and a half. Gregory the Great, when still a monk, had admired the fair forms of Saxon slaves exposed for sale in the Roman Forum, and conceived the design of preaching the Gospel to their nation. After his elevation to the Papacy he despatched to England several missionaries, headed by the monk Augustine. They landed in Kent probably in the autumn of 597. Ethelbert, the Saxon king of Kent, consented to receive the missionaries. He listened with attention to the discourse of Augustine, and promised

[1] Council of Orange, i. can. 14, 15.
[2] Concil. Carthag. iv. can. 92. [3] *Ibid.* can. 91.
[1] Concil. Laod. can. 26.
[2] Concil. Illib. (Elvira) can. 29, 37. [3] Can. 14.

the strangers his protection as long as they should remain in his dominions. The protection of the king, and the active support of the queen, who was a Christian, produced the happiest results. On Whitsun Eve, Ethelbert with his nobles received the sacrament of Baptism, and at Christmas 598 as many as 10,000 of his people were similarly regenerated in Christ. Thanks to the wise directions of the Pope, Christianity made rapid progress. In 601 Augustine received from Rome the pallium and a band of new helpers: Mellitus, Paulinus, Justus, and Ruffinianus. Augustine was to consecrate twelve bishops, to make London the metropolitan see of the South, and York that of the North, each metropolitan having twelve suffragans. But this scheme was not carried out. Augustine enlarged an old Roman church in Canterbury, and consecrated it to SS. Peter and Paul. The neighbouring monastery later received the name of its founder. The saint died 604, after a fruitless attempt at union with the British bishops (see BRITISH CHURCH), and was succeeded in the see of Canterbury by Laurence. In Ethelbert's lifetime an episcopal see was founded at Rochester in Kent, and another at London. Ethelbert of Kent and Sebert of Essex died about 616, and were succeeded by pagan princes hostile to the new religion. A reaction set in: Mellitus, bishop of London, and Justus of Rochester, fled first to Canterbury, and thence to Gaul. Laurence was only prevented from joining them in their flight by a dream. In a short time Eadbald the persecutor became a member, and the chief supporter of the Church. Mellitus and Justus came back, and both in turn succeeded Laurence in the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. Peace was not restored in Essex until later. In 625 Paulinus, who had accompanied the princess Ethelberga to York, received from King Edwin permission to preach the Gospel north of the Humber. Edwin himself, after a long resistance, embraced the new faith. His example, his support, and the wonderful zeal of Paulinus soon brought about conversions numerous enough to found a bishopric at York. Paulinus also preached, made conversions, and built churches in the kingdom of Mercia. Penda, the pagan king of Mercia, to stop the progress of the faith, entered into a league with Caedwalla, king of the West Britons, and attacked and killed King Edwin in the battle of Hatfield (633). Paulinus and Queen Ethelberga fled south, Paulinus was made bishop of Rochester, then vacant, and laboured there until 642. Ceadwalla retained hold of Northumbria until 634, when the Christian king Oswald defeated him at Dilston. Oswald had been educated by the Irish monks of Iona, and now invited them to preach the Gospel to his subjects. St. Aidan is the first of a long list of Irish priests and bishops who were destined by God to establish the Christian Church among so many tribes and in so many countries. [See IRISH CHURCH.] They were all monks. Bede, although blaming the Irish missionaries for the tenacity with which they clung to certain of their customs, has yet great admiration for their zeal and holiness. He praises especially St. Aidan, whose meekness and humility won the hearts of the Saxon youths, and secured him many followers. Oswald, like Edwin, fell in a battle against Penda (642). His brother Oswy succeeded at last (655) in freeing the country from the yoke of Penda. The death of the latter and the victory of Oswy mark a turning-point in Christian history—the end of paganism in England.

Redwald, king of East Anglia, had received baptism in Kent, but soon reverted to his heathen worship. His son Eorpwald's conversion (632) was more sincere. Eorpwald's successor, Sigebert, brought over from Burgundy the missionary Felix, who, with the approbation of Archbishop Honorius of Canterbury, established a bishopric at Dunwich (635). About this same time Birinus converted the West Saxons. His episcopal see was Dorchester, afterwards transferred to Winchester. The church only began to flourish in Mercia after the death of Penda. Cedda, Adda, Betti, and Diuma are the great apostles of this kingdom. In Essex also the Gospel again found favour. In 654 Cedda was created bishop of London. Wherever the work of conversion had been either commenced or completed by Irish monks, certain peculiarities of Irish church discipline had been maintained. They referred to the celebration of Easter [*q.v.*], and to the form of the tonsure. Although not doctrinal, these differences were a perpetual source of dissension in the Church. King Oswy of Northumbria convened a synod at Whitby, in which the contending parties should discuss the questions in dispute (664). The principal speakers were Colman, bishop of Lindisfarne, in favour of the Irish or Scotch, and Wilfrid of York, in favour of the Roman practice. The king presided. After learning from Wilfrid's eloquent speeches that the Roman practice was sanctioned by the Council of Nicæa, by the decrees of the Apostolic See, and by the usage of the universal Church, he asked: "Colman, is it so?" Receiving an answer in the affirmative, he resumed with a smile, "Who, then, is the greater in heaven, Columba or Peter?" All replied "Peter." "Then," said the king, "will I obey the decrees of Peter; for if he who has the keys is to shut me out, who is there to let me in?" The bystanders applauded the witticism, and the conference broke up. The result was, that several of the Scottish clergy passed

over to the party of Wilfrid; and Colman, after a short interval, taking with him his own adherents and about thirty natives, returned to his monastery in the isle of Iona. The conference at Whitby established harmony in the Anglo-Saxon church; but many years elapsed before the question was set at rest among the Picts, the Scots, and the Britons. (Bede, iii. 25, 26; Lingard, "Anglo-Saxon Church," ch. i.)

The organization of the English Church was perfected by Theodore of Tarsus, a Greek by birth. He was consecrated by Pope Vitalian (668), and landed in England in 669. The new archbishop visited the whole country, preaching and teaching everywhere. The princes, the clergy, the people received him with testimonies of the most profound respect. In 673 he held a synod at Hertford, at which were present the bishops Bisi, Putta, Leutherius and Winfrid; Wilfrid sent a representative. Ten decrees, chiefly on church discipline, were made, and accepted by the bishops at this synod. Theodore understood the necessity of more bishoprics, and of episcopal sees removed from the seat of temporal power. But in carrying out his reforms he occasionally ventured to transgress the letter of the Canons, conceiving himself justified perhaps by the wants of the people and the anomalous state of the Church. He divided the immense diocese held by Wilfrid into four parts, and gave a new bishop to each. Hence his celebrated dispute with that prelate. Pope Agatho, to whom Wilfrid appealed, seems to have approved Theodore's policy, though he condemned his treatment of the bishop. The same pontiff confirmed to Theodore and his successors the authority which he possessed by a decree published in a council at Rome (697) fixing the number of Anglo-Saxon bishops at twelve, of whom the Bishop of Canterbury should be the metropolitan, and the other eleven his suffragans. Theodore's successor, Brithwald, carried on the work of subdivision, but the increased number of bishops was not yet enough for the spiritual needs of the people. Bede was anxious that the original plan of Gregory the Great should be carried out, but the whole of the dioceses remained united in one single ecclesiastical province until by a decree of Gregory III. (Chron. Sax. anno 735) the bishoprics north of the Humber were formed into a separate province subject to the metropolitan of York, and Egbert, the bishop of that see, was duly invested with the pallium from Rome. Offa, the powerful king of Mercia, obtained from Pope Adrian (787) a decree raising Lichfield to be metropolitan see for East Anglia and Mercia. By authority of Leo III. this decree was set aside (803) and the southern dioceses were once more united into one province. The cathedral chapters remained in the hands of monks, but Theodore made provision for the formation of a secular clergy, and for the establishment of parishes in connection with the manors. Even in time of war, synods were held. National Councils were frequent, the most notable being that of Cloveshoe (747). The organization of the Church paved the way for the unification of the seven kingdoms. The predominance of monks in the Church made ecclesiastical dignities less liable to become as it were hereditary in certain families; the bishops were but little exposed to the bad influences of princely favour. Nowhere, except perhaps in Ireland, was there ever shown the same eagerness to embrace the monastic life: kings, bishops, and nobles abandoned their worldly position to lead a life of solitude with God. Nowhere were the clergy honoured as in England; the priest ranked with the thegn, the bishop with the ealdorman, the archbishop with the atheling. But this honourable status was not without its dangers; it involved the clergy in worldly concerns. Especially after the invasion of the Danes was the discipline of the Church relaxed; it almost seemed that the Northman would bring upon the Anglo-Saxon Church the same ruin which the Anglo-Saxons had brought upon the British Church. Europe owes it to Alfred the Great that the Northmen were unable to found a great monarchy in France and England. The Danes, instead of subjecting the Saxons, became fused with them into one people. During the long wars churches and monasteries had been destroyed and the priests put to death. Religious zeal had all but disappeared. Alfred was obliged to send abroad for monks to fill the monasteries he had rebuilt. He also did much to revive science and art, yet with scanty results. No poet like Caedmon, no historian like Bede, no learned men like Aldhelm and Alcuin, no missionary like Boniface, were forthcoming. Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, and later Archbishop of Canterbury, is the only man of commanding importance during this period. From 943 to 988 this great prelate was the adviser and the right hand of the kings Edred, Edgar, and Edward II., the reformer of Church and clergy. He introduced into the monasteries the strict rule of St. Benedict; he filled the cathedral chapters with monks, and endeavoured to stem the torrent of abuses. Danes and Normans still continued to invade the country, but the monasteries were respected and were almost the only safe refuge during the raids of the invaders. The reign of Ethelred (979–1014) was disastrous to England, and led to the elevation of Canute (1016–1035), whose wise administration to a certain extent remedied the sores of Church and State. Edward the Confessor showed an excellent will, but the baneful influence of the Godwins prevented him from giving it

effect. Simony was rife during his reign, in England as elsewhere, and some unworthy bishops were appointed.

We have devoted a separate article to the examination of the faith and discipline of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

Norman Period, 1066–1216.—The Norman Conquest could not fail to exercise vast influence upon the Church. The Saxon bishops were, for the most part, strenuous supporters of Harold. The power which they wielded over their countrymen made it expedient for William to oust them from their sees and put Norman prelates in their stead. The abuses which had crept in during the long struggles between Saxons, Danes, and Normans gave him a colourable pretext for so high-handed a proceeding. Stigand, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was excommunicated by Pope Alexander II., and was afterwards deprived of his see by the papal legate. It must, however, be acknowledged that the Norman bishops were men of virtue and learning, as, it is fair to add, were not a few of the Saxon prelates, one of whom at the time was St. Wolstan. Lanfranc, St. Osmund, and especially St. Anselm, re-established ecclesiastical discipline and boldly upheld the rights of the Church against the tyranny of their own Norman sovereigns. Although, as we have seen, during the Saxon period the English Church was in communion with and subject to Rome, yet the semi-barbarism and isolation of the country told upon its communications with the rest of Christendom. One of the most important consequences of the Conquest was the establishment of closer connection between England and the Continent. The Norman kings held possessions on both sides of the Channel; their subjects passed freely to and fro from the mainland to the island. Hence we are not surprised to find that the power of the Popes manifested itself more during the early years of the Conquest than during the later years of the Saxon rule. Appeals and pilgrimages to Rome became more frequent, and papal legates visited the country armed with extraordinary powers. A separation was made between ecclesiastical and civil courts, and the canon law was recognized. But these various changes of *personnel* and procedure serve only to bring out the identity between the Saxon and Norman Churches. William and Harold belonged to the same religion; the expelled Saxon bishops differed in no way concerning doctrine from their Norman successors.

But while the Conquest strengthened the position of the Church and brought her into closer union with Rome, it also introduced the elements of strife between the civil and ecclesiastical powers. Under the Saxon kings the extensive lands belonging to the Church had been held by allodial title or in frankalmoign (free alms). According to the feudal system all lands were held of the king by military tenure, and the holders were his vassals. Hence William insisted that all bishops and abbots should go through the ceremony of investiture just like any other barons, and should be subject to the same exactions. Thus bishoprics and abbeys were purposely kept vacant for years together, during which time the king claimed, on the analogy of a lay fief, to receive all the profits for his own use; and when at length a successor was nominated to the vacant benefice, a fine was demanded equivalent at least to the relief which would have been payable by a lay heir. Some account of the history of the struggle will be found in the art. on INVESTITURE. Henry II. was dissatisfied with the compromise accepted by his grandfather (Henry I.) and sought to establish the complete supremacy of the State over the Church. By the Constitutions of Clarendon the ecclesiastical tribunals, established by the Conqueror in accordance with the principles of the Canon Law, were shorn of almost all their authority; ecclesiastical penalties were not to be inflicted without the king's consent; elections to bishoprics and abbacies were to take place in obedience to the king's writ, and the incumbent elect was to do homage to the king before consecration; the chief clergy should be on a footing with the barons as to feudal duties; no ecclesiastic should quit the realm without the royal licence; and no appeals should proceed further than the archbishop's court without the king's consent. The Church found a worthy champion in St. Thomas à Becket. His death secured the downfall of Henry's system.

The reign of John is a most important one in the history of the English Church. Here we find clergy and people banded together to secure their freedom from the royal tyranny. In a disputed election to the see of Canterbury, Innocent III. set aside both the candidates of the king and the chapter, and nominated Stephen Langton, who was already a cardinal. No better choice could have been made. Langton was a man of great learning and ability; a worthy successor to Lanfranc, Anselm, and Becket. The king refused to allow him to land. Innocent laid the kingdom under an interdict (1208) [see INTERDICT], and afterwards excommunicated John. The struggle lasted till 1213, when the king submitted to Pandulf, the papal legate, and did homage to him as his liege lord. It is no part of our business to tell the story of the Great Charter. We should note, however, that the first signatory is Stephen, "Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church"; another is Pandulf, "sub-deacon and servant of the Lord Pope"; the first article declares that the English Church should be free, and that this free-

dom has been "confirmed by the Lord Pope, Innocent III."

The Mediaeval Period, 1216–1531.—The signing of Magna Charta is the beginning of the history of the English people. Henceforth the names Saxon, Dane, and Norman fell into disuse; men called themselves, and spoke, English. We have already described the faith and practices of the earlier periods. We have now to inquire what was the religion of Simon de Montfort, Edward III., and Henry V., names bound up with the glories of English freedom and English valour. The Church of old England was in full communion with the rest of the Catholic Church, identical with it in faith and in worship, and subject to the See of Rome. Every archbishop of Canterbury acknowledged the Pope's supremacy, and received in return the pallium [*q.v.*] which was the sign of his authority and the pledge of his submission. This fact clearly shows that the faith of the English church was the same as that of Rome. The great mediaeval Council, the Fourth Lateran, which is looked upon by Protestants as setting the seal on "Roman abuses," was held in the same year as the signing of Magna Charta (1215), and the English ambassador was present. The English Church was therefore committed to all its enactments concerning transubstantiation, confession, indulgences, and the primacy of the Pope, and the condemnation of the Albigenses and Waldenses. We have not space to describe at any length the faith and devotions of this period. Two admirable works by Father Bridgett, "The History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain" (ed. Thurston) and "The Dowry of Mary," prove most convincingly that in the days of Merrie England the people were thoroughly Catholic. They went to Mass, to confession, and to Holy Communion. They were especially devout to our Lady. The Rosary was in common use; the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was taught at Oxford, and it was from England that the feast spread through Europe. The shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham was famous throughout Christendom. "Among the royal pilgrims we hear of Henry III. in 1241, Edward I. in 1280, and again in 1296; Edward II. in 1315; Edward III. in 1361; David Bruce in 1364; Henry VI. in 1455; Edward IV. in 1469; Henry VII., with the young prince, afterwards Henry VIII., in 1505; Henry VIII., in company with Catherine of Aragon, in 1510" ("Dowry of Mary," p. 305). The usual form of will was: "I bequeath my soul to Almighty God, our Blessed Lady St. Mary Virgin, and to all the company of heaven." Everyone who had it in his power left money for Masses for the repose of his soul. Thus Henry V., the hero of Agincourt, provided that three Masses should be said for him every day while the world lasted. One of these at least was always to be a Mass of the Blessed Virgin, on Sunday of the Assumption, on Monday of the Annunciation, on Tuesday of the Nativity, on Wednesday of the Conception, and so on. The liturgy used by the clergy was much the same as that used in Rome [see *infra*, LITURGIES, p. 533]. All the great orders of the Church, both of men and of women, flourished in England (see BENEDICTINES, CARTHUSIANS, CISTERCIANS, PREMONSTRATENSIANS, &c.). The mendicant friars made their way into England soon after their foundation. St. Dominic himself preached in the city of London. The names Greyfriars (Franciscans), Blackfriars (Dominicans), Whitefriars (Carmelites), Crutchedfriars, Austinfriars (Augustinians), besides Charterhouse (Carthusian monks), still testify to the various convents of these orders in London. During the reign of Edward III. Oxford became more famous even than Paris as a school of theology. St. Edmund of Canterbury (d. 1240) had introduced there the study of Aristotle, and his most famous follower was Roger Bacon, a Franciscan (d. 1292). The university also claimed as her children Richard Middleton, Alexander of Hales, William Ware, William de la Marre, Duns Scotus, Occam, Grosteste, Adam Marsh, Bungay, Burley, Archbishop Peckham, Bradwardine, Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, and Thomas Netter (Waldensis).

It is usual to appeal to Acts passed under Edward I. and Edward III. and to the history of Wyclif as proofs of the anti-papal character of the Church of old England. We shall deal with these in separate articles, but we may remark in passing that the way in which the Lollard heresy was condemned shows how Catholic the mass of the people were. The statutes of Mortmain and Provisors deal with difficulties likely to arise between the Pope and *Catholic* sovereigns, and it must be admitted that the Avignon Popes were exacting in their demands. A Protestant king would treat the Church in far more summary fashion. But Edward III. addresses Clement VI.: "Our most holy Father in Christ, and Lord, the Pope by Divine Providence, Chief Bishop of the Holy Roman and Catholic Church, &c. . . . We desire your Holiness to recollect how obedient our royal family, the clergy, and laity of our kingdom have hitherto been to your see," &c.

The Wars of the Roses wrought great havoc in the Church, and threw it more and more under the power of the crown. Still, as late as the reign of Henry VII., there was little to forebode the coming storm. Even the early years of Henry VIII.'s reign seemed favourable to the Church. Had Wolsey been a worthy successor of Lanfranc, Anselm, Thomas, and Edmund, the schism might possibly have been averted.

The Reformation Period, 1531–1563.—The separation of England from the communion

of the Catholic Church, and the establishment of a national institution, retaining the old titles of the sees, the church lands, the tithes, and portions of the old ecclesiastical discipline, were transactions not easily or suddenly effected. They may be regarded as spread over a period of thirty-two years, from 1531, when Henry VIII. first claimed the title of Supreme Head of the Church, to 1563, when the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, at the very time when a general council was sitting at Trent, consummated the schism, and launched the Anglican Church on an independent course.

In 1530 the bishops, with Archbishop Warham at their head, were in full communion with Rome; clergy and laity alike acknowledged that when a religious question arose the ultimate appeal lay to the chair of Peter; and the Christianity of an Englishman was the same as that of a Frenchman or a Spaniard. But there was a body of sectaries scattered through the country, the Lollards [see WYCLIFFITES] fanatically attached to subversive ideas, assisted by the numerous abuses which great wealth had brought into the Church, and promising a "pure Gospel" to their followers, like the Cathari of the Middle Ages. As the Vandals found allies in the Donatists, so any enemy who might attack Catholicism in England was sure of the enthusiastic support of the Lollards. Wolsey died in 1530; and Thomas Cromwell then gave the king the famous advice to follow the example of Gustavus Vasa—who had carried through a religious revolution in Sweden—and by a breach with Rome bring the clergy into a state of unconditional submission to himself. Two objects which he ardently desired might thus, Henry saw, be compassed—one, a divorce from his wife; the other, the replenishment of his treasury from the wealth of the Church.

The first step was taken in 1531, when the Attorney-General filed a bill against the whole body of the clergy as having been the "fautors and abettors" of Wolsey in breaking the Act of Praemunire. [See PRAEMUNIRE.] Convocation voted a large grant of money to the king, imagining that nothing more was required of them; but Henry refused to receive it unless words were inserted in the preamble to the grant, importing that he was the "protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England." The consternation of the clergy was great; they debated the matter, and finally consented to go to the utmost verge of lawful compromise. They recognized the king as the "chief protector, the only and supreme lord, and, *as far as the law of Christ will allow*, the supreme head," of the English Church and clergy. The saving clause preserved the concession from being heretical, but it was evidently perilous; for the king might, and in fact did, employ the remaining words for his own purposes, and omit the saving clause.

Archbishop Warham died in 1532, and by the appointment of Cranmer as his successor Henry secured a pliant instrument in the prosecution of his designs against the Church. The Pope consented to the appointment and expedited the usual bulls; under the authority of these Cranmer was consecrated, and took in public the oath of canonical obedience to the Pope, having previously made a private protest before witnesses that his oath should not prejudice the "rights of the king," nor his own co-operation with him in "reforming" the Church of England. Events now moved rapidly. Cranmer declared the king divorced from Catherine (1533), and Acts of Parliament were passed (1534) abolishing all appeals to Rome, making the "King in Chancery" the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes, and recognizing him as the supreme head of the English Church. By a clause in the Act of Supremacy a new oath was imposed on the bishops, by which they were required to recognize, without any saving clause, the supremacy of the king, and to abjure that of the Pope. All the influence of the new primate was employed in getting the bishops to take this oath; still it remains matter for amazement that they were found so pliable that all, with one exception, did so. That exception was Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who, for the crime of refusing to the king his title of supreme head of the Church, was thrown into prison and after a time beheaded (1535). A few days afterwards Sir Thomas More suffered death for the like offence.

The English Church was now in a state of schism, being separated from the see of Peter, through union with which it had been for nine hundred years in communion with the Church universal. But no other change was made, and by the statute of the Six Articles (1539) Henry strove to repress the rising tide of heterodox innovation. The dissolution of the monasteries [see SUPPRESSION OF MONASTERIES] gave great power and wealth to the reforming party. In the next reign, that of Edward VI., the Protestant party obtained the reins of power. First one Prayer Book (1549), and then another (1552)—the second diverging considerably more from the Catholic doctrine than the first—were substituted for the Missal and Breviary, not by Convocation, but by act of Parliament. In these changes, Cranmer and his associates, several of whom were foreigners, were unceasingly active. The bishops generally—such is usually the lot of time-servers—found that if they were expected to give up Rome in the last reign, they had to give up a great deal more in this, even fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith. Several, as Gardiner, Tonstall, Day,

Heath, and Veysey, resisted, with more or less of consistency, the novelties which the primate and council were continually foisting upon them, and were deprived of their sees. The majority, it is to be feared, acquiesced in all the iniquities and follies of the reign, even in that monstrous injunction of the council (1552) requiring them to remove the altars from all parish churches in their dioceses. A formulary of faith, in forty-two articles, was drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, but too short a time before the death of Edward to allow of its being either embodied in a statute or assented to by Convocation.

In the reign of Mary, all the religious changes that had been made under Edward VI. were, so far as possible, undone, and the old state of things restored. Cardinal Pole was made archbishop of Canterbury, the authority of Rome was recognized, and the nation reconciled to the Holy See. Everyone knows with how great severity Mary's government proceeded against the Protestants, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and many others being burnt, and hundreds forced to flee for their lives into foreign countries.

At the accession of Elizabeth the bishops, and the higher clergy generally, were staunch Catholics. But it was Elizabeth's evident interest as the daughter of Ann Boleyn—whose marriage with her father two Popes had declared to be null and void—to renounce the authority of Rome and throw herself into the arms of the Protestant party. Counsellors and ministers of great ability and determination were soon by her side, ready to confirm her in this course, and to point out the best means for effecting it. Pole was dead; Heath, archbishop of York, held the seals as chancellor; they were immediately taken from him, and given to Nicholas Bacon, a Protestant. Elizabeth made it known at once that she did not believe in transubstantiation, by forbidding the Bishop of Carlisle to elevate the Host when saying Mass before her in her private chapel. Seeing this, Archbishop Heath, upon whom the office fell, as Canterbury was vacant, refused to take a part in her coronation; Oglethorp, of Carlisle, alone among the bishops, was found sufficiently complying. Parliament met early in 1559, and in the course of the session two important Acts, those of Supremacy and Uniformity, were passed. In the first the queen was styled, not "supreme head" of the Church, but "supreme governor, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal." Practically, these words had the effect of severing England from the Holy See, and throwing her into schism, just as effectually as the earlier form. By the Act of Uniformity the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. was restored, and its use made compulsory, some slight alterations being introduced, the object of which was to make acquiescence less difficult for those who leaned to the Catholic doctrine.[1]

The English laity, as represented by Parliament, had now adopted the Protestant religion; it remained to see what the bishops and clergy would do. The bishops, all but one, stood firm. Only Kitchen, of Llandaff, could be induced to take the oath imposed by the new Act of Supremacy. Had the inferior clergy shown a like spirit, it is possible that the plans of the Court would have failed; for it was notorious that the elections had been grossly tampered with by the agents of the Government, and that the general feeling in the country was far less favourable to Protestantism than the easy passing of the Act of Uniformity appeared to indicate. But although a large number, perhaps about half, of the cathedral clergy, archdeacons, and heads of colleges at the universities, followed the lead of the bishops and refused the oath, yet the other half, driven on by interest, fear, or conviction to unsay those pledges of fidelity to Rome which they had solemnly given, with the mouth if not with the heart, in the reign of Mary, consented to abjure the Pope and adopt the Erastian principle that the sovereign of a country should have the supreme control of its religion. This being so, the Government feared not to eject the recusants at once, for they knew that among the men of university training whose Protestant sentiments had made them exiles under Mary, they would find numbers more or less qualified in point of character and learning to take the vacant posts, and eager to obey the Government in all things.

But it was necessary to find a working head for the new Church, and after some time Matthew Parker was pitched upon, and consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth, according to the Ordinal of Edward VI., in December 1559. [ANGLICAN ORDERS.] Parker had been a Catholic priest, and the head of a college at Cambridge; nevertheless, in violation of his canonical obligations, he had married a wife; and the irregularity thus incurred obliged him to remain in hiding during the reign of Mary. All the bishops who refused the oath were deposed. Three of their number (the bishops of St. Asaph, Chester, and Worcester) escaped to the Continent; the first-named, Thomas Goldwell, took part in the later sittings of the Council of Trent. Men were soon found to accept the temporalities of the vacant sees, with all the conditions attached to them by the State. Thus Grindal was made Bishop of London; Cox, of Ely;

[1] The words of administration in the book of 1549 ("The Body of Jesus Christ," &c.), which have a Catholic sound, were now prefixed to the Zwinglian form of administration ("Take and eat this in remembrance," &c.), employed in the book of 1552; and so the words have remained ever since.

Cheney (who, Camden tells us, had been a warm friend and admirer of Luther), of Gloucester; and Jewell, of Salisbury. With equal ease the vacancies in the ranks of the higher clergy and the authorities at the universities were filled up.

To consummate the severance of the new Church from Catholic Christendom, it was still necessary to provide it with a distinct symbol. This was done in the Convocation of 1563, which unanimously adopted, on Parker's suggestion, the revised Articles of Edward VI. From forty-two they were reduced to thirty-nine, but the omitted articles referred to points of minor importance. Substantially the Creed then adopted, and ever since adhered to by the Anglican Church, represents the opinions of Cranmer and Peter Martyr. A useful note in Lingard's "History of England" (vol. vi. note G) analyses the divergences of the religious system put forth in the Thirty-nine Articles from Catholic belief. In few words it may be stated that, while the Articles adhere to the ancient doctrine on the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption of man, they broach novel views on justification (the Lutheran tenet of justification "by faith only" being distinctly adopted), on Purgatory (which they deny), and on the Sacraments (which they reduce from seven to two). They also declare that general councils may not be summoned except by the commandment and will of princes (Article 21); that they may err even on matters of faith (*ibid.*); that all the patriarchates, both East and West, have erred in matters of faith (Article 19); that the English sovereign (though he or she must not meddle with "the ministering of God's Word or of the Sacraments") has supreme authority over all ecclesiastical persons and in all Church causes within his or her dominions (Article 37); and that the Pope has no jurisdiction in England (*ibid.*).

The necessity of finding a firm support in the Government against the Catholic party, which was still strong down to the accession of James I., seems to have driven the Anglican leaders into the excessive Erastianism exhibited by the Thirty-nine Articles. This, while it gave them strength on the side of the Government, alienated from them large numbers of the more conscientious and consistent Protestants, and more than any other single cause has contributed to that progressive attenuation of the national Church by secessions which at the present day has left her with little more than half the English people within her pale. For an account of the procedure of the Holy See with reference to Elizabeth, see DEPOSITION, BULL OF.

The Persecution Period, 1563–1829.—The Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy passed at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign caused much consternation among sincere Catholics; nevertheless it is clear that there was a much larger number who were exceedingly unwilling to oppose the Government, and who flattered themselves that if they complied for a while and attended the Protestant service the storm would blow over, and the Mass be restored as before under Mary. Ribadeneira[1] states that in the first years of Elizabeth the Catholics in great numbers frequented the parish churches, thinking it sufficient if they did not enter or leave them in company with Protestants! But this was stopped as soon as the matter was referred to a committee of theologians (one of whom was Laynez) at the Council of Trent, whose unanimous decision was that such attendance at Protestant worship was sinful. The oath of supremacy, not being generally tendered even to the clergy, and not at all to the laity unless they wished to hold office under the Crown, did not at first cause much difficulty. But the lawfulness of the oath was warmly discussed, and its essential repugnance to Scripture and tradition demonstrated, in writings which soon began to issue in swarms from the presses of Flanders, where Catholic exiles found a secure refuge. The Government of Elizabeth found a legislative, if not a theological, answer ready in reply to the Catholic pamphleteers. In 1563 a law was passed by the obsequious Parliament making the second refusal of the oath of supremacy an act of high treason, punishable with *death*. The Emperor Ferdinand, in whose dominions at that time Protestants received a full toleration, wrote to Elizabeth, appealing for more indulgence towards the English Catholics, and asking that they might have one church in every considerable town in which to celebrate their worship. This, Elizabeth, whose imperious humour would not brook that any of her subjects should have a different religion from herself, flatly refused.

The other persecuting Acts of this reign, or the chief of them, were as follows:—

1. Statute of 1571. In the preamble, offences against the Act of 1563, and the late insurrection in the North, are named as circumstances calling for fresh legislation. It is enacted that if any persons procure or use bulls for reconciling persons to the "usurped authority" of the see of Rome, or if any should "obtain or get from the said Bishop of Rome or any of his successors . . . any manner of bull, writing, or instrument, written or printed, containing any thing, matter, or cause whatsoever . . . then all and every such act . . . shall be deemed to be high treason; and the offender and offenders therein," on conviction, "shall suffer pain of death, and also lose and forfeit

[1] In his book *De Schismate*, quoted by Hallam, *Const. Hist.* i.

all their lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods, and chattels." After the passing of this Act, any man who might get a dispensation from Rome to marry his first cousin did so at the risk of being reduced to beggary and hanged! We have given the very words of the statute, stripping them of technicalities, because even now it is a common belief with Protestants that the Catholic martyrs under Elizabeth died for treason, not for religion. If the Government could justly make into a treason the profession of what had been the religion of the country for nine hundred years, then the Catholics were traitors, but not otherwise. Treason meant, under the old English law,[1] compassing the sovereign's death, or levying war within the realm, or joining his foreign enemies,[2] and must be proved by some overt act. What resemblance is there between any of these offences and such acts as the refusal to swear that the Queen is supreme head of the Church, or persuading a person to become a Catholic, or being absolved by a priest and reconciled to the Church? These acts did not change their nature by being called "treasons"; the only difference was, that after the passing of the Elizabethan statutes the blood of the Catholics could be shed under colour of law, instead of openly and avowedly for "cause of religion."

2. Statute of 1581. Any act of persuasion to the Romish religion was declared by this statute to be high treason, and punishable as such. Anyone, after the end of the session, who should be willingly absolved by, and promise obedience to, "the said pretended authority," being taken, tried, and convicted, was to "suffer and forfeit as in cases of high treason." By another clause, any person saying Mass was to forfeit two hundred marks and be imprisoned for a year; anyone hearing Mass was to forfeit one hundred marks, and also undergo a year's imprisonment.

3. Statute of 1585. This Act ordered all Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests to quit the kingdom within forty days after the end of the session; if any such should be found after that date, they were to be adjudged traitors, and suffer as in case of high treason. Any person sheltering or aiding such Jesuit, &c., was to be "adjudged a felon without benefit of clergy, and suffer death."

4. Statute of 1587: for the speedier execution of the Act of 1581. It made void all dealings with property, subsequent to 1558, by persons who had not attended, or should not attend, the Anglican service, and declared such property forfeit to the Crown. Everyone who had been convicted of not going to church was to pay a fine calculated at the rate of 20*l.* per month since the date of such conviction.

5. Statute of 1593: against "Popish recusants." Such were "to repair to their own homes, and not to travel five miles therefrom; if they had not goods to satisfy the monthly fine of 20*l.* for non-attendance at church, they were to abjure the realm: and if they refused to do so, they were to suffer as felons."[1]

These laws were not intended to be a *brutum fulmen*; they were skilfully designed with a view to terrify the English people into embracing the royal religion, and to kill and reduce to beggary those who preferred the religion of their fathers. Being vigorously executed, they accomplished to a great extent the ends proposed; and if a Catholic remnant still survived at the end of the reign, and the estates of many Catholics still remained to them, this was not because the laws were deficient, but because common humanity and English good-nature induced many who had conformed themselves to screen their less complying friends, so far as they could, from a persecution which they felt to be iniquitous. Under these laws the following persons lost their lives in the reign of Elizabeth:—

128 priests and members of religious orders
58 laymen[2]
3 women
—
189

besides thirty-two Franciscans said by Mr. Law to have been starved to death in prison in 1583.[3] The names of many others are recorded as having "died in prison," slowly sinking under the effects of the noisomeness and filth of the horrible bastilles of those days. In the above list there is one layman who died under the torture. No statesman ever made a more systematic use of torture to extort the confessions which he wanted than the sanctimonious Burleigh. Under his direction Topcliffe, the pursuivant, put the noble Robert Southwell ten times to the torture, to make him confess in whose houses he had been staying; but not a syllable could be extracted from him. "The rack," says Mr. Hallam, "seldom stood idle in the Tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign."[4]

The Holy See regarded with sorrow and alarm the sufferings of the English Catholics and the rapid progress of the schism. It is commonly said that Paul IV. spoke roughly

[1] Statute of Treasons, 1351.

[2] Besides some other offences—counterfeiting the Great Seal, murdering the king's judges, &c., with which no one ever thought of taxing the Catholics.

[1] *Annals of England*. 1862.

[2] "No layman was brought to the bar or to the block under its provisions" (those of the Act of 1581): Green's *Short History of the English People*. But Green should have added that under *other* Acts of the same class *fifty-eight* laymen were put to death for religion. In later editions he says "Few."

[3] *Calendar of the English Martyrs*, T. G. Law (1876). The names and other particulars are given, except in the case of the Franciscans. See also Pollen and Burton, *Lives of the English Martyrs*; Camm, *Lives of the English Martyrs*.

[4] *Constit. Hist.* ch. iii.

to Sir E. Carne when he announced to him Elizabeth's accession, but at last declared that if she would place herself in his hands he would do what he could to serve her. This story appears to rest only on the authority of Sarpi, the historian of the Council of Trent. It is certain that in May 1560 Pius IV. made friendly overtures to her; for we have the text of a letter of that date,[1] announcing, in courteous and even affectionate terms, that the Pope was sending to her Vincenzo Parpalia, whom she knew personally, to confer with her; that he earnestly desired to accord to her whatever she might wish for the confirmation of her princely dignity; and that nothing could express the joy of himself and of the fathers about to attend the Council (of Trent) were they to hear of her returning into the bosom of the Church.[2] Parpalia was not allowed to come into England, and the work of anti-Catholic legislation went on. Remonstrance and admonition having proved useless, the Holy See resolved, while there was yet time, before a generation educated in Protestant schools had grown up, to employ against Elizabeth the censures of the Church. Pope Pius V. published a bull for this purpose in 1570 [DEPOSITION, BULL OF]. It failed of its effect; and the efforts made by Sixtus V., in 1587 and 1588, to dethrone her by means of the fleets and armies of Philip II., and terminate the miseries of the Catholics, similarly miscarried. Nothing remained but to console and sustain the recusants as much as possible under the persecution, and hope for better times under a new sovereign. In July 1600, Clement VIII. wrote to the nuncio in Flanders that he was very anxious on the subject of the English succession, and instructed him, as soon as the "misera femina" was dead, to write to the English Catholics, urging them to postpone every other consideration to the one paramount object of having a king who would, if not protect, at least leave free the Catholic religion.

The effect of the laws described above, executed with cold, ruthless, stealthy tenacity by very able administrators, who were zealously aided by the Anglican clergy, was to reduce the profession of Catholicism, in the last years of the reign, to a minimum. No cruel stratagem, no conscience-rending device, was spared; husbands were made responsible for the conformity of their wives, wives for that of their husbands; accumulated fines for non-attendance at church held up before fathers the prospect of ruin and social descent for their sons, for whom yet they could scarcely by any sacrifice obtain a Catholic education; the ancient universities were perverted; the ancient schools were perverted; the town populace, long since won over by the coarse satires of the Lollards, was everywhere against Catholics; the circumstances of the time made it easy to fix on them the brand of disloyalty. If anyone wishes to understand their unhappy condition in detail, let him read the report of Father Holtby, in 1594, to Garnet the Provincial, published in the third volume of Dodd (ed. Tierney). It is commonly estimated that at the end of the reign about half the population were still Catholics; but this can only be understood of secret inclinations, if, even so limited, it be true; those who actually practised their religion must have borne a much smaller proportion than this to the mass of the population.

The time came when she who, for the security of her crown, had shed so much blood, broken so many hearts, ruined so many lives, had to depart out of this world. "Heaven was just," says the Catholic historian, "in making her inconsolable who had been the author of so much grief to others."[1] She fell into a settled melancholy; would sit silent in her chair for days and nights together; and when urged by the Lord Admiral to go to her bed, told him that if he had seen what she saw there he would not ask her. "She became tedious to herself, and troublesome to all about her."[2] While she was in this state the Archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates called to see her, at which she was very angry, "bidding them be packing, saying she was no atheist, but knew full well that they were hedge priests, and took it for an indignity that they should speak to her."[3] Such—assuming that the words are correctly reported—was her final estimate of those "Anglican orders" which she had done so much to establish. In this state of mind she died.

Aware that James I. had carried on the government of Scotland in a tolerant spirit, and not foreseeing what an insurmountable attraction the theory of "headship of the Church" would have for a learned fool, and how it would work on a despotic temper, the English Catholics hailed with joy his accession to the throne. But in the following year (1604) was passed an Act "for the due execution of the statutes against Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests." It was enacted that two-thirds of a Catholic landowner's real estate might be seized to meet the fine of 20*l.* per month for not attending church, if the money was not paid. Under Elizabeth many Catholics, without much molestation, had provided for the education of their children abroad. [See DOUAY, ENGLISH COLLEGE AT.] That

[1] Dodd's *Church History*, iii. cccxxi.

[2] The story told by Camden that Pius IV. offered to settle the English Liturgy by his authority and to allow the English Catholics the use of the sacrament in both kinds seems to rest on mere rumour.

[1] Dodd's *Church History*, iii. 70. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* His account is taken from the narrative of Lady Southwell, one of the queen's waiting women, who was present.

scanty liberty was cut off by this statute, which fined anyone sending a child abroad for education "in Popery," for each offence 100*l.*, and made the person so sent incapable of inheriting or enjoying any property, real or personal, unless he conformed to the Established Church. Another clause prohibited the keeping of a school by or in the house of any recusant.[1] The alarmed Catholics, still unwilling to believe that the hopes which they had indulged must be renounced, petitioned the king for the free exercise of their religion in private houses, reminding him how much they had suffered "for your good mother's sake."[2] For answer, James issued a proclamation (September 1604) banishing all the Catholic missionary priests out of the kingdom. This climax of tyranny drove some of the Catholics to desperation; they began to conspire, and the Gunpowder Plot (1605) was the result. Nothing can be fairer than what Bellarmine writes on this subject: "I excuse not the deed; I hate murders; I detest conspiracies; but no one can deny that men were driven to despair. For the Catholics hoped . . . that under a new prince, who had always been noted for clemency, and whose accession they had cordially welcomed, they would draw breath again after so long a persecution, and be free to retain that faith and religion which the king's own mother and all his ancestors had piously practised. But when they saw that the cruel edicts of Queen Elizabeth were confirmed, that crushing fines were imposed on those refusing to frequent heretical places of worship, and that under colour of accusations for breaches of the law they were being gradually despoiled of all their property, some among them, who could not put up with their wrongs, driven to despair, framed that plot which we and you alike deplore."[3]

Soon after the Gunpowder Plot, James, with the assistance of Bancroft and Christopher Perkins, a renegade Jesuit, framed a new oath of allegiance for Catholics, the object of which was to divide them—to extract as much disloyalty to the Holy See from those who took it as was compatible with not absolutely withdrawing their obedience—and to mitigate the foreign outcry against the persecution in England. To understand what followed, it is necessary to describe the measures which had already been taken to give English Catholics a new organization. While the hope was not yet extinct that the nation might be restored to Catholicism, and some of the old bishops deposed by Elizabeth were still alive, questions of government and jurisdiction remained more or less in suspense. When, however, after the foundation of a seminary college at Douay [*q.v.*], by Allen (ex-principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford), in 1568, followed by a similar foundation at Rome in 1579, English priests came over into England in considerable numbers, and Jesuits and Franciscans hastened to the post of peril, questions of jurisdiction and administration could not but emerge. In 1597 Father Parsons drew up a petition to the Holy See requesting that two English bishops might be appointed, one to reside in England, the other in Flanders; this last being ready to take the place of his English brother, should he fall into the hands of the persecutors. The petition also recommended that the bishop in England should be assisted by seven or eight ecclesiastics of higher rank—archpriests or archdeacons.[1] It was not thought prudent at Rome to do all that the petition recommended; but to provide a head for the struggling mission, Cardinal Cajetan (1598), the protector of the English nation, appointed George Blackwell archpriest, with a council of twelve consultors, of whom six were nominated by the Cardinal, six were to be selected by Blackwell himself.

In 1606 the king caused an "Act for the better discovering and repressing of popish recusants" to be passed, which contained the new oath of allegiance above mentioned. The Catholic was no longer required to swear that the king was the supreme spiritual authority in England. "He was to declare that James was lawful king, and that the Pope had no kind of authority to depose him, or to authorize others to depose him, or to release his subjects from their allegiance. The person thus swearing was moreover to declare that he would support the king, notwithstanding any excommunication or deprivation. . . . He was to add: 'And I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever.'"[2] The theory underlying this oath evidently was, that the right of a king to his throne was original and *jure divino*, and that *no* power on earth, whether emanating from his own subjects or from any other source, could lawfully depose him. In times when a high doctrine of royal prerogative was generally accepted, such an oath, it was thought, would be particularly ensnaring to Catholics; and so it proved. The archpriest Blackwell published an opinion favourable to it, and advised that it be taken. Cardinal Bellarmine, who had been a fellow-student with him, wrote a letter gently

[1] Recusants were those who refused the oath of supremacy under Elizabeth, and the oath of allegiance, presently to be described, under James I. and his successors.

[2] Dodd, iv. App. pp. 82.

[3] From Bellarmine's reply to the *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance*; *Opera*, iii. 645.

[1] Dodd, iii. App. No. 21.

[2] Flanagan's *History of the Church in England*, ii. 292.

remonstrating against the course he was taking, and reminding him how inconsistent it was with the teaching which they had received. James, with the help of Bishop Andrewes, then published an "Apology for the Oath of Allegiance," which Bellarmine met with a "Responsio" (1610), under the feigned name of Matthias Tortus. In this masterly treatise the Cardinal shows that for a Catholic to swear that he would continue to obey the king in spite of any sentence of excommunication by the Pope was as much as to say that the Pope was not the head of the Church, had no power of binding and loosing given him by Christ, and could do nothing against a heretic king. It was equivalent to saying that the duty of a man to his king was antecedent to, and of higher obligation than, his duty to God and the Pope His vicar. But this touched faith, and was not a matter of civil allegiance merely, as the king and his Anglican advisers laboured to prove.[1] The Pope (Paul V.) wrote a brief to the English Catholics in 1606, and another in 1607, warning them against taking the oath; and after some time the general body of English Catholics carefully refrained from doing so. But not only did a contumacious minority accept or at least defend it, but it cannot be doubted that a large number of waverers, thinking or pretending to think that continued adhesion to their religion was inconsistent with their civil duty, took this occasion of conforming to the Establishment. The steady continuance of sanguinary repression of course contributed to this result. According to the list in Dodd[2] twenty-four Catholics were executed for religion under James I., but Mr. Law[3] gives the names of twenty-seven, of whom eight were laymen. These executions were scattered pretty evenly over the years of James's reign. The king's resolution to seek a wife for the Prince of Wales among the Catholic royal families of Europe, not the Protestant, inspired new hopes at Rome, as we learn from a touching letter addressed to him by Urban VIII. on October 2, 1623.[4]

The hopes created by James's matrimonial projects were not entirely defeated. Though the Spanish match fell through, a marriage was arranged with Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henri Quatre and sister of Louis XIII., the Pope granting a dispensation in consideration of articles in the marriage treaty promising a free exercise of their religion for Henrietta and her attendants, and some relaxation of the penal laws for the English Catholics. This relaxation, if we regard the reign as a whole, actually took place. It is true that Charles did not carry out the stipulation in favour of the Catholics uniformly; but it must be remembered that he had to deal with a Parliament and a populace which a long course of Protestant teaching and preaching had now inflamed with a superstitious hatred of Catholicism. Whenever Parliament met, they petitioned the king to execute the penal laws more rigorously, and the rejoicings of the mob in London at the news of the failure of the Spanish marriage had shown how strong was the popular prejudice. Charles could not openly defy this mass of popular sentiment; we read accordingly of proclamations issued by him ordering priests to quit the kingdom, parents to recall their children from foreign schools, &c., and in two cases (1628) the blood of Catholics was shed.[1] But after the dissolution of 1629 the penal laws gradually almost ceased to be executed; no one was put to death for many years; the celebration of Mass was little impeded; even the fines for recusancy, unless the king's wants were urgent, were languidly exacted.[2] Still, seventy years of severance from Rome had effectually done their work: the nation was now Protestant. Panzani, a secret agent sent by Urban VIII. to England in 1635, reported that the Catholics in the kingdom were about 150,000 in number.[3] Among these doubtless a much larger proportion were persons of property and standing than was the case in the general population. Numerous conversions added to their strength about this time. Panzani declares in the Report just quoted that "while he was in London almost all the nobility who died, though reputed Protestants, died Catholics." Goodman, the Anglican bishop of Gloucester, died a Roman Catholic. Secretary Cottington, Secretary Windebank, Crashaw the poet, Sir George Calvert the coloniser of Maryland, Sir Toby Matthews the diplomatist, Abraham Woodhead, one of the Oxford proctors, Cressy, a canon of Windsor, with many others, submitted to the Church before the middle of the century.[4] It was to these conversions that Milton, whose religious sympathies were Puritan, referred in his "Lycidas" (1637):

"Besides what the grim wolf, with privy paw,
Daily devours apace, and nothing said."

The Catholics began, even in London, to go *openly* to Mass; schemes of reunion were in the air;[5] Laud's ritual innovations, and the measures of harsh repression taken in the High Commission Court against the Puritans, all seemed to point one way.

In the civil war between the king and the Parliament, which soon broke out, the English Catholics, to a man, took the king's side.

[1] Bellarm. *Opera*, iii. 638. [2] Dodd, iv. 179 (Tierney).
[3] *Calendar*, &c. [4] Dodd, v. App. No. 58 (Tierney).

[1] Father Arrowsmith and Mr. Richard Hurst. A remarkable story is told about the former in Milner's *End of Controversy*.
[2] Hallam, *Const. Hist.* ch. viii.; Clarendon, vol. i. pp. 8.
[3] Hallam, *loc. cit.*; the total population at this time was probably between four and five millions.
[4] Flanagan, ii. 327, note.
[5] Montagu, Bishop of Chichester, made overtures in this sense to Panzani; but he seems not to have appreciated the difficulties in the way, and his proposals were somewhat coolly received. Hallam, *loc. cit.*

This has been spoken of sometimes in their honour, sometimes to their dispraise; but, in fact, they had no alternative. It was no preference for an absolute compared with a constitutional monarchy which led the descendants of the men who forced reforms from John and the first Edward now to rally to the royal standard, but a simple political necessity. They could expect some justice from the king; they could expect none from the Parliament. The popular party under Charles I., and the country party in the next reign, reserved all their indignation against intolerance for Protestant persecution of Protestants; Protestant persecution of Catholics was in their eyes right and necessary. This is the more remarkable because at this very time the Protestants across the Channel were enjoying full toleration under the Edict of Nantes. It is, however, an indisputable fact, and, besides being proved in many other ways, it is established by a mere reference to the returns of the executions of Catholics during the reign. Between 1625 and 1640, only the two persons already named suffered death; but in the period between the meeting of the Long Parliament in the autumn of 1640 and the death of Cromwell in 1658 the penal laws claimed twenty-four victims. A few of these were executed by royal authority, that authority being put in force in consequence of pressure from the Parliament; but the greater number were hanged at Tyburn after the king had ceased to govern in London. For the death of the aged Father Southworth, hanged in 1654 solely for his priesthood, Cromwell, who was then at the head of the Government, was responsible. There is therefore nothing surprising in the devotion with which Catholics fought and suffered in the cause of Charles I. Many of them fell in battle: *e.g.* Robert Dormer, Earl of Carnarvon, killed at Newbury (1643), and Sir Arthur Aston, who perished in the massacre after the storm of Drogheda (1649). The pages of Dodd record the names, services, and manner of death of many others. It was estimated (though the proportion is probably too high) that out of about five hundred gentlemen who lost their lives for Charles in the civil war, a hundred and ninety-four were Catholics.[1] A finer type of a brave and loyal gentleman "true as the dial to the sun," than the Marquis of Worcester,[2] lord of Raglan Castle, it would not be easy to produce. When Parliament got the upper hand, the Catholics were treated with great severity; their estates were often confiscated, when their Protestant neighbours were suffered to compound. After the king's execution they ceased to play an active part in public life; nor did they seek to maintain relations with the exiled royal family. Cromwell's government, on the whole, treated them leniently. But, in truth, after the battle of Worcester (1650) all parties were sick of bloodshed, and this feeling protected for some years the Catholic priests, and caused a comparative toleration of their worship.

Reverting to the subject of ecclesiastical organization, we find that the archpriest Blackwell (who, being thrown into prison after the Gunpowder Plot, had consented to take the new oath of allegiance) was on this account deprived by the Holy See of his office and of all faculties (1608), George Birkhead being appointed to succeed him. Harrison succeeded Birkhead in 1614. Our space does not permit us to do more than glance at the dissensions which troubled the Catholics, arising out of the contention of certain priests that Blackwell's jurisdiction was invalid, and out of differences between seculars and regulars. The necessity for the presence of a bishop in England became more and more manifest, and at length, in 1623, Dr. William Bishop was appointed by Gregory XV. as the first vicar apostolic. He erected a chapter, which exercised some kind of jurisdiction, in the face of considerable doubt and opposition, down to 1695, when a decree of Propaganda appeared, declaring that since the deputation of the four vicars apostolic in 1688 all previously existing jurisdictions had ceased. Dr. Bishop dying in 1624, Dr. Richard Smith succeeded him in the following year, but withdrew into France in 1629, in consequence of a proclamation having been made for his arrest, and never again returned to England. He died in 1655. The Holy See did not deem it prudent to appoint a successor for many years, though strongly urged to do so by Sir Kenelm Digby and others.

Charles II., who, from the time of his enforced residence on the Continent, appears to have been intellectually convinced of the truth of Catholicism, but had not moral courage enough to avow it, was as favourable to the English Catholics all through his life as he dared to be. The Pendrells, honest Catholic yeomen who sheltered him while he was in hiding at Boscobel after the battle of Worcester, were now rewarded with a pension, which their descendants are said to receive to this day. Between 1660 and 1677 not a single Catholic was executed; two Test Acts, however, were passed, requiring that before entering upon any office under the Crown, or taking his seat in Parliament, a man must receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. The effect of these statutes, joined to the other penal laws, was to make English Catholics mere sojourners in their own land till the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829. In 1678, through the machinations of Shaftesbury, the frantic popular excitement about a supposed "Popish Plot" arose, and between that year

[1] Dodd, quoted by Hallam, *Const. Hist.* ch. x.

[2] His son, Edward, was also a staunch Catholic; his grandson, Henry, first Duke of Beaufort, conformed to the Church of England. (Dodd.)

and 1685 the blood of twenty-four victims, all absolutely guiltless of any crime, flowed upon the scaffold. The last of these was Oliver Plunket, the saintly Archbishop of Armagh. Charles II. himself was reconciled to the Church on his deathbed by Father Huddleston.

James II. had become a Catholic, while Duke of York, and his change of religion was generally known about 1673. When he came to the throne in 1685, he was full of zeal for Catholic interests; but it was a zeal little "according to knowledge." Moreover, the scandalous immorality of his private life justly damaged his advocacy; pious Protestants could not be blamed for regarding with distrust the efforts of the married lover of Catherine Sedley [1] to advance the interests of his religion by overriding the existing laws. It was a time when special caution was necessary, and James proceeded with singular rashness. The Catholics had by this time dwindled fearfully; [2] their political weight in the country was gone; Parliament was more likely to add new penal laws against them than to repeal the old ones; their one hope lay in the favour of the executive. Nor need this hope have been fallacious; for the English, when not alarmed or flurried, are a good-natured and indulgent people; the penal laws were intrinsically unjust; and the exemption of here and there an individual from their stringency by means of the dispensing power, assuming that the individual so exempted had been really fit for posts of public trust, would have led to no commotion. That the dispensing power was really a part of the royal prerogative, as till then understood, and might lawfully be exercised, was decided by eleven out of twelve judges at Sir Edward Hales' trial in 1686, and cannot truthfully be questioned. But James, with that perverse stupidity which was natural to him, proceeded to use his power to dispense with, as if it were equivalent to a power to repeal, the law, and filled the public service with Catholics to an extent far beyond what either their numbers or their qualifications justified. He gave commissions in the army to a number of Catholic officers, and caused Catholic soldiers to be freely enlisted; he ordered four Catholic lords to take their seats in the Privy Council without taking the test required by law; and he actually made Father Petre, one of the worst qualified men in England for such a post, a privy councillor, although the appointment, owing to the strong opposition raised, remained in abeyance. [3] He worried the two universities, especially Oxford, where he forced his candidate, Parker (who had professed himself a Catholic), upon the Fellows of Magdalen instead of the President of their choice; made Massey (another Catholic) Dean of Christ Church; and induced the old Master of University (Obadiah Walker) to fit up a chapel for Catholic worship within the college precincts. But the most utterly foolish and suicidal act of all was when, borrowing a weapon from the anti-Catholic armoury of Queen Elizabeth, he appointed a court of Ecclesiastical Commission to control the Anglican Church, and by its means suspended the Bishop of London, because he had not taken severe measures against one of his clergy who had preached against the Court! The members of the commission, it is true, were Protestants, with the exception of the crafty Sunderland, a nominal convert, who boasted of having counselled rash courses to the king, the sooner to arouse the Protestant feeling of the country. But they were mere courtiers, and the odium of their acts justly fell on the king, who appeared to be using an ecclesiastical supremacy which his own Church disowned and condemned, in order to vex and weaken the body for whose behoof it was originally claimed. None can wonder that the indignation felt was general and deep.

All this time the Whig leaders were secretly negotiating with William of Orange; an army of fourteen thousand veterans was equipped with all the expedition and secrecy possible; an invasion was determined on; and the landing of the troops was safely effected in Tor Bay in November 1688. The general history of the period shows how the shameless treachery of Churchill and others, and the skilful use of calumnies against the "Papists," [4] paralysed the resistance on the king's side. Yet nothing can be more clear, on the whole, than this—that it was the solid military strength of the foreign troops who had been landed which enabled the Revolution to succeed. That strength would not have sufficed without those calumnies, and without the king's unpopularity; but these last causes could not have overturned the throne without the presence of the Dutch troops. Macaulay describes with exultation William's entry into Exeter on the 9th of November, at the head, not only of his Dutch regiments, but of mercenary battalions of Swedes, Brandenburghers, Swiss, and even negroes, followed by a formidable train of artillery. Against these veterans James's inexperienced troops, though much superior in numbers, would probably have made no effectual stand;

[1] Lingard, vol. x. ch. 2.

[2] According to a return quoted by Hallam, the number of Catholics above sixteen soon after the Revolution was only 13,856, which would give under 30,000 for the whole Catholic population. *Const. Hist.* ch. xv. However, this number, as he adds, "appears incredibly small."

[3] James tried hard to obtain the Cardinal's hat for Petre, but this the Pope (Innocent XI.) courteously but firmly declined. Dryden, who was a good judge of men, augured ill from the political elevation of the favourite (*Hind and Panther*, book iii.).

[4] "Danby," says Macaulay, "acted with rare dexterity." At a general meeting of the gentry and freeholders of the three Ridings which had been summoned to York to address the king on the state of affairs, "the discussion had begun, when a cry was suddenly raised that the Papists were up, and were slaying the Protestants." They were more likely, as Macaulay says, to be trembling for their own safety; but the thing was believed, the populace were gulled, and Yorkshire went for William.—*Hist. of Eng.* ch. ix.

and Churchill's desertion may have had more motives than one. As Flamininus proclaimed the liberty of Greece at the Isthmian Games, so William displayed a banner inscribed with "the Liberties of England"; but a thoughtful Englishman reading the narrative might well repeat the verse of Wordsworth—

"Ah! that a conqueror's words should be so dear!"

The Revolution was accomplished; for Catholics, both in England and Ireland, a long period of humiliation began. Nevertheless, from one point of view, the event justified them and confounded their adversaries. There was, then, a "deposing power," after all! Catholics had been tortured and put to death, not for maintaining only, but simply for refusing to deny, that a king who grossly abused his trust might justly be deposed by the sentence of the Pope, as the common father of Christendom. Protestantism had maintained that this was a wicked doctrine: that no power could depose an anointed king; the duty of passive obedience had been solemnly enunciated by the University of Oxford only five years before the Revolution. Now, on a sudden, the king was deposed, and most Protestants were delighted. It appeared, therefore, that there was a lawful "deposing power," but that it resided, not in the Pope, but *in any strong political party assisted by a foreign army.* The case resembled, in some respects, the struggle of the League with Henri Quatre in the sixteenth century. The Catholic League, helped by the Pope, prevented the unreconciled Henri from reigning peaceably; the Whig party, helped by a Dutch army, prevented the Catholic James from reigning at all. Which of these foreign interventions—the helping power being moral in the first case, material in the second—involved the greater amount of national humiliation, it may be left to the justice of the future to decide.

From 1688 for nearly a hundred years English Catholics were debarred from any share in the public life of the nation and subjected to countless disabilities and indignities. A new batch of penal laws came in with William "the Deliverer." First it was enacted (1689) that Papists and reputed Papists should remove at least ten miles from Westminster. Another statute of the same year ordered that Papists and reputed Papists should be disarmed, and that a horse worth more than 5*l.* belonging to any Papist might be seized. In the Toleration Act (1689) a proviso was inserted, "that neither this Act, nor any clause, article, or thing herein contained, shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any papist or popish recusant whatsoever." In the Bill of Rights it was declared that no Papist, nor anyone that married a Papist, should inherit the crown. In a later statute (1699) "for further preventing the growth of Popery," a reward of 100*l.* was offered for information leading to the conviction of a Catholic priest for saying Mass or keeping school, and such priest was to be imprisoned for life. It contained also provisions of which the object was to disinherit Catholic landowners, and transfer their estates to the next of kin being, or becoming, Protestant. The Act of Settlement (1701) confirmed the decision of the former Act, by which the son of James II. had been included in the sentence of deprivation passed against the father, and settled the crown on the Princess Sophia and her issue, being Protestants. In the Bill of Rights before mentioned a new oath of allegiance was inserted, by which aspirants to public employment were required to deny that any foreign prelate—and therefore, by implication, the Pope—had or ought to have any ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction within the realm. The object being now to *exclude* English Catholics—not, as it had been under James I., to *entrap* them—this was the simplest way of attaining the end proposed, since no Catholic could take the oath without abjuring his religion. In violation of the treaty of Limerick (1691), to which William's faith was pledged, the Irish Parliament framed, in the course of this and the next reign, their notorious penal code, with the deliberate object of destroying the nationality, breaking the spirit, and plundering the remaining property of the Catholic people of Ireland.

A large proportion—perhaps the majority—of the English people regarded William as a usurper; many of the very men who had set him up, in particular Marlborough and Russell, repented of what they had done, and opened secret negotiations with the exiled Court; there were the war in Ireland, the plot of Sir J. Fenwick, James's conciliatory Declaration of 1693, and the war carried on by France from 1691 to 1697. Everything, however, miscarried—partly through William's sagacity and good fortune, but chiefly owing to the rooted aversion of a community long inured to heresy to come to any terms with Catholicism. As Pope says—

Hopes after hopes of pious Papists failed,
While mighty William's thundering arm prevailed.

James died in 1701, and Anne his daughter succeeded in the following year. Her brother, James III., was brought up at the French Court; the chivalrous generosity of Louis XIV. never suffered him to feel that he was a dependent and a helpless exile. If the young man would have consented to embrace the Anglican religion, his accession, upon Anne's death, would have been effected

with ease. Curious evidence of this may be seen in Lord Middleton's correspondence with Cardinal Gualterio.[1] For instance, writing in 1712 to complain of a certain coldness and want of sympathy on the part of the Pope (Clement XI.) towards his unfortunate master, Middleton says this is all the harder to bear when the king is surrounded by temptations, and "the English are resorting to every means in the endeavour to gain him and bring him over to their side; he would have but to comply in order to be recalled, and to reign peaceably in his three kingdoms." But, he adds, his master's religious faith is too firm and pure to allow him to listen to such overtures for a moment.

As soon as Anne was dead, James made the attempt to regain the throne of his fathers for which he had been long preparing; and the rising of 1715 was the result. But for the incompetency of the leaders, Mar and Forster, opposed as they were by Whig chiefs of great vigour and ability, the enterprise might have succeeded; for the rule of a foreigner who could not speak a word of English was most unacceptable to the great majority of the people. Both after this rising, and the much more serious one of 1745, the scaffold streamed with the blood of Jacobite and Catholic *traitors*, men who died bravely for hereditary right, and were immolated by the Whigs on the altar of revolution and parliamentary sovereignty.

The elder Chevalier died in 1758; the younger, as time wore on, was said to have fallen into vicious courses. Despairing of ever seeing the ancient line restored, the Catholics of England had begun to cool in their loyalty to the Stuart family, just about the time when the disasters of the later years of the War of Independence had warned the English Government of the expediency of conciliating the proscribed classes in the population of England and Ireland. Sir George Savile's Act of 1778 repealed the worst portions of the statute of 1699; a new oath of allegiance was framed, which it was possible for a Catholic to take without denying his religion; and Catholic noblemen and gentlemen flocked up to Westminster in great numbers to take it. It would ill become us, who are in the enjoyment of full civil rights, to sit in judgment on the conduct of men so severely tried as were the English Catholics of those days. Yet it may be remarked that their abandonment of the Stuart cause, whether justifiable or not, was far from bringing them the advantages which they expected from it. Parliamentary life and public employment were still barred against them by the Test Acts. Fifty years had still to elapse before those barriers were removed by the Act of Emancipation. During all that time the Catholics—at least an educated and influential section of them—were incessantly agitating; they were ready to go to lengths which seem to us ridiculous; to call themselves "Protesting Catholic Dissenters"—give Government a veto on the appointment of bishops—pledge themselves to support the Anglican Establishment—and repudiate the temporal jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs in every conceivable form,[2] if only they might be admitted within the pale of the constitution. All was in vain; and it was not till the imminent danger of civil war in Ireland, with a great man like O'Connell leading the Catholics, frightened the English Parliament into new courses, that the Catholic claims were conceded (1829).[3] It is also indubitable that the sight of so many Catholic gentlemen coming up to London to take the oaths excited the slumbering bigotry of the Protestants: Wesley wrote several violent anti-Catholic tracts; the Protestant Association was formed; and the terrible riots of 1780 wrecked in a week—for the London mission at least—the slow and difficult reparations of two hundred years.[3] Moreover—as if some secret link existed in the minds of many Catholics between loyalty to their princes and fidelity to their religion—the abandonment of the Stuarts was followed by the open defection from the faith of several Catholics of high standing, and even of some priests.[4] The death, in 1807, of the last male descendant of James II., Henry, Cardinal of York, appeared to the general public to confer [5] on the fortunate House of Hanover, besides its existing titles of possession and Parliamentary sanction, the title also of hereditary right. During the long Continental war, the Catholic body strenuously supported, with whatever social and political influence was left to it, the king and the aristocracy, in their struggle against the crowned anarchy in France. At the same time, the presence in England of some 8000 émigré French priests helped to break down much of the old prejudice against the Church. The government even voted large sums of public money for their support, since voluntary effort proved inadequate.[6]

Reverting again to the subject of ecclesiastical organization, we find that, after the

[1] Gualterio Papers, Add. MSS. 31257, Brit. Mus. Middleton, a man of character and capacity (see Macaulay), was Secretary of State at the exiled Court.

[1] See Charles Butler's *Historical Memoirs* (1819), Milner's *Supplementary Memoirs* (1820), and especially B. Ward's *Dawn of the Catholic Revival* (1909), for the history of the famous Catholic Committee of 1787.

[2] B. Ward, *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*.

[3] The number of Catholics was now considerably increased, and "appears, by the returns made in the House of Lords in 1780, to have been [in England and Wales] 69,376." Husenbeth's *Life of Bishop Milner*, p. 91.

[4] Milner gives the names of nine peers, four baronets, and five priests, with an "&c." after each list. See *Suppl. Mem.* p. 44, *note*. He is speaking of the year immediately following 1780.

[5] It did not really do so; for the lines of Savoy and Savoy-Modena, being descended from Charles I., have a better title to the crown on the legitimist principle than the House of Hanover, which traces back to Elizabeth, Charles I.'s *sister*.

[6] B. Ward, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, ii. 1 *sqq*.

long interval of nearly sixty years (1629–1685) during which there was no resident bishop in England, the Holy See, at the request of James II., nominated four bishops of sees *in partibus* to be vicars apostolic in as many districts into which England was now divided—the London, the Midland, the Northern, and the Western. The first holders of these vicariates were Drs. Leyburn,[1] Gifford, Smith, and Ellis, and the succession was from this time uninterrupted. The saintly bishop Challoner governed the London district, at first as coadjutor, from 1741 to 1781, dying at the age of ninety.[2] The rugged, energetic, noble-hearted Milner, Bishop of Castabala, author of the "End of Controversy" and many other well-known works, was vicar apostolic in the Midland district from 1803 to his death in 1826. The "Rules of the Mission," which put an end to many disputes of old standing, were settled by a bull of Benedict XIV. in 1753.

A new division was made in 1840, when the number of vicariates was raised to eight.

The Second Spring.—Soon after Emancipation (which, as said above, was obtained for English Catholics by the growing political power of their Irish brethren), what is known as the Tractarian movement developed itself within the English Church (1833). The chief leader and most gifted representative of the movement, John Henry Newman, together with Ward, Oakeley, and several hundreds of the clergy and laity of the Establishment, came over to the Catholic Church in or about the year 1845. Since that time there has been a constant stream of conversions which, together with a large Irish immigration, has greatly increased the Catholic element.

In 1850, by an apostolic brief of Pope Pius IX., the privilege of being governed by bishops in ordinary, after an intermission of nearly three hundred years, was restored to the English Catholics, to the satisfaction of all concerned, though to the consternation of many who were *not* concerned, who raised an extraordinary hubbub about what they called the Pope's "insolent intrusion." Parliament passed an Act (which, after remaining inoperative for some years, was repealed) prohibiting the new bishops from taking territorial titles. By the Papal brief, the whole kingdom, with Wales, was formed into one province, under the new Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Wiseman, with twelve suffragan sees, Beverley, Birmingham, Clifton, Hexham, Liverpool, Newport and Menevia, Northampton, Nottingham, Plymouth, Salford, Shrewsbury, and Southwark. In 1878 the diocese of Beverley was divided into two new dioceses, Leeds and Middlesbrough; in 1882 the new diocese of Portsmouth was formed out of Southwark, and later Menevia was separated from Newport.

Lastly, in 1911 Pius X. divided England and Wales into three provinces: Westminster, consisting of the archiepiscopal see of Westminster, with the four suffragan sees of Northampton, Nottingham, Portsmouth, and Southwark; Birmingham, consisting of the archiepiscopal see of Birmingham, with the five suffragan sees of Clifton, Newport, Plymouth, Shrewsbury, and Menevia (in Wales); Liverpool, consisting of the archiepiscopal see of Liverpool, with the four suffragan sees of Hexham and Newcastle, Leeds, Middlesbrough, and Salford.

There has been little opportunity for English Catholics since the Reformation to serve their country in civil or military capacities, because they have been usually under the ban of the laws. In literature, the field being comparatively open, many among them have attained to distinction. The names of Pope and Dryden will occur to everyone; besides these may be mentioned Habington, Crashaw, Massinger, Alban Butler, Bishops Challoner and Milner, Cardinal Wiseman, Waterton, &c., &c.

Enough has been said in this article to show how baseless are the claims of the Protestant Church of England to be identical with the Church in England before the Reformation. A body without any teaching authority, or unity of belief or worship, cannot rightly be called a Church at all. Low Church, Broad Church, and High Church must first settle which of them is *the* Church before they can set up the continuity theory. No doubt there is some external likeness between Ritualism and medieval Catholicism. But the great principle of authority is wanting to the Ritualist. It is the chaotic state of Anglicanism which proves most convincingly that it cannot be the same as the old Church. In truth we need no subtle arguments or learned researches to make good our claim. It speaks little for the logical power of Englishmen that they applaud the anti-Italian, anti-Papal utterances of an Archbishop of Canterbury, whose see was founded by the Italian monk Augustine, at the bidding of the Roman Pope Gregory. (It would not be possible to give here a full list of works on the history of the Church in England. Many have been mentioned in the course of this article. To these may be added F. W. Maitland, "Roman Canon Law in the Church of England," an admirable statement of Papal authority in England before the Reformation; James Gairdner, "Lollardy and the Reformation in England"; *id.* "The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the death of Mary"; and Bp. Brownlow, "A Short History of the Catholic Church in England.")

[1] Dr. Leyburn had been consecrated as sole vicar apostolic three years earlier.

[2] E. Burton, *Life and Times of Bp. Challoner* (1691–1781).

ENGLISH COLLEGE AT ROME. A school and hostel for the use of Saxon pilgrims is said by Matthew of Westminster to have been founded by Ina, king of Wessex, in 727. It was situated beyond the Tiber, and has no direct connection with the present foundation. The institution, or revival, of Jubilees in 1300 and 1350 brought many English pilgrims to Rome, and for their entertainment a hospice was established by John Shepherd, a merchant of London, about the year 1362. This was in the Via di Monserrato, where the present English College now stands. It flourished until the disputes between Henry VIII. and the Holy See. In 1449 the hospital was rebuilt on an improved plan. To meet the expense a collection was made in every parish in England; but this is said to have answered but ill, owing to the great cost of transmitting the money. Under Henry VIII. several persons whom fear of the tyrant had driven from England were relieved in this Roman hospital. When the Catholic bishops were driven from their sees at the accession of Elizabeth, Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, came to Rome, and was allowed by the Pope to have the use of the hospital, along with several Marian priests and two or three laymen. The same Goldwell soon afterwards sat as one of the fathers of Trent.

A great change now passed over the hospital; it had heretofore served to supply the material wants of the few English who visited Rome; it was now to be remodelled, and serve for the future the spiritual wants of the whole English nation, then fast lapsing into heresy. The generous soul of Gregory XIII., moved with a deep compassion for the state of England, and instigated by Dr. Allen (afterwards Cardinal) and Owen Lewis, Archdeacon of Cambrai, resolved upon the conversion of the hospital into a missionary college. For this purpose (1579) he added plentifully to the old rents, assigning, till other provision should be made, 3000 crowns annually for the support of the college from the Apostolic Datary, and making Cardinal Morone, the legate whose able diplomacy had done so much for the success of the Council of Trent, its first protector. The bull effecting all this begins *Quantam bonitas*. The design was that the college should maintain about sixty students, all English, and that these should swear to go on the English mission on the completion of their education as might be directed by their superior. Dr. Maurice Clenock was nominated the first rector, but in about a year[1] the college was made over to the Jesuits, who had the charge of it down to the suppression of the society in 1773. The supply of students came at first from the Rheims seminary, afterwards from the Jesuit school of St. Omer. Gregory XIII. enriched the college with many gifts and privileges; Sixtus V. (Peretti), though he favoured its design, found himself compelled by financial difficulties to make a large deduction from the revenue hitherto assigned to it from the Datary; Gregory XIV. raised the grant again, though not to its former level. By 1647 the college could count among its alumni forty priests who had suffered martyrdom in England. Pictures of many of these hung upon the interior walls of the college previous to the havoc and rapine made by the French invaders in 1798. So near to certainty was their chance of winning the palm considered, that when St. Philip Neri, the founder of the Oratory, met any of the students, he used to salute them with the words, "*Salvete, flores martyrum!*" ("Hail, ye flowers of the martyrs"). On the disputes and difficulties which commenced in the sixteenth and continued on in the seventeenth century, because some of the students, either for the sake of a more secure subsistence, or in the belief that it could not be wrong to embrace a more perfect way of life, neglected the missionary oath by which they were bound to serve as seculars on the English mission, and joined religious orders, some particulars may be seen in Flanagan, vol. ii. ch. 23. All such proceedings were severely condemned by a brief of Alexander VII. dated in 1660. After the suppression of the Jesuits, and till the French invasion, the college was managed by Italian secular priests. The advent of the Jacobins involved it and most of the other colleges in ruin; and it was only restored in 1818, during the pontificate of Pius VII., who appointed Dr. Robert Gradwell rector. His successor was Nicholas Wiseman, afterwards Cardinal. The dress of the students is the soutane, the *mantellone*, or long cloak, of black cloth, and the clerical hat. They attend the lectures at the Gregorian University. Among the Cardinal-protectors since the restoration of the college have been Consalvi, Zurla, Weld, Antonelli, and Howard. A new church was completed about thirty years ago. (See "The Diary of the English College (1579–1783)," published in English by Foley; Dodd, "Church Hist. of England," ed. Tierney, esp. II. p. 167 *sqq.*, III. 37 *sqq.*; Wiseman, "Recollections of the Last Four Popes"; B. Ward, "The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England," I. 60 *sqq.*; Guilday, "English Cath. Refugees on the Continent, 1558–1795"; Cronin in "Cath. Enc.")

ENGLISH COLLEGE (DOUAY). [See DOUAY.]

ENGLISH COLLEGE (LISBON). [See LISBON.]

ENGLISH COLLEGE (VALLADOLID). [See VALLADOLID.]

[1] The cause of Dr. Clenock's removal was an unhappy difference which arose between the Welsh and English students. The latter complained that the rector, a Welshman, showed partiality towards his countrymen, and became insubordinate. Being required to obey or leave Rome, they chose the latter alternative. See Flanagan's *Church History*, vol. ii. ch. 12; KNOX, *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen*, p. 69 *sqq.*

EPACT. [See CYCLE.]

EPARCHY (ἐπαρχία). This was the Greek word for *provincia*. On the transfer of the term to the ecclesiastical organization, it meant an ecclesiastical province governed by a metropolitan (ἔπαρχος) and containing several bishops' sees. (For this use Suicer, in his "Thesaurus," quotes Macarius of Ancyra.) The Council of Antioch (341) limited the exercise of a bishop's power to his own ἐπαρχία; by which some have understood "diocese"; but it is better to understand it of his ecclesiastical province.

Latterly, in the East the word came to mean diocese, and at the present time in the Russian church a bishop is commonly called an "eparch." (See Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church.")

EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF. The Third General Council met at Ephesus in 431. It defined the Catholic dogma that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God, and condemned the contrary error of Nestorius.

1. *The Occasion of the Definition.*—The Church, which had taught the reality of Christ's human nature in opposition to the Docetae, expressly defined His true and perfect Godhead when it was denied by the Arians; and at a later date the question as to the way in which these two natures were united began to be agitated. Early Fathers had used different expressions to indicate this union, but they had not investigated, or at least discussed, the point with scientific precision. Ignatius speaks of Christ as "bearing flesh" (σαρκοφόρος);[1] Tertullian describes Him as "clothed with flesh"; very often the early Fathers use the word "mixture" (κρᾶσις, *commixtio*) of the union between the two natures.[2] No doubt these expressions are meant to express the Catholic doctrine that the two natures of God and Man are united in the one Person of the Word, that the one Christ is both God and Man; but the theological controversies which began in the fourth century made it plain that formal definition on the union of the two natures of Christ was imperatively demanded.

The doctrine of Apollinaris, who taught that the divinity in Christ supplied the place of intellect which is proper to man, amounted to a denial that Christ really was perfect man and to a confusion of the divine with the human nature. In opposition to the false doctrine, great teachers in the school of Antioch, particularly Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore, afterwards Bishop of Mopsuestia, fell into error at the opposite extreme. Theodore, who developed the idea of Diodorus and is the great representative of the school, in his anxiety to maintain the perfect manhood of Christ, conceived of Him as a man in whom God the Word dwelt—*i.e.* he confessed, not that the Word became man (ἐνανθρώπησις), but merely that the Word, who dwells in all good Christians, dwelt in a special way and with extraordinary power in Christ (ἐνοίκησις). True, he distinguishes the indwelling of the Word in Christ from His indwelling in Christians, pointing to Christ's supernatural birth, His sinlessness, and to the fact that, owing to the union between the Word and Christ, the latter participated in the glory of the former; still, far as he may have been, and doubtless was, from intending it, the logical result of his premisses was to reduce Christ to a mere man, differing from others in the degree and not in the kind of His union with God. Further, Theodore, as he did not acknowledge the unity of Person in Christ, was forced to recognize in Him two different and distinct agents. [See COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM.] Catholics say "God suffered," "the man Christ raised the dead," because the one Person of the Word suffered in His human, raised the dead in the might of His divine nature, just as in the case of ordinary men it is the one personal being who reasons with his mind and moves with his body. Here Theodore was at issue with the language of Scripture and the Fathers from the earliest times. St. Peter says (Acts iii. 15) the Jews "killed the prince (ἀρχηγὸν) of life," and one of his earliest successors, Clement of Rome, speaks of "the sufferings of God." In particular, Theodore refused to call the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, although the title had been approved by Origen, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius.[1] Only in a loose sense, he urged, "could Mary be called the Mother of God, viz. because God dwelt in Christ after an extraordinary manner. Properly speaking she bore a man, in whom the union with the Word had begun, but was so far from being perfect that he was not [till his baptism] called the Son of God." In another place he writes, "It is madness to say, God was born of the Virgin; not God, but the temple in which God dwelt was born of Mary."

Nestorius was a younger contemporary of and belonged to the school of Theodore. Born in a Syrian town, Germanicia, he came for his secular education to Antioch, entered a monastery there, became afterwards a priest of the cathedral, and made a good reputation by his eloquence and strictness of life. In 428 he was consecrated Bishop of Constantinople. Almost immediately afterwards the strife on the title θεοτόκος began: indeed, Nestorius said he found the strife already kindled when he came to Constantinople. In homilies, fragments of which are preserved, Nestorius defended the doctrine which had been propounded by Theodore, to the great scandal, not only of priests, but of lay people. The orthodox cause was de-

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* 5, *PG*, v. 712.

[2] See Iren. iii. 19, 1, *PG*, vii. 939; Redepenning's note on Orig. *De Princip.* p. 196, xii.; Cyprian, *De Vanitat. Idol.*, ed. Hartel, 19.

[1] See Newman, "St. Athanasius," ii. 210.

fended in Constantinople itself by the bishops Eusebius of Dorylaeum and Proclus of Cyzicum, while Cyril of Alexandria stated the true doctrine in a sermon preached at Easter 429, and wrote twice to Nestorius, conjuring him to recant. Cyril's letters were in vain, and both he and Nestorius referred the case to the Roman Bishop. The Pope, Celestine I., called on Nestorius to recant within ten days, and commissioned Cyril to depose him in case of refusal. At a council held in Alexandria, Cyril published twelve anathemas against the doctrine of Nestorius. Nestorius answered with twelve anathemas of his own. John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus, and others sided with Nestorius, and to restore peace the Emperor Theodosius II. convoked a council at Ephesus in 431. Pope Celestine wrote to Theodosius on May 15 of that year promising to send legates.

2. *The History of the Council.*—For some time the bishops who had assembled at Ephesus waited for the arrival of John, Patriarch of Antioch; when, however, there seemed to be no hope of his arrival, the council opened on June 22. There were 160 bishops present, and before the end of the first session this number had increased to 198. The fathers met in the cathedral dedicated to the Mother of God, and Cyril, who, as the Acts expressly say, represented the Pope, presided. Nestorius refused to appear, on the ground that the council was not complete so long as John of Antioch and his bishops were absent, while a considerable number of bishops from Asia Minor, including Theodoret of Cyrus, refused to take part for the same reason. During the session, which lasted late into the night, letters of Cyril, Nestorius, Celestine, as well as passages of the Fathers confirming the Catholic faith, were read and compared with the utterances of Nestorius, who was at last solemnly deposed by the council. All the bishops subscribed this sentence. The people of the town received the news of the result with great joy. The city was illuminated in many parts, and the bishops were escorted home with torches.

Candidian (who represented the emperor at the council) and Nestorius protested against the proceedings as null and void, because they had taken place before the arrival of the Antiochene bishops. John of Antioch came at last on the 26th or 27th of June, and in a council of forty-three bishops deposed Cyril with Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, and excommunicated all who agreed with them.

On July 10th the second session of the real council opened, in presence of the three Papal legates, two of whom, Arcadius and Projectus, were bishops; the third, Philip, a priest. The legates were directed by the Pope to see that his sentence against Nestorius was carried out, and, in case of approval, to confirm the acts of the synod. The Pope's letter was received with acclamation by the council. and the Fathers declared that in their condemnation they had but followed the sentence and rule (*ψῆφον καὶ τύπον*) of Celestine. In the third session, the legates approved the resolutions passed before their arrival. In the fifth, John of Antioch and his bishops were excommunicated. The Fathers also addressed a letter to Celestine, giving a history of the Council and stating their acceptance of the Western decrees against the Pelagians. In the sixth session, the Nicene Creed was read and all new symbols of faith prohibited; in the seventh and last, Cyprus was declared independent of the Antiochene Patriarchate; a circular letter was addressed to the whole Church, and six canons were published. The legates signed the decrees, and they were confirmed next year by Pope Sixtus III. The emperor was at first extremely averse to the proceedings of the Ephesine Council, and he began by declaring it his will that both Cyril and Nestorius should be deposed. At last, however, he sent deputies to meet the bishops at Chalcedon and examine the matter, and he ended by accepting Cyril's doctrine and allowing him the quiet possession of his see. Nestorius was confined in his old monastery at Antioch, and afterwards banished to Upper Egypt. It was only gradually that the Syrian bishops made peace with the Egyptian and Western bishops. However, this opposition of the former really arose from personal feeling and misunderstanding rather than from difference of faith; and less than two years after the council, early in 433, peace was restored between Antioch and Alexandria. Some, however, of the Antiochene bishops, particularly Theodoret of Cyrus, continued their opposition longer. The priest Ibas, on the other hand, was heretical as well as schismatic; he was devoted to the doctrine of Nestorius, and his friends, failing to obtain toleration within the Roman empire, emigrated to Persia, where one of them, Barsumas, founded a Nestorian church at Nisibis. The later history of the Nestorians will be found in a separate article.

Two points in the history of the council seem to call for further explanation.

First, it may be well to state more fully the definitions of faith promulgated by the Fathers at Ephesus. They declare that the Blessed Virgin is Mother of God (*θεοτόκος* [1]), because she "after the flesh bore the Word from God, who had become flesh; that the Word is united substantially (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*) to flesh"—*i.e.* as substance to substance; whereas the Nestorians made the union one of Person to Person, and so merely accidental [2]; that the same person (*τὸν αὐτὸν*) is God and man, so that it is heresy to distinguish the things which the Scripture says of Christ in

[1] "Dei genetrix" rather than "Dei mater" is the accurate translation.

[2] The old Latin version renders *ὑπόστασις* here by "substance": see Petav. *De Incarnat.* vi. 17.

such a manner as to say that some belong to the man, conceived of as with a proper existence over and above the Word of God (*παρὰ τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμένῳ*), others only to the Word. Further the council anathematizes those who call Christ a man "who bore God" (*θεοφόρον*); who say that the Word is the God or Lord of Christ; that the risen Christ is to be adored *with* the Word; &c., &c.

Next it is to be observed that the council forbade alterations in, or additions to, the Nicene Creed, for special reason. The Nestorian party at the time were using a Creed which had been written by Theodore of Mopsuestia and imposing it on Quartodecimans who wished to join the Catholic Church. To prevent abuses of this kind the council prohibited the use of any other Creed than that of Nicaea. But this was plainly a disciplinary rule, which a competent authority had imposed and a competent authority could abrogate. (See the acts of the synod in Mansi, IV, V; and in other collections of Councils; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. c. ii.; Jugie in DThC; Petavius, l. v., c. 14 *sqq.*; Franzelin, "De Verbo Incarnato," thes. xxxix.)

EPHESUS, ROBBER SYNOD OF. [See LATROCINIUM.]

EPICLESIS, EPIKLESIS. [See CONSECRATION.]

EPIGONATION. [See VESTMENTS, GREEK.]

EPIPHANY (*ἐπιφάνεια*). A feast kept on January 6 to commemorate the manifestation of Christ's glory—(1) when the Magi adored Him; (2) in His Baptism, when the voice from heaven proclaimed Him the Son of God; (3) in the miracle of changing water into wine, when Christ began His miracles and "manifested" His glory. In the fourth century the feast of the Epiphany ranked among the greatest of the Church's solemnities. Sometimes, as appears from St. Gregory Nazianzen, the Baptism only of Christ was commemorated on the Epiphany, and hence probably the Greek name for the feast, "the holy day of lights" (*ἡ ἁγία τῶν φώτων ἡμέρα*), which alludes to the "illumination" of Baptism (cf. Heb. vi. 4, *φωτισθέντας*), or possibly to a very ancient tradition that at Christ's baptism lights appeared on the Jordan. However, the Breviary hymn for the day, composed by Prudentius in the fourth century, proves that the threefold commemoration on the Epiphany is ancient in the West.

The Vigil of this feast is not a fasting day, because the whole Christmas season is regarded as a prolonged feast. There is no invitatory in the matins of the day, probably because the psalm "Venite" occurs in Nocturn III. Solemn Baptism was given in the East on the vigil of the Epiphany; and at the present day among the Oriental sects it is usual for the clergy to bless the river of the place at this time, and the devout plunge, despite the cold, into the hallowed water. (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes.")

EPISCOPACY. [See BISHOP.]

EPISTLE. A portion of Scripture read after the collects and before the Gospel in the Mass. In our missal it is more properly entitled "lectio" or lesson. This portion of Scripture is generally, but not always, taken from the Epistles of the Apostles, and above all from those of St. Paul; whence in old MSS. of the Missal it is inscribed "De Apostolo." Sometimes, however, it is taken from the Old Testament; in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Missals there are two lessons read before the Gospel—one from the Old, the other from the New Testament. And in the Roman Missal, in some of the Ember Masses and on Good Friday there are Old Testament lessons as well as those from the New Testament. In early times letters of bishops and Popes were sometimes read at Mass, especially letters of peace and communion testifying to the unity which bound orthodox bishops to each other, and to the see of Peter. Our present arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels is commonly attributed to St. Jerome, but doubt has been thrown upon this opinion.

The priest who celebrates always reads the Epistle, but in high Masses it is also sung by the subdeacon, who receives special authority to do so at his ordination. However, the old forms of ordination make no allusion to any such function of subdeacons, and till the eighth century it was the lector, not the subdeacon, who used to exercise it. The Congregation of Rites permits a clerk in minor orders to sing the Epistle at high Mass, if a subdeacon cannot be had, but the clerk must not wear the maniple. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss."; Baudot, "The Lectionary: its Sources and History," Eng. tr.; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 254.)

EPISTOLAE ECCLESIASTICAE. Of these there are many kinds, the following being the most important:

1. *Apostolicae.* Letters written by the Roman Pontiff in virtue of his apostolic authority, whether they be constitutions, or briefs, or rescripts, &c.

2. *Commendatoriae.* [See COMMENDATORY LETTERS.]

3. *Communicatoriae.* Letters granted to all who were in the communion of the Church, and cultivated peace with her.

4. *Confessoriae.* Letters by which martyrs and confessors for the faith entreated bishops that particular Lapsi (persons who had consented to sacrifice) might be restored to the peace of the Church. [See INDULGENCE, p. 452.]

5. *Decretales.* [See DECRETALS.]

6. *Dimissoriae.* [See DIMISSORIALS.]

7. *Encyclicae.* [See ENCYCLICAL.]

8. *Enthronisticae.* Letters addressed by bishops after their consecration to other

bishops, in testimony of their faith and orthodoxy, and that they might receive from them letters of peace and communion in return.

9. *Formatae.* Both commendatory and dimissorial letters were anciently called by this name, after the Nicene Council had ordered that they should be composed according to a certain *form.* Some are of opinion that they were so called from the form of the seal attached to them, to assure the receiver of the genuineness of the letter. In later times it came to mean a letter of orders, containing certain signs, only understood by the bishops, certifying that an order had been conferred on the bearer. (Leclercq in DACL, *Alphabet Numéral Gr.*)

10. *Paschales.* Letters by which metropolitans announced to their suffragans, and these to their clergy, the right time of keeping Easter.

11. *Pastorales.* Letters of instruction sent to particular churches, as some of those of St. Paul and of St. Ignatius. (Ferraris, *Epistolae*; "Kirchenlex." *Literae Commendatitiae.*)

EQUIVOCATION. [See MENTAL RESERVATION.]

ERA (Lat. *aera*). The word is probably derived from *aera*, the plural of *aes*, which seems to have been used in classical times in the sense of "a given number." It has been proposed (art. by Hensley in the "Dict. of Christ. Antiq.," Smith and Cheetham) to use *era* of any succession of years commencing at a certain date, and *epoch* of the date from which such era is reckoned. But this appears to be a departure from the ordinary use of the word for which sufficient reason is not shown. It seems better, with the writer in Ferraris, to distinguish between *era*, a date fixed upon by the consent of some nation or community, and *epoch*, a date fixed by chronologers.

There is no trace in the Old Testament of the Jews having dated events from a recognized era until we come near to the time of Christ. Attempts seem to have been made to establish an era, but they came to nothing. We read of events which happened "in the second year of their going out of Egypt" (Num. i. 1), or "in the twentieth year" (2 Esdras i. 1), or "in the thirtieth year" (Ezech. i. 1); but in none of these cases did the event temporarily chosen as an era come to be generally used as such. The indications of time in the Old Testament are usually, therefore, either vague ("in the days of Josias the king," "in the days of Heli the priest," &c.), or else they are taken from the regnal years of some king ("in the first year of Cyrus," 1 Esdras i. 1; "in the third year of the reign of Joakim," Dan. i. 1, &c.). Not till the time of the Maccabees did the Jews use an era, and then it was one adopted from the Greeks—that of the Seleucidæ.[1]

[1] "After Antiochus had ravaged Egypt *in the one hundred and forty-third year,*" 1 Mach. i. 21. See also 2 Mach. i. 7, 10

Setting aside the systems of computing time in use in Hindostan and China, we find no earlier adoption of an era than that by the Greeks, who began in the fifth century before Christ, and perhaps earlier, to date events by the "Olympiad," or period of four years, in which they happened, the first Olympiad being that the first year of which was distinguished by the victory of Coroebus, and was found to answer to the year B.C. 776. Thus A.D. 1 is the first year of the 195th Olympiad.

Era of Rome, A.U.C. The exact date of this era has been much disputed, but the determination made by Varro is generally received, according to which it fell in 753 B.C.

Era of Nabonassar. Ptolemy and other ancient astronomers employ this era, which is named after a king of Babylon who is said to have delivered his countrymen from bondage to the Assyrians, and corresponds to 747 B.C.

Era of the Seleucidae. This corresponds to the 1st October 312 B.C., at which date Seleucus Nicator recovered Babylon from Antigonus, and founded his empire. It is called also the Greek era, and the era of contracts. The Jews adopted it, as we have seen, and used it till the eleventh century after Christ, when they substituted for it the supposed date of the creation of the world. It is still used by the Arabs.

Spanish Era. This corresponds to 38 B.C., and "is supposed to mark some important epoch in the organisation of the province by the Romans."[1] It was employed in the Peninsula long after the Christian era had come into general use in Europe, having been "preserved in Aragon till 1358, in Castile till 1383, and in Portugal till 1415."[2]

Christian Era. Called also the Diony[illegible] era, from Dionysius Exiguus, a Scyt[illegible] abbot, who, writing at Rome early in [illegible] sixth century, computed that Jesus Chris[illegible] was born in the year of Rome 754, and proposed that events should be dated from His Incarnation. This era soon came into use at Rome, and gradually spread to other countries; the Venerable Bede, by adopting it in his "Ecclesiastical History," greatly assisted in its wider diffusion. It cannot be exactly correct, for Herod the Great, according to Josephus, died in the year of Rome 750, and our Saviour must have been born some considerable time before Herod's death. It is usual to make a correction of four years on this account, and to date the Crucifixion A.D. 29 instead of A.D. 33; but Hefele and others would put back the birth of Christ as much as six or seven years—to A.U.C. 747.

Era of Diocletian. This era, which is still used by the Copts in Egypt, corresponds to A.D. 284. It was in general use in

[1] Merivale's *History of the Romans under the Empire,* vol. iv. p. 114.

[2] *Ibid.*

the Western Empire, till displaced by the Christian era.

The Indiction. This became a common way of reckoning time in the Eastern Empire, the indiction being a period of fifteen years, and the first indiction deemed to commence on September 24, A.D. 313.

The Hegira. This era, which is the date of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, and is used by all Mussulmans, corresponds to A.D. 622.

Era of Constantinople: called also the Byzantine era. This was long in use among the Greeks and Russians, and is still employed by the Albanians. It reckons from the Creation, which it dates 5508 B.C.

Jewish Era. This is used by the modern Jews, and is also referred to the creation of the world, which it dates in 3761 B.C.

Chronologers have invented the "Julian period," a multiple of the number of the years in the solar cycle (28), of those in the lunar cycle (19), and those in the Indiction; of this product, 7980 years, they place the first year in 4713 B.C., because in that year all three cycles stood at 1 simultaneously, and will not do so again till A.D. 3268. Into years of this Julian period, any year expressed in terms of any one of the above-named epochs may be converted. But in fact no era could be devised, or can be conceived, which is more convenient for dating events, either before or after it, than the Christian, and it cannot be doubted that, with the advance of the world in civilisation, this era will supersede all others. The Republicans of the first French Revolution, conscious how much the human imagination is influenced [redacted]ese things, attempted to substitute the [redacted]encement of their own blood-stained [redacted]lic, September 1792, after first inaugu- [redacted] it by the massacre of the eleven [redacted]ed prisoners in the jails of Paris, as [redacted]year 1 of the new period of universal [redacted]nity, but the attempt did not survive [redacted]suppression of the anarchical factions. [redacted]te, the founder of Positivism, recom- [redacted]ded to his followers the adoption of this [redacted]lutionary epoch, or of a similar one [redacted]ed by himself. (Ferraris, *Æra*; Kiel in "Kirchenlex." *Zeitrechnung*; Smith and Cheetham, art. by Hensley.)

ERASTUS AND ERASTIANISM. Thomas Lieber, or Liebler (Erastus), was born in Baden in Switzerland in 1524 and died in 1583. He was of the Zwinglian party, and distinguished himself by his zeal against the Lutherans. The system of subservience of the Church to the State, to which he has given his name, by no means occupied the main part of his energies. Of his famous 'Seventy-five Theses" only the last three are concerned with it, the others chiefly dealing with the supposed right to exclude sinners from the sacraments, which he denies. His theory of the relations of Church and State is thus stated by him: "I see no reason why the Christian magistrate at the present day should not possess the same power which God commanded the magistrate to exercise in the Jewish commonwealth. Do we imagine that we are able to contrive a better constitution of Church and State than that?" (th. lxxiii). "If that Church and State were most wisely founded, arranged, and appointed, any other must merit approbation which approaches to its form as nearly as present times and circumstances will permit. So that, wherever the magistrate is godly, there is no need of any authority, under any other pretension or title, to rule or punish the people—as if the Christian magistrate differed nothing from the heathen. . . I allow indeed the magistrate ought to consult, when doctrine is concerned, those who have particularly studied it; but that there should be any such ecclesiastical tribunal to take cognizance of men's conduct, we find no such thing anywhere appointed in the Holy Scriptures" (th. lxxiv). "But in those churches, the members of which live under an ungodly government (for example the Popish or Mahometan), grave and pious men should be chosen, according to the precept of the Apostle, to settle disputes by arbitration, compose quarrels, and do other offices of that sort. These men ought also, in conjunction with the ministers, to admonish and reprove them who live unholy and impure lives; and if they do not succeed they may also punish, or rather recall them to virtue, either by refusing to hold private intercourse with them or by a public rebuke, or by any other such mark of disapprobation. But from the sacraments, which God has instituted, they may not debar any who desire to partake." These views were eagerly taken up by eminent English divines, as being in accordance with the 37th article of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, they were opposed by the Presbyterians, especially in Scotland. In the Westminster Assembly (1643-7), after a long discussion, the principles of Erastus were rejected, and it was decreed that "the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath herein appointed a government, in the hands of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate." In England, however, Erastianism has continued to have a firm foothold. Hooker (a contemporary of Erastus) adopted the system in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," vol. viii., and from him it has been handed on to our own day. In the early nineteenth century it found a strenuous defender in Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, who maintained, not the alliance or union, but the absolute identity of the Church with the State. (Stanley, "Life of Arnold" i. ch. iv.)

It need hardly be said that Erastianism is entirely opposed to the Catholic doctrine of the relations between Church and State. "The Church and State, distinct in aims and means, in extent and compass, are neverthe-

less to work together for the well-being of mankind, mutually supporting and aiding one another. But though both powers are co-ordinate and independent in their own domain, still a certain order of precedence must exist between them, since they do not precisely coincide; and in case of conflict preference must be given to one over the other; and in this case the preference is given to the Church" (Hergenröther, "Catholic Church and Christian State," Eng. tr., ii. p. 173). Pius IX., in the encyclicals from which the famous Syllabus of 1864 was taken, and Leo XIII. in his great encyclical *Immortale Dei*, clearly laid down these principles. (See ESTABLISHMENT, CHURCH; "Acta ex quibus excerptus est Syllabus"; Tarquini, "Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones"; B. Ward in "Cath. Enc."; Henson, "English Religion in the Seventeenth Century" art. *Erastianism*.)

ESCHATOLOGY. [See LAST THINGS.]

ESPOUSAL (*sponsalia*) is defined by Gury as "a deliberate promise to marry made by each party, expressed by outward signs, each being capable of entering upon such an engagement." This definition implies that the engagement refers to the future —*i.e.* the parties do not give themselves to each other there and then, but promise to do so on a future occasion. The promise must be made and accepted on each side. Each party must be aware of the obligation incurred; hence there can be no binding engagement between children who have not come to the use of reason, &c. Each party must act freely. Lastly, there must be no impediment which would nullify the marriage, or even make it unlawful—*e.g.* one cousin cannot bind himself or herself to marry the other, because, till a dispensation is obtained, a union between the two would be no marriage at all. If a valid engagement has been made, then neither can lawfully withdraw from it, unless the other gives consent, or unless changes have occurred or circumstances come to light which alter the nature of the case. Thus a man, having engaged to marry a girl whom he thought virtuous, would not, of course, be still bound if she turned out to be of bad character.

No betrothal between Catholics, or in which one of the parties is a Catholic, is valid, or has any canonical effects, unless it is contracted in writing and is signed by the parties, and also by the parish-priest or the local Ordinary, or by at least two witnesses (*Ne Temere*, "De Sponsalibus" Aug. 2, 1907).

Among ancient Romans a man sent a ring of iron to his future wife; and this custom was adopted by Christians. The *annulus pronubus* is mentioned by Tertullian. St. Gregory of Tours speaks of the man presenting his intended wife with ring (*sponsalius annulus* [*sic*]) and shoes. The Franks used to betroth their wives with pieces of money—a relic, according to Chardon, of the old custom of buying girls from their parents. Betrothal among the Greeks takes place with prayer and much solemnity in the church, and on the same day as the marriage. (Historical portion from Chardon. See the text-books of Moral Theology and Canon Law, where the subject of Espousals is treated in connection with the sacrament of Matrimony, *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moralis," lib. vi. tr. vi. cap. 1; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. vi. p. 1 *sqq.*; Slater, "Moral Theol." ii. p. 251 *sqq.*)

ESPOUSALS (DESPONSATIO) OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. A feast kept on January 23. An office commemorating this event was written by the famous Gerson. In the sixteenth century Paul III. allowed the friars and nuns of the Franciscan Order to recite the office of the Espousals. The office was simply that of the Blessed Virgin's Nativity, except that a new Gospel was chosen and the word "nativitas" w changed into "desponsatio." Howeve special Office of the Espousals was w by the Dominican Peter Doré and a by the same Pope, Paul III. An of Benedict XIII., in 1725, permit use in the Papal States. Though never been extended to the Universal it is kept in many countries. (B XIV. "De Fest.")

ESTABLISHMENT, CHURCH. A of things in which the civil power, for poli and moral ends, recognizes a parti religion in preference to all others, and re its ministers, as such, as bodies corp capable of suing and being sued, of h property, and transmitting it to their cessors.

The questions bearing on the util a Church establishment have long keenly debated in this country betwe Anglicans and the non-established Prot sects; but Catholics are little concern the controversy. A word or two of crit on the chief arguments advanced is all we shall offer. What the Anglicans sa to the advantages secured to a nation by public recognition, on the part of the power, of Christianity and its ministe of course perfectly true; and when they appeal to history, and show what benefits accrued to English society from Ethelbert's supporting the Roman missioners, or Ethelwulf's appropriation of the tithe to religious uses, or from many other like acts on the part of our civil rulers, it is impossible not to agree with them. So long as Englishmen continued to be of one religion, and to be in communion with the Holy See, the benefits of Church establishment, on the whole, were undeniable. Religion, by it, was brought to every man's door; it lent a form and a splendour to human life; and an Englishman's fidelity to Jesus Christ and his Church was

made easier for him by the fact that the king to whom he owed loyalty was, no less than himself, an obedient son of the same Church, and also its zealous protector. The chief drawback accompanying these benefits of establishment was that, in times of lukewarmness and relaxed discipline, kings, egged on by worldly counsellors, availed themselves of the connection between Church and State to impede free communication with Rome (laws of Provisors, Praemunire, &c.), and to bring the heads of the Church in England more under their own power. This evil tendency, long operating, with other causes, brought the Church in this country to the ruin which we have attempted to describe in the article ENGLISH CHURCH. But to return to the Anglican argument. Down to the Reformation, as has been said, we differ little from them in our estimate of the benefits of establishment. Since that time, as they maintain,[1] the same Catholic Church has continued to be established in England with the like beneficial results; to which we must reply that the common sense of mankind and the received use of words are against them. Everyone but an Anglican can see that it does not follow—assuming that Church establishment was beneficial before the Reformation—that it is equally beneficial now, because the body established is no longer the same. Whether, and how far, the present Anglican establishment is beneficial, is a question on which we cannot here enter.

On the other side, the great argument of the Nonconformists against Establishments is that there is no guarantee for their being applied in support of pure Christianity, and that they may thus become the means of stereotyping error. "Human establishments . . . have been, and are, productive of the greatest evils; for in this case it is requisite to give the preference to some particular system; and, as the magistrate is no better judge of religion than others, the chances are as great of his lending his sanction to the false as the true."[2] As between the Anglicans and the Dissenters, this seems to be unanswerable. "The magistrate"—*i.e.* Elizabeth and her Government—established Anglicanism in 1559, and things have so continued to the present day; but "the magistrate" was not infallible, nor were the handful of divines who assisted him; he may, therefore, have applied the forces of Establishment to the support of what was more or less false; and, of course, the Dissenters hold that he *did* so apply them. Against a Catholic theologian the argument is powerless; for, although it is quite true that the magistrate, as such, is "no better judge of religion than others," yet, if he allows himself to be guided by the Church and the Pope, he rests upon a basis of infallible truth, and his action in applying the forces of Establishment to the support of religion cannot, in that case, be either mistaken or mischievous. (See Phillimore, "Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England"; Newman, "Present Position of Catholics in England.")

[1] See Hook's *Church Dictionary*, art. "Establishment."
[2] Buck's *Theol. Dictionary*, ed. by Henderson, art. "Establishment."

ETERNITY. [See HELL.]

EUCHARIST. The word Εὐχαριστία (literally thankfulness, thanksgiving) is used both for the sacrament and the sacrifice of Christ truly present under the appearances of bread and wine. It is so called from the action of our Lord "giving thanks" (εὐχαριστήσας Lk. xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23) as He instituted both. It is also known as "the Lord's Supper," "the Lord's Table" (1 Cor. x. 21), "the Lord's Body," and anciently as the "Eulogia" (the "blessing," from our Lord's blessing [εὐλογήσας] the bread, Mt. xxvi. 26; Mk. ix. 22); "Agape" (love feast [*q.v.*]); "Breaking of bread" (from our Lord's action "He broke the bread," ἔκλασεν Mt., Mk., Lk.); "Synaxis" (meeting, assembly) (see LITURGIES, p. 526). The Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist is stated with great clearness by the Council of Trent, sess. xiii., xxi., and xxii. The Church regards the Eucharist as a sacrament, as a sacrifice, and also as an object of supreme worship; so that our treatment of the subject falls naturally into two great divisions, to which we will add supplementary remarks on the adoration and reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. Considered as a sacrament, the Eucharist is the true Body and Blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine. Like all the sacraments, it was instituted by Christ, and, like them, it consists of an outward part—viz. bread and wine, or the appearance of bread and wine; and an inward or invisible part—viz. the body and blood of Christ with the grace which they impart to those who communicate worthily. But as this definition of the Eucharist is rejected by most Protestants, and as there are many other points concerning this mystery which need explanation, we are obliged for the sake of clearness to make many subdivisions and to take the points in debate one by one. As the whole of the Church's doctrine on the sacrament and sacrifice depends upon the Real Presence, we shall consider this first.

I. *The Real Presence.*

(a) The Council of Trent, sess. xiii. De Euch. can. 7, teaches that, after the consecration, the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, are contained "truly, really, and substantially in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist," and it anathematizes those who say that Christ's Body and Blood are there in sign and figure only, or

virtually. Christ is in the Eucharist truly—*i.e.* the words "This is my body" are not, as the Zwinglians contend, a mere figure; He is there really—*i.e.* objectively, so that His presence does not depend, as Calvin said it did, on the faith of the recipient; He is there substantially, which word excludes the Calvinistic error that Christ's body is in heaven and nowhere else, though it exercises its virtue and power in the Eucharist.

The Real Presence is clearly implied in Scripture. It was taught first of all by our Lord Himself in the synagogue at Capharnaum, just a year before his Passion. On the day preceding this discourse He had fed the five thousand by the miraculous multiplication of bread, and the crowd went to Capharnaum next day in quest of Him (Jn. vi.). Christ rebuked them, because they set greater value on earthly bread than on the food of the soul; and they asked Him for a "sign" in confirmation of His authority. The miracle of the day before was not enough. He had, after all, only fed the crowd with common bread. What was that to the miracle of the desert? "Our fathers eat the manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." Christ answered that He was the true bread come down from heaven; the food of the soul to those who believed in Him, as the manna had been the food of the body. So far—*i.e.* down to verse 50—there is nothing in the discourse to prove the Real Presence. But Christ goes on to say, "The bread which I will give is" (not my doctrine but) "my flesh." "He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." The future tense ("the bread which I *will* give") shows that the mysterious gift of which Christ spoke was not yet bestowed. It was possible to believe in Him, but it was not possible as yet to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. This feeding on Christ's flesh and blood can only refer to the Holy Eucharist. No doubt Christ might most fitly have spoken of belief in Himself as a feeding on heavenly bread; but to describe faith in Him as a feeding on His flesh and blood would be a violent and unnatural use of words in any language, and as addressed to Jews it would have been worse than unnatural. They were accustomed to use the words "eating a man's flesh" metaphorically, but the metaphor signified, not to accept a man's doctrine, but, on the contrary, to treat him with brutal cruelty. Thus the Psalmist speaks of his enemies coming near him to "eat his flesh"; and Job uses similar language of his false friends.[1] Our Lord, therefore, speaks of a literal, not of a metaphorical, eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood. Another argument for the Catholic interpretation is supplied by the way in which Christ's words were received. The Jews exclaimed "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Whereupon our Lord, instead of explaining that He meant only to say that they must believe in His doctrine, repeated His former assertion in the most solemn and emphatic manner: "Amen, amen, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have not life in you. . . . My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink." Others who heard the doctrine from His disciples found it hard and intolerable. To remove the scandal they had taken, Christ appealed to that divine power which He was to manifest in His Ascension, and added, "It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life: but there are some of you who do not believe." In the first part of this verse Christ cannot have meant to say that His flesh was absolutely unprofitable: to do so would have been to contradict the substance of His previous discourse, even if we accept the ultra-Protestant interpretation of it. Christ was to give His flesh for the life of the world, so that He could not speak of this flesh as utterly unprofitable. His meaning is that flesh in itself, even His own flesh apart from that Spirit which God had given Him without measure[1] and which was united to it, could not be of any avail. Nor again, in the latter part of the verse "The words I have spoken to you are spirit and life," does Christ contrast faith in His words with feeding on His flesh, for, apart from other objections, our Lord does not speak of His word generally, but of those particular words which He has just uttered and which some of His hearers did not believe. The discourse in the synagogue had been a scandal to them, and our Lord declares that His words, far from giving any real occasion for scandal, were spirit and life to those who received them; the fault lay not in Him or in His words, but in their unbelief.

This exposition is confirmed by the last part of the chapter. Clearly, the Evangelist did not think that Christ had softened down or explained His mysterious promise, for he goes on to tell us that from that time many of Christ's disciples went back and walked no more with Him, so that our Lord was constrained to ask the twelve Apostles if they also would go away.

At the Last Supper, Christ explained by the institution of the Eucharist that mysterious eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood which He had announced in the synagogue of Capharnaum. He celebrated with the chosen twelve the paschal rite. This rite was a sacrifice commemorative of Israel's redemption; it was,

[1] Ps. xxvi. (in Heb. xxvii.) 2. Job xix. 22. The Chaldee Targum preserves the same metaphor in both passages.

[1] 1 Jn. iii. 34.

indeed, the one commemorative sacrifice of the Old Law. Further, it was a feast upon a sacrifice, and the eating of the Paschal Lamb bound the Israelites together in the unity of the Jewish Church. Christ, as His disciples knew, was the true Paschal Lamb, come to take the sins of the world away. As He substituted His atoning death for the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, so He gave His Body and Blood in place of the lamb on which they had been used to feast. Just when He was about to abolish types and shadows by His death, He instituted for all time the new paschal rite which was more than a type or shadow. It was to be at one and the same time a sacrifice commemorative of the redemption, a feast on Himself, the Lamb of God, the great means of sanctification for His people, and the bond which was to unite the "Israel of God" throughout the world. He said of the bread, "This is my body"; of the wine, "This is my blood," and He invited His disciples to eat and drink of the banquet prepared for them.

St. Paul, in 1 Cor. x., testifies to the same doctrine. He warns his disciples against participating in the sacrifices offered to idols, and points out the inconsistency of eating the flesh of victims offered to idols and also eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. Christians are to "flee from idols" because they receive the Eucharist. St. Paul contrasts the real flesh of victims sacrificed to idols with the real flesh present in the great Christian sacrament. "I cannot partake," he says, "of the table of the Lord and the table of devils"—*i.e.* of idols. And in order that there may be no possibility of mistaking the sense of his words, he asks, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in (κοινωνία) the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" St. Paul does not say that the consecrated bread and wine are a symbol of Christ's body and blood, but a participation in them. He uses the very same word (κοινωνοὶ) to describe the "partaking" in the Jewish altar. Persons "partook" in Jewish and heathen sacrifices by really eating the flesh of the victim; just in the same way they "partook" of the Christian Eucharist. But the participation in each case was ordered to ends widely different from each other, so that it was a gross inconsistency to unite any two of the three different participations with each other.

We can only select a few from the mass of patristic testimonies to the doctrine of the Real Presence. St. Ignatius, St. John's disciple, is arguing against the Docetae, who denied the reality of our Lord's body altogether. St. Ignatius[1] points out the consequences of this unbelief. Not admitting that our Lord took on Himself true flesh, those men "abstained from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Had the Church of those days believed that the Eucharist was no more than a symbol, there was nothing in the celebration of the sacrament which need have offended them. They granted that our Lord had an apparent body, and they could offer no objection to the commemoration of His death under a symbolic form. But they could not partake in a sacrament which professed to communicate the true body of Christ, for the simple reason that they denied the reality of Christ's body altogether. It may be worth while to mention in passing that the celebrated Protestant commentator Meyer[1] admits the force of this passage. In an historical account of the Eucharistic doctrine, appended to his commentary on St. Matthew, he allows that St. Ignatius, in opposition to the Docetae, "undoubtedly states the doctrine that in the Eucharist Christ's flesh and blood are given in a real way." In one of the earliest accounts which we possess of the Eucharistic celebration among the primitive Christians we find the same unhesitating belief in the real presence. "This food," says Justin Martyr, who died in the year 166, "is known among us as the Eucharist. . . . We do not receive these things as common bread and common drink; but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given (εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν), through prayer in His words, and from which our blood and flesh are nourished in such a way as to be changed, are the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."[2] Some words in this passage are very difficult to understand, or even to translate, and they have proved the *crux* of commentators, but the part relating to the Real Presence is clear and simple. Justin considers the presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist as certain as the fact that He took flesh and blood in His Incarnation. And here again we may remark that Meyer interprets St. Justin exactly as we have done. At the close of the second century, St. Irenaeus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John, uses the very argument against the Gnostics which St. Ignatius had employed against the Docetae. Against the Gnostic error that the material world is evil and that Christ was not the Son of that (inferior) God who made the world, St. Irenaeus, argues thus: "If the Lord came from another father, how did He act justly when, taking the bread of the creation which lies around us, He confessed that it was His own body, and affirmed that the mixture of the chalice

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* 7, *PG*, v. 713.

[1] *Comm. on St. Matthew*, ed. 5, 1864.
[2] *Apol.* i. 66, *PG*, vi. 428.

[wine mixed with water] was His own blood?"[1] Again, repelling the Gnostic error that the flesh is incapable of salvation, and so would not rise again, St. Irenaeus argues that on the Gnostic theory Christ would not have redeemed us with His Blood, or sanctified our bodies with His own Body and Blood in the Eucharist. "If this flesh of ours is not saved, then clearly the Lord did not redeem us with His blood, nor is the chalice of the Eucharist the communication of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communication of His body. For there is no blood except that which comes from veins and flesh and the rest of man's substance, which human substance the Word of God truly became. He redeemed us with His blood; . . . and since we are his members and are nourished through His creatures, and since He Himself bestows His creatures on us, . . . He confessed that the chalice [taken] from the creature was His proper blood, with which He bedews our blood, and the bread [taken] from the creature He affirmed with a strong affirmation to be His proper body, from which He nourishes our bodies."[2] Let the reader observe that St. Irenaeus puts the Blood of Christ in the Eucharist in the same category with that shed on the cross, the former being real, just as the latter was real; next, that Irenaeus tells us what he means by blood—viz. literal blood, taken from the veins; lastly, that Irenaeus intimates that he is speaking of a stupendous mystery, for he tells us that our Saviour solemnly or strongly affirmed (διεβεβαιώσατο) that the bread was His proper Body. We may conclude our patristic citations on this head with a few words from Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386). "Since then He has declared and said of the bread, 'This is my body,' who after that will venture to doubt? And seeing that He has affirmed and said, 'This is my blood,' who will raise a question and say it is not His blood?"[3] Even if the witness of Scripture to the Real Presence were doubtful, the fact that a doctrine so mysterious, so difficult to reason, found such speedy and universal acceptance throughout the Church that Ignatius, a disciple of St. John, could take it for granted in his controversy with heretics, should be enough to turn the scale in favour of the Catholic interpretation.

(β) *Transubstantiation.*—It is not enough to confess Christ's Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Council of Trent requires us further to confess the "change of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood [of Christ], only the appearances of bread and wine remaining; which change the Catholic Church most fitly calls transubstantiation." The word "transubstantiation" appears to have come into use during the controversy with Berengarius, and a person who rejected it as "foolish and barbarous" would not thereby fall into heresy, though his conduct, Suarez says, would be scandalous and rash, and would expose him to just suspicion of heresy. But the word implies a truth beyond the mere fact of Christ's presence in the sacrament; and this truth is of faith. It is necessary then to begin by explaining the word.

The Church has adopted the distinction made by the Aristotelians between substance and accident. The essence or substance is that which constitutes the thing, which makes it what it *is*, and it is distinct from accidents or qualities which may change while the thing itself remains. Common sense teaches us this distinction. If water undergoes certain accidental changes—*e.g.* if having been cold it becomes heated to the boiling point—we still call it water: in other words, we recognise the fact that though the water has become hot instead of cold, the substance of water is there still, and that the change is merely accidental. If, however, the water were changed by natural process into blood, or grape-juice, or again by miracle into wine, anyone would see that not merely the qualities, but the thing was changed. The substance of water would have ceased to be, and would have been replaced by that of grape-juice, blood, or wine. Substance is the inner reality in which the qualities or accidents inhere, or, in the more exact language of the Schools, substance is that which naturally stands by itself without any subject or substratum in which it inheres. An accident is that which naturally inheres in a substance as its subject or substratum. Now, whereas the change which the elements in the other sacraments undergo is accidental (*e.g.*, the water in Baptism remains water, and simply receives a new power to cleanse from sin), the change of the elements in the Eucharist is an essential or substantial one. The substance of bread and wine ceases to be, for it is changed into Christ's Body and Blood. In one respect, however, this substantial change differs from all other substantial changes. In other cases, when one substance changes into another, the accidents also change. When our Lord changed the water into wine, the new substance had the appearance &c. of wine. But here the accidents of bread and wine remain unaltered; and so long as they remain, the Body and Blood of Christ also remain concealed beneath them. Hence it follows that in the Eucharist there is no deception of the senses. What we see, feel, or taste in the Blessed Sacrament is real, for the accidents are real entities, and the accidents are all that the senses ever do perceive. From the existence of

[1] Iren. iv. 33, 2, *PG*, vii. 1073.
[2] Iren. v. 2, 2, *PG*, vii. 1124.
[3] *Cat. Mystag.* xxii. 4, *PG*, xxx. iii. 1097.

the accidents reason infers that of the substance to which they naturally correspond, but with regard to the Eucharist this inference would be false, since faith assures us that in this case the accidents conceal the Body and Blood of Christ, not the substances of bread and wine. It is, moreover, because the accidents remain that the Eucharist is a sacrament. They constitute the outward part—they are the sensible sign of that refreshment of the soul which follows from a worthy reception of the Blessed Sacrament.

Taking for granted the Real Presence, we may fairly claim to prove the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words of consecration as given in the Gospels. On the Lutheran theory of consubstantiation [*q.v.*]—according to which the substances of bread and wine are still present after consecration, though the substance of Christ's Body is there also—Christ could not have said "This is my body," but only "My body is here"—"My body is present with this bread." The sensible signs or accidents indicate the substance which underlies them; so long, therefore, as the substance of bread remains, the proposition "This is bread" must be true, and any other proposition—*e.g.* "This is Christ's body"—must be false. It is of no avail to urge that Christ's Body is also present. The question is not whether it is present, but whether it is directly indicated by the accidents of bread. If the substance of bread remains, the natural connection between accidents and substance remains also; and to say of bread "This is Christ's body" is not less absurd than it would be to say of bread in which a gold coin was concealed "This (pointing to the bread) is gold." True, we may point to a cask and say "This is wine," because everybody knows that the cask is meant to contain liquid, and by a permissible licence of speech we put the thing which contains for that which is contained in it. But the accidents of bread are not intended, on the theory of consubstantiation, either by nature or use, to contain the body of Christ; and the word "this" could only signify the substance of bread visible by its accidents.[1]

We pass to patristic testimonies, and here we shall have an opportunity of adding to the proofs from tradition already given for the Real Presence; and we shall also be able to set the doctrine of transubstantiation in a clearer light, and to show that, although the term is philosophical, the truth which it implies is very simple. The Fathers, then, imply this belief in transubstantiation when they say that the bread is changed into or becomes the Body of Christ; because, on any theory except that of transubstantiation, the substance of bread remains, and is not, therefore, changed into another substance. The following quotations are taken from Franzelin's treatise on the Eucharist. "Taking bread, He *made* it His body." (Tertullian, "Adv. Marc." iv. 40, PL, ii. 460): "Of old He changed water into wine, which is akin to blood, in Cana of Galilee; shall we think Him unworthy of faith now that He has *changed* wine *into* blood?" (Cyril of Jerusalem, "Cat. xxii. Myst. iv." 1, 2, PG, xxxiii. 1097): The change of water into wine was, of course, an instance of transubstantiation; so, also, according to Cyril, is the change effected in the Eucharist. "Before consecration," says St. Ambrose, "De Myster." ix. 54, PL, xvii. 407, "it is called something else; after consecration it is named blood; and thou sayest 'Amen'—*i.e.* 'It is true.'" St. James of Sarug writes: "From the point of time when He took bread and called it His body, it was not bread, but His body." Theodoret, on Mt. xxvi. 26: "It [the bread] is *changed* by a wonderful operation, though to us it *appears* bread. . . . Bread, indeed, it appears to us, but flesh in fact (τῷ ὄντι) it is." Against such testimonies (which might easily be multiplied) it is useless to quote passages from Scripture or the Fathers in which the appearances which remain after consecration are called bread and wine. They are naturally called according to the outward appearance which they present; and it would be easy to prove, by the same argument, that Catholics at the present day do not believe in transubstantiation.

(γ) *The Mode of Christ's Presence.*—The Council of Trent defines that Christ is contained whole and entire under either species—*i.e.* that His Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity are given both under the form of bread and under that of wine. Where Christ's Body is, there His Godhead must be also, because by the hypostatic union the Godhead became indissolubly united to human nature. Moreover, as Christ, having died once, lives for evermore, it follows that the human soul must needs be united to that risen and glorified Body which we receive in communion. Hence Christ speaks of eating his Flesh as equivalent to eating Him.[1] Further, the same kind of reasoning certifies that Christ is given whole and entire under either kind. True, the force of the words of consecration puts the body under the appearance of bread, the blood under the appearance of wine; but Christ has no Body except that glorified one united to His Blood—no blood except such as is united to His Body. Otherwise Christ would be slain over again every time Mass is said; for on each occasion the Body would be separated from the Blood. Again, the constant practice of the Church relieves

[1] The argument given from the words of consecration is adopted by most theologians, and seems to be favoured by the language of the Council of Trent, xiii. 4. However, Scotus and Durandus denied that the words *in themselves* proved transubstantiation.

[1] Jn. vi. 57, 58, "He that eateth me"; . . . "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

us from any fear that this reasoning may be precarious. Since the Council of Constance it has been the general law in the West that all except the celebrant should communicate only under the species of bread. And the Church, though it has changed its discipline in this matter, has by no means introduced a new principle. Infants among the early Christians received Communion under the form of wine, and sick persons, solitaries, &c., under the one form of bread. The principle was fixed—viz. that Christ was given whole and entire under either species; it was merely the application of this principle which varied. [See COMMUNION.]

The Council of Trent goes on to say that the whole Christ is present under every separate part of each species (*sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta*). What has been said in defence of Christ's presence under either species admits of obvious application here; and we will only add that Christ said of the divided host, "This is my body."

This seems the fitting place to explain what theologians mean by the spiritual presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. It is not meant to deny that Christ's Body in the Eucharist is a real one (such a denial would be heresy), but just as all bodies after the resurrection become spiritual without ceasing to be bodies, because they have certain properties of spirit, so it is with Christ's Body in the Eucharist, only to a much wider extent and in a more wonderful way. At one and the same time Christ's Body is in heaven and on a thousand altars. As the spirit is present entire in the whole body and in each part of it, so the Body of Christ, with all its substance and qualities, is present in each host and in each part of the host. Consequently, the Eucharistic Body of Christ is not extended in space—*i.e.* one part of Christ's body does not correspond to one particular part of the host. All this, of course, involves a series of stupendous miracles. It does not, however, imply any contradiction; and nothing, we know, is impossible to God Almighty.

II. *The Eucharist as a Sacrament.*

(*a*) *Its Institution, including the Matter and Form.*—Christ Himself instituted the Eucharist on the night before His Passion. Our Lord took bread into His hands, and having given thanks (εὐχαριστήσας),[1] He broke it and gave it to His disciples, saying, "This is my body which is given for you: this do for a commemoration of me." In the same manner He took the chalice and said, "This is the blood of the New Testament which is shed for you." From this it appears that bread and wine are the matter to be used in the sacrament. It is certain, further, that wheaten bread ought to be used, for the Council of Florence declares that "wheaten bread and wine" are the matter of this sacrament, and nearly all theologians hold that no other kind of bread can be used without invalidating the sacrament, because, when bread without further qualification is mentioned wheaten bread would be commonly understood.[2] The Council of Florence in the Decree of Union, defined that consecration either in leavened or unleavened bread is valid. Latin priests are bound to use the latter; Orientals, except Maronites and Armenians, use the former. It is certain that the Latin Church follows the use of Christ Himself, for leavened bread could not have been employed at the paschal supper, so that the violent attacks made on the Latin Church for its use of unleavened bread by Michael Caerularius in 1043, and often repeated by the schismatic Greeks, are clearly unwarranted. It is impossible to ascertain with certainty the use of the ancient Church on this head. Sirmond contends that even the Latins used leavened bread for eight hundred years and more. Authorities of equal reputation — viz. Mabillon and Christianus Lupus—hold that the Latins have always used unleavened bread since Apostolic times. Bona thinks that, whereas the Greeks have always used leavened bread, the Latins in the early ages used either leavened or unleavened bread according to convenience, and that the use of the latter was not obligatory among them till the tenth century.[3] The wine must of course be the fermented juice of the grape. Water is mixed with it according to a custom which must have been followed by Christ (for the paschal wine, which He used in the first Eucharist, was always so mixed), and which is proved to be Apostolic, both because it is mentioned by Justin Martyr[4] in the sub-Apostolic age, and because it is followed at this day, not only throughout the Catholic Church in all the varying rites according to which Mass is said, but also by all heretical sects which have preserved the priesthood, with the single exception of the Armenian Monophysites.[5] But the mixture of water with the wine does not belong to the essence of the sacrament, and it must be made in small quantity, since wine, not wine and water, is a constituent part of the matter of the sacrament.

[1] The term εὐλογήσας, used by Mt. xxvi. 26 and by Mk. xiv. 22, translated "blessing it" (the bread), need not be taken as synonymous with "giving thanks," but may possibly imply some prayer of petition. Both Mt. (*v.* 27) and Mk. (*v.* 23) in reference to the chalice have εὐχαριστήσας. The church employs both forms in her Liturgy, "gratias agens, benedixit." But see CONSECRATION.

[2] Cajetan (apud Billuart, *De Euch.* diss. iii. a. 1) denied that the use of wheaten bread was absolutely necessary. But Ἄρτος is the word used by the Evangelists, and that means wheaten bread, μαζα being the word for barley bread.

[3] Benedict XIV. *De Fest.* P. I. clxiv.

[4] *Apol.* 1. 56.

[5] They in all probability altered this rite to express their detestation of the Catholic doctrine on the two natures of Christ, and the Church has refused to tolerate their present custom. Benedict XIV. *De Miss.* xi. 10.

(β) The *Ministration* of the Eucharist is committed to priests. They alone can consecrate validly; for it was His Apostles, and not the faithful generally, to whom Christ said, "Do this for a commemoration of me." Justin, in his account of the Eucharist already referred to, speaks of the προεστὼς, or president, as the celebrant; and Tertullian, "De Coron. Mil." 3, PL, ii., tells us that the Eucharist "was taken from the hands of nobody else except those of the presidents." The "president" is evidently another word for the bishop, who, in early times, celebrated the Eucharist while the priests around him joined in the sacred acts as *consacrificantes*. The First General Council takes for granted that priests alone can consecrate. It condemns the abuse of deacons administering the Eucharist to priests, because it was unseemly that those who cannot sacrifice should "give the Body of Christ" to those who could offer it (*τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*).[1]

The Eucharist of course remains the Body of Christ whoever administers it. But priests alone do so lawfully and by virtue of their office.[2] Deacons may administer it if empowered to do so, and at one time they did commonly give the chalice to communicants [see DEACON].

(γ) *The Effects of the Eucharist.*—To communicate with profit we must do so without the stain of mortal sin on the soul. This appears from St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. xi. 27, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the chalice"; from the constant practice of Christian antiquity, as testified by the declaration of the Fathers, the exclusion of penitents from communion, the words "sancta sanctis" in the ancient liturgies; from the nature of the sacrament, which is intended as the food of the soul, and therefore can confer no benefit on a soul dead by sin.[3] In a soul duly disposed the Eucharist produces effects similar to those of natural food on the body. It unites us to Christ, the author of grace and virtue. It sustains and increases the spiritual life; it repairs the injuries done to the soul by sin, for it increases the love of God and of true virtue, and fills us with spiritual sweetness; on the same grounds it preserves the Christian from future falls. It is also both to soul and body the pledge of future glory, since Christ is bestowed on us for this special end, that we may preserve and obtain that happiness which God reserves for the virtuous; while the body has a new title to a glorious resurrection. It is fitting that Christ should regard the flesh of the worthy communicant with a special interest, and conform it in due time to His own glorified body.

III. *The Eucharist as a Sacrifice.*

A sacrifice is defined as "the oblation of a sensible thing made to God through a lawful minister by a real change in the thing offered, to testify God's absolute authority over us and our entire dependence on Him." This is not the place to discuss the history and meaning of the primitive sacrifices. Catholic theologians have generally taught that in sacrifice the life of the victim—or the existence of the thing, or, at least, of some small part of the thing (Levit. ii.) as a memorial, if the oblation be of a thing without life—is substituted for the life of those in whose name it is offered. The thing offered must be visible, for sacrifice pertains to external worship, and it is only in a metaphorical sense that the prayer of the heart and the like are called sacrifices. It can be made lawfully to God alone, for no other but He is the Lord of life and death. Such sacrifices were offered from the earliest times to the true God by the patriarchs, and among heathen nations to their false deities. God accepted and approved sacrificial worship from the first; and when the law was given to the people of Israel sacrifice was enjoined and its mode carefully regulated on divine authority. Christ offered on the cross a sacrifice for our redemption, and from that moment the Jewish sacrifices ceased to have any efficacy. They were instituted to typify the sacrifice of Christ, and now that the reality had come the types were no longer needed. The worship of sacrifice, however, was not to cease in the Church, and the Council of Trent defines that in the Eucharist or Mass a true and proper sacrifice is offered to God. (Sess. xxii. can. 1.)

The Old Testament[1] foretells this sacrifice of the Mass just as clearly as it predicts the sacrifice of the cross. No prophet seems to speak more lightly of the Jewish ritual than Jeremiah. He looks forward to a time when the ark of the covenant will not be remade or even missed. "They will not say any more 'The ark of the covenant of the Lord,' and it will not be thought of; they will not remember it or miss it, and it will not be made again" (iii. 16). He looks forward instead to that new covenant which God will write on the heart. But is there to be no sacrifice under this new covenant? Let the following passage answer: "In those days Judah will be saved, and Jerusalem will dwell confidently, and this is the name which they call it [Jerusalem], the Lord our justice. For thus saith the

[1] Can. 18, Hefele-Leclercq, i. 610.

[2] Concil. Trid. xiii. 8.

[3] One exception must be here made. Many theologians hold that a person who without fault of his own approaches Communion in a state of mortal sin, for which he has supernatural sorrow, but not that sorrow known as perfect contrition, would be reconciled to God in the act of reception. Such a case might occur, *e.g.*, if a person erroneously supposed that he had been absolved.

[1] The passages of Scripture here and elsewhere throughout this article are translated for obvious reasons from the original texts.

Lord, a man shall not be cut off to David sitting on the throne of the house of Israel; and to the priests, the Levites, a man shall not be cut off from before my face presenting the holocaust and offering the meat [or flour] offering and making sacrifice all the days. And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias saying: Thus saith the Lord, if ye will break my covenant [consisting in] the day and my covenant [consisting in] the night, so that there should be no more daytime and night in their season; then also shall my covenant be broken with David my servant, so that he should not have a son reigning on his throne, and with the Levites, the priests who minister to me. As the host of the heavens cannot be numbered, and the sand of the sea cannot be measured, so I will multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites who minister to me" (xxxiii. 16 *seq.*). Evidently this is a Messianic prophecy. The son of David is, as orthodox Protestants gladly admit, no other than Christ the son of David, and the Son of God. Surely, then, there is no escape from the conclusion that in the Messianic kingdom—*i.e.* in the Church—sacrifice will continue to be offered, and will last while sun and moon endure, or, in other words, till the end of the world and of the Christian dispensation. A recent Protestant writer who belongs to the sceptical school, and has scant sympathy with Catholic doctrine, admits that, "taken literally, the eternity of Levitical sacrifices, as expressed in xxxiii. 18, seems quite inconsistent with all else in Jeremiah's prophecies," and, "taken typically, only fits the sacrifice of the Mass, to which Roman Catholic expositors refer it; for the sacrifices are to be offered continually in all time." [1]

Malachi, in a familiar passage, expresses the same idea still more strongly and definitely. He speaks of God as rejecting the Jewish sacrifices. "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and a meat [or flour] offering I will not accept from your hands." But is sacrifice to cease? On the contrary, "from the rising of the sun even to its going down great is my name among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure flour offering, since great is my name among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts" (Malach. i. 10, 11). The sacrifices of the old law were offered only in Palestine; the new sacrifice of Messianic times is to be offered among the Gentiles. Jewish sacrifices could be offered only in one place; the new sacrifice is to be offered all over the world. The sacrifice here predicted cannot be that of the cross, which was made once for all on Calvary. The rabbins and Protestant scholars, whether sceptical or orthodox, have been utterly unable to explain this passage even plausibly. To say with Ebn Ezra and Kimchi [1] that the prophet means that the heathens would, if God commanded them to do so, offer acceptable sacrifice, is doing violence to the plain meaning of the words. Again, the whole context, which speaks of sacrifice in the literal sense, excludes the supposition that the offering of the Gentiles is to be a mere sacrifice of praise and prayer; nor would a prophet of the Persian period have regarded the offering of such a sacrifice in every place as anything extraordinary.[2] Still more desperate is Hitzig's interpretation, which attributes to Malachi the modern and utterly un-Hebrew notion that "Jahve, Ormuzd, Zeus (!), and perhaps others, were only different names of the one Supreme God." The sacrifice of the Mass, and that only, satisfies the requirements of a scientific exegesis.

Christ at the Last Supper fulfilled these prophecies and instituted the transfigured Passover of the new law, in which He Himself, the true Paschal Lamb, was to be continually sacrificed and eaten. When He blessed the bread and wine His eye was fixed on the morrow when He was to suffer and die; but His priesthood, begun when He assumed our human nature, was not to end with a single act of sacrifice. He was to continue it throughout time by the hands of His earthly representatives, who were to offer Him on the altars of the Church under the forms of bread and wine. He speaks of Himself under the forms of bread and wine as already in the state of a victim offered as sacrifice for men. He speaks of His body in the Eucharist as "given for you" (Lk. xxii. 19), just as He had said "the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (Jn. vi. 52). He says of the chalice—*i.e.* of the blood therein contained—that it is "shed for you" (Lk. xxii. 20). We lay no stress on the fact that it is the present and not the future tense which Christ employs; to do so would show great ignorance of Scriptural usage. But the fact remains that Christ speaks of the body *under the form of bread*, of the blood *in the chalice* as presented in a sacrificial state for the life of men. The perpetual sacrifice of the altar was to be one with the sacrifice of the cross.

[1] Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 402. The passage is wanting in the chief MSS. of the LXX. The LXX version of Jeremiah omits some 2,700 words found in our Hebrew text, and gives many of the chapters in a different order, so that this omission need not surprise us. Hitzig, *ad loc.*, and Kuenen, *Het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken de ouden verbonds*, ii. p. 203, treat the passage as an interpolation. Ewald's opinion (*Propheten*, ii. p. 269) is diametrically opposite.

[1] Quoted by Steiner *ad loc.* in his commentary published in 1881.

[2] This interpretation, adopted by many Protestants (*e.g.* by Keil, *ad loc.*), is given in the Targum. In the Chaldee the verse is paraphrased thus: "Since from the rising of the sun and to its setting great is my name among the peoples, and in every time when you do my will I will receive your prayer and my great name will be sanctified by means of you, and your prayer shall be as a pure oblation before me, since great is my name among the peoples, saith Jehovah of hosts."

The one offering worthy of God was to replace the typical sacrifices prescribed in the Pentateuch. The sacrifice of the altar was to represent and commemorate that of the cross and also to supply all that was wanting in the latter. The Jews were commanded to eat of their peace offerings and so to enter into communion with God. No one could eat of the sacrifice offered on Calvary, but Christians for all time were to feed on the divine Victim present in the Eucharistic oblation. The sacrifice of the cross was offered once; in the sacrifice of the altar the Christian Church was provided with the noblest form of worship, to be offered day by day. The sacrifice of the cross was "dishonoured, without public testimony to its dignity and power." The sacrifice of the altar was to be the centre of the Church's worship and solemnities, the object of her unceasing veneration. It was to unite the faithful to God and to each other; it was to teach them how to offer themselves, body and soul, in sacrifice to God in union with the perfect sacrifice of Christ; it was to separate them wholly and utterly from participation in Jewish and heathen sacrifices. This last point is clearly brought out by St. Paul in a way which shows beyond possibility of mistake his belief in the Eucharistic sacrifice. In urging the Corinthians not to partake in heathen sacrifices he reminds them, as we have seen above, that the Eucharistic bread imparts the Body of Christ, the chalice of benediction His Blood, and he concludes, "Ye cannot partake in the table of the Lord and the table of devils." The table of devils was of course the heathen altar, and partaking in the table of devils means eating of the sacrifices offered to false gods, whom St. Paul declares to be really demons. The Apostle therefore sets altar against altar, sacrifice against sacrifice, communion against communion

This belief in the sacrifice of the altar has prevailed at all times and all places within the Church. St. Ignatius tells the Philadelphians they must partake of one Eucharist, since there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ; one Chalice which unites us to His blood; one *θυσιαστήριον* or place of sacrifice.[1] "The chalice," says Irenaeus,[2] "which comes from this world of ours, He [Christ] confessed to be His blood and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which oblation the Church, receiving it from the Apostles, offers in the whole world to God." "The oblation of the Church," he continues, referring to the prophecy of Malachi, "which our Lord taught to be offered in the whole world, is counted a pure sacrifice before God." He proves that Catholics alone have the right to celebrate this new oblation, heretics being excluded because a belief in the Real Presence is inconsistent with their other theories; Jews, because "their hands are full of blood, for they have not received the word which is offered to God."[1] This is nothing less than a distinct assertion of the Catholic truth that the divine Victim who shed His blood for us on the cross applies to us the merits of His Passion, by offering Himself continually on the altar. We may add that the Fathers, from very early times, explained the words in Psalm cx., "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," as referring to the Eucharistic sacrifice. They knew from the Epistle to the Hebrews that Melchizedek, "the king of justice and of peace," was a type of Christ. They remembered the words in Genesis xiv 18, "Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of God most high," and the prophecy in Psalm cx., "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order or manner of Melchizedek," and accordingly they found the reality typified by Melchizedek in the Eucharist when Christ offers Himself through His priests under the appearances of bread and wine. "Who," asks Cyprian, "is more truly a priest of God most high than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father and offered the same sacrifice which Melchizedek offered (that is bread and wine)—namely, His own body and blood?"[2] "His body," says St. Augustine, "is offered up instead of all those sacrifices and oblations, and it is given to the communicants." Ambrose, Chrysostom, and a multitude of other Fathers hold similar language. The ancient liturgies, written in many languages and used in many different parts of the Church, testify likewise to the universality of this belief. They speak of the "tremendous, divine, unbloody, the perpetual, the living sacrifice" of the Lamb "who, being sacrificed, never dies"; they declare that "our sacrifice is the body and blood of the priest Himself, Christ our Lord."[3]

Having established the truth of the Church's doctrine on the sacrifice of the Mass, it only remains to state and explain that doctrine more fully, avoiding however, as far as possible, merely scholastic questions. All that is included in the idea of sacrifice is found in the Eucharist. There is the oblation of a sensible thing—viz. of the Body and Blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. The oblation is made by a lawful minister—viz. by Christ Himself acting through earthly priests, who are His

[1] *Ad Philad.* 4, *PG*, v. 821.
[2] Iren. iv. 17, 5; 18, 1, *PG*, vii. 1023.

[1] Iren. iv. 18, 4. "Verbum quod offertur"; this is the reading of the three best MSS. (Clarom., Vet. et Voss.), except that the two latter omit the unimportant word "Deo." The reading adopted by Harvey and Neander (*Kirchengeschichte*, i. p. 424) rests on very inferior authority.
[2] "Suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem"; Cyprian, Ep. 63, ed. Hartel, 703. See also Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 25.
[3] See the quotations in Franzelin, *De Euch.* p. 339 *seq.*

representatives.[1] There is the protestation of God's supreme dominion, for the Mass is and can be offered to God alone. Moreover, it fulfils the form and ends of sacrifice. Like the holocausts, it offers homage to God; like the sin-offerings, it propitiates Him by the very fact that it is an oblation of Christ, the Victim for our sins. Like the peace-offerings, it pleads for grace, for we offer here the Victim of our peace. In this sacrifice of thanksgiving we offer God the most excellent gift He has bestowed on us—namely, the Son in whom He is well pleased. Lastly, the sacrifice of the altar is one with that of the cross. True, no blood is shed on the altar, nor does Christ die any more, so that it is by the sacrifice of the cross, not of the Mass, that we were redeemed from sin and its penalties. But on the cross and altar we have the same Victim and the same Priest, and therefore, in the words of the Council of Trent, the sacrifice of the Mass, though a commemoration, is "not a mere (*nuda*) commemoration of the sacrifice on the cross." It is truly "propitiatory"[2] and may be offered for the living and dead, for sins and penalties, for satisfaction and other needs, spiritual and temporal. "Moved," says the same council, "by the oblation of this sacrifice, the Lord, granting grace and the gift of repentance, forgives crimes and sins, even if they be great":[3] and in another place, that it is the most efficacious means of helping the souls in Purgatory.[4] The Mass is offered for the salvation of the living and of the dead who still suffer in the state of purgation. It is necessary that the priest should communicate in every Mass which he celebrates, for consumption of the species forms an integral part of the sacrifice, but it is not necessary that anyone else should do so. The Council of Trent does, indeed, express a desire that in each Mass the faithful who assist, as well as the priest, should communicate; but it "does not condemn, as private and unlawful, those Masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, but approves and even commends them, since such Masses should be considered public (*communes*), partly because the people in them communicate spiritually, partly because they are celebrated by a public minister of the Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful who belong to the body of Christ."[5]

IV. *Adoration, Reservation, &c., of the Blessed Sacrament.*

Several other subjects connected with the Eucharist are treated of under separate articles — *e.g.* BENEDICTION, COMMUNION, CORPUS CHRISTI, EXPOSITION, PROCESSIONS, RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. But it will be well to state here one or two dogmatic principles relating to these matters. Christ gives Himself in this sacrament to be the food of the soul; and every host is consecrated in order that ultimately it may be received by the communicant. Thus the host which is used for Benediction is, after a few days, received by the priest at Mass, and the particles reserved in the tabernacle are all given to communicants and replaced by other particles. However, as food has the qualities which nourish before it is eaten, the actual reception being only the condition without which it will not actually nourish, so the Eucharist, so long as the appearances of bread and wine remain, is always the true Body and Blood of Christ. This truth appears from the words of institution. Our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body"; not "This will be my body the moment you receive it"; and it is defined by the Council of Trent, sess. xiii. can. 4. In consequence of this belief, the Church has from the earliest times treated the Blessed Sacrament with the most anxious reverence. "We are full of anxiety," says Tertullian,[1] "lest anything of our chalice and bread should fall to the ground." Severe penalties were imposed, both in East and West, upon the ministers of the altar, if through their negligence an accident happened to the Blessed Sacrament. Again, the Church commands, and at the same time regulates by stringent laws, the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick. Lastly, Catholics pay to the Eucharist, present on the altar, reserved in the tabernacle, or carried in procession—to the Eucharist, in short, wherever it may be present—that supreme worship which is due to God alone. "The Eucharist," says the Council of Trent,[2] "is not the less adored because Christ instituted it in order that it might be received; for we believe that that same God is present in it of whom the eternal Father, bringing Him into the world, said, 'Let all the angels of God adore Him'; that God whom the Magi adored falling down before Him; who, finally, was adored by the Apostles in Galilee, as the Scripture bears witness." (A masterly account of the New Testament doctrine on the Eucharist will be found in Wiseman, "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, proved from Scripture"; see also Döllinger, "First Age of the Church." It would not be possible to name here the enormous number of books written on the subject. The Schoolmen treat of it in their commentaries on Peter Lombard, lib. iv. dist. 8–13; and on St. Thomas, 3a, qq. 73–83.

[1] Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe*, i. 22. The words of consecration would of themselves put the Body only under the form of bread, the Blood only under that of wine, were it not for the fact of concomitance explained above. But theologians hold different theories as to what constitutes the essence of the sacrifice. See Wilhelm and Scannell, "Manual of Cath. Theol." ii. p. 449. See also SACRIFICE.

[2] Sess. xxii. can. 3.

[3] Sess. xxii. cap. 2.

[4] Sess. xxv. De Purgat.

[5] Sess. xxii. cap. 6.

[1] *De Coron. Mil.* 3, *PL*, ii. 80.

[2] Sess. xiii. cap. 5.

The great work "La Perpétuité de la Foi" is a storehouse of materials for the defence of the Catholic doctrine. Among recent works we may mention Franzelin, "De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento et Sacrificio"; Dalgairns, "Holy Communion"; Ruch, Bareille, Bour, Vernet, De Ghellinck, Mangenot, Godefroy, in DThC—an admirable and exhaustive article by these scholars, with a copious bibliography; Batiffol, "Études d'Histoire, &c., ii. L'Eucharistie"; Rauschen, "Eucharistie"; Hedley, "Holy Eucharist.")

EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS. [See CONGRESSES.]

EUCHITES (Εὐχῆται, praying people; called also Messalians, from an Aramaic word of the same meaning). An heretical sect, of Oriental origin, founded in the fourth century. They rejected all sacraments and religious practices except prayer, which according to them brought them into immediate communication with the Godhead. Thus they were much the same as the Quietists of after ages [*q.v.*]. (See St. Epiphanius, "Haer." lxxx., PG, xlii. 756; Bareille in DThC.)

EUCHOLOGY (Εὐχολόγιον). The book which contains the ritual of the Greek Church, for the celebration of the Eucharist and other Sacraments, and all ecclesiastical ceremonies. It corresponds to the Missal, Pontifical, and Ritual of the Latin Church. It was published by Goar, at Paris, in 1647, under the title "Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecorum, complectens ritus et ordines divinae liturgiae, officiorum, sacramentorum, &c., juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae." (Fortescue in "Cath. Enc.")

EUDISTS. A congregation of secular priests established under the names of Jesus and Mary for the purpose of training clergy and giving missions, and called after their founder, the Père Eudes. M. Eudes (a native of the diocese of Séez, in Normandy) was born in 1601. After being ordained priest, he laboured for several years as an Oratorian, preaching with great power and abundant fruit. Desiring to found a special congregation for the ends specified above, he left the Oratory, and, being joined by eight zealous priests, established the first house of his community at Caen in 1643. In the course of his long life he conducted no less than a hundred and ten missions in all the principal towns of France. He wrote several works, among which "Le Bon Confesseur" and "Le Prédicateur Apostolique" are distinguished. He died at Caen in 1680, leaving his community in a flourishing condition. The Eudists make no vows; yet very few, after being once incorporated in the congregation, have been known to leave it. They wear the ordinary dress of secular priests. It is their principle, while residing in any house of the order, scrupulously to obey the superior, although they are not bound by vow to do so. Frequent change of the superiors of the different houses, with the approval of the bishop, is a fundamental rule of their institute. They are said never to have been infected by Jansenism. The Congregation perished at the Revolution, when many were martyred. In 1826 the order was revived, with F. Blanchard for superior; thirty years afterwards they were more than eighty in number, with four flourishing colleges, the chief house being at Rennes, in Brittany. Mgr. Poirier, Archbishop of Trinidad, who had himself been a Eudist, succeeded in procuring for them the formal approbation of the Holy See; before the Revolution, owing to the opposition of the Oratorians and other causes, they had only obtained partial approbation.

Father Eudes was declared Venerable by Leo XIII. in 1903, and was beatified by Pius X. in 1909. (See Hélyot; Lebrun in DThC.)

EULOGIA (from εὐλογεῖν, to bless, Mt. xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 16). The Blessed Sacrament is the great bond of union among the faithful. "We being many," says the Apostle, "are one bread" (1 Cor. x. 17). However, when many of the faithful no longer communicated as a matter of course at every Mass,[1] the need was felt of showing by some outward sign that they were in full communion with the Church. Accordingly the celebrant consecrated so much only of the bread placed on the altar as was needed for the communicants; the rest of the bread was merely blessed and distributed to those who did not actually communicate, though they had the right to do so. The Eulogia, then, was a substitute—though of course a most imperfect one—for Holy Communion, whence the Greek name, ἀντίδωρον, "that which is given instead."

The learned Dom Cagin in his "Eucharistie" (ii. p. 273) has published some results of his fruitful and original studies on this and kindred subjects. He traces the Eulogiae up to the first century and shows their connection with the primitive Agape or Love-Feast [*q.v.*]. With the help of the "Didache" and "Didascalia," and especially of the remains of the ancient Ethiopic rite, he has even succeeded in sketching the ceremonial accompanying their distribution. It involved a sort of *Missa Sicca* preceding the Eucharistic celebration of the day and recalls vividly our own Palm-Blessing before Mass. A Preface was sung as at Mass, but with the singular rubric that before it be said "Gratias agamus," &c., but not "Sursum corda"—"Hoc enim dicetur (it says) tempore oblationis." The original Eulogiae included, it appears, with the morsel of bread, a sip of blessed but unconsecrated wine from a chalice. Catechumens had no right to

[1] See Cyprian, *De Orat. Dom.* c. 18, ed. Hartel, p. 280.

blessed bread and wine, but received in their place the one and the other simply exorcized.

In the West we find it mentioned by Gregory of Tours in the sixth century, and by the Council of Nantes in 658. The bread used was sometimes the same as that which was set aside for consecration; sometimes ordinary bread was placed on the altar and used for the Eulogiae. Usually the latter bread was blessed after the offertory; but sometimes, as Honorius of Autun tells us, at the end of Mass. The Council of Nantes gives a form of benediction which the Church still employs in the blessing of bread at Easter. The Eulogiae were not given to the Catechumens,[1] to the excommunicated, or to the possessed. Eulogiae were also sent by one bishop to another in sign of intercommunion and as a mark of peace and good will. Here too the Eulogia was a substitute for the Eucharist, since in the earliest times the Blessed Sacrament itself was sent from Church to Church.[2]

Various traces of the Eulogiae may still be discovered in the present usages of the Church. The *ἀντίδωρον* or Eulogia is still distributed among the Greeks; and the "Pain Bénit" [see BREAD] is given in some French churches at Mass. Moreover, words which occur in the canon of the Roman Mass after the consecration, "by whom, O Lord, thou dost ever create all these good things, dost sancti + fy them, quick + en them, ble + ss them, and bestow them on us," in all likelihood were used at first over the Eulogia, not over the Blessed Sacrament.[3] (Smith and Cheetham, "Dict. of Christ. Antiq."; Hefele, "Beiträge," ii.; Heuser in "Kirchenlex."; Rock, i. 110; Bridgett-Thurston, "Hist. of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain," 159 *sqq.*; Kraus, "Real-Encykl.")

EUNOMIANS. The followers of Eunomius, a disciple of Aëtius [see AËTIUS]. Eunomius, born of poor parents in Cappadocia, probably about 320, not feeling disposed to hold the plough, trusted to his wits for a living. After various adventures, he heard that there was a great teacher (Aëtius) residing at Antioch. He went there, and, finding that Aëtius had departed, followed him to Alexandria, where George, his countryman (a violent Arian), had at that time (356) intruded himself into the see of St. Athanasius. Eunomius attached himself to Aëtius, and learned from him theology—*i.e.* Arianism. In 358, Eudoxus, an Arian, having established himself in the see of Antioch, sent for Aëtius; he went there, accompanied by Eunomius. But a semi-Arian council held the same year deposed Eudoxus, and banished him and his friends from Antioch. Eunomius was sent to Midaea in Phrygia. Two years afterwards there occurred an extraordinary revolution; a council held at Constantinople raised Eudoxus to the patriarchal throne there, and made Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus. Here he soon began, in spite of the warnings of his friend Eudoxus, to broach his heretical opinions. Complaints were carried to the emperor (Constantius); and Eudoxus, being pressed on all sides, was obliged to depose him. This was in 361 or 362. Eunomius, retiring to his native country, lived there for many years, frequently ordaining bishops and priests, though he had been deposed. He made known his opinions freely; and his numerous admirers, considering that he had been ill-used by Eudoxus, attached themselves ardently to him in his misfortunes and took his name. St. Gregory Nazianzen, writing to Nectarius, who had succeeded him as Patriarch of Constantinople in 381, calls Eunomius "our bosom mischief," *τὸ ἐγκόλπιον ἡμῶν κακόν*. Gregory, it will be remembered, was himself a Cappadocian.[1] The five orations of this author "De Theologia" are mostly directed against the Eunomians, who, he says, "confessed, when pressed in argument, that the Son was God, but said that it was only a participation of name and designation"[2]—*i.e.* not one of nature. St. Basil, another great Cappadocian († 379), also wrote a treatise against Eunomius. (ARIUS AND ARIANISM; Fleury, "Hist. Eccl." xii.-xiv.; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 886 *sqq.*; Newman, "Arians of the Fourth Century," ch. iv. sect. iv.; Gwatkin, "Studies of Arians"; Le Bachelet in DThC.)

EUSEBIANS. [See ARIUS AND ARIANISM.]

EUSTATHIANS. I. A congregation of fanatical monks, said to have been founded by the versatile Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, about 360, in Armenia. These monks, like the Cathari of later times, condemned marriage as impure, rejected the religious services of priests who had been married, and, while they disregarded the Church fasts, fasted on Sundays and feast days, like those satirised in "Hudibras"—

> "That with more care keep holiday
> The wrong, than others the right way."

The Council of Gangra (340 ?) condemned and suppressed these monks. (Hefele Leclercq, i. 1029.)

II. The party among the Christians of Antioch who, after the unjust deposition of their bishop (St. Eustathius) by the machinations of the Eusebians (330 or 331), refused to recognize any of the Arianizing successors whom that faction thrust into the see, and would not hold communion with those who did so. When Meletius was appointed in 300 there was a prospect of peace; but although Meletius was personally orthodox, the Eustathian party would not accept him,

[1] Some writers consider that St. Augustine says that catechumens received the Eulogiae (*De Peccat. Merit.*, ii. 26); but he is speaking of the blessed salt.

[2] Iren. apud Euseb. *H.E.* v. 24.

[3] Hefele, *Beiträge*, ii. p. 288.

[1] *Or.* xlvi.

[2] *Or.* xxxv.

because he had communicated with Arians. [See MELETIAN SCHISM.] In a short time the Arian party, disgusted with Meletius for the open professions which he had made of agreement with the faith of Nicaea, obtained his deposition and the appointment of Euzoius in his place. There were now three bodies of Christians at Antioch: two orthodox—the Eustathians and the Meletians (*i.e.* those who held that the removal of Meletius was unjust and regarded him as still bishop), and one heretical—namely, those in communion with Euzoius. Many holy bishops desired the termination of the schism between the orthodox parties; and (since Eustathius had died in exile) this result would soon have been brought about by the general reception of Meletius but for the officious zeal of Lucifer of Cagliari, who, going to Antioch in 362, consecrated Paulinus bishop. The Eustathian party at once recognized him; and through the influence, in a great measure, of Lucifer, he was recognized at Rome and in other parts of the West. Nevertheless, as Ballerini shows,[1] the mediate communion of St. Meletius with the see of St. Peter was not broken, for he was in full communion with St. Basil and others, who were in communion with Rome. This state of things lasted many years. St. Meletius, who had been allowed to return to Antioch, died in 381. His followers elected Flavian to succeed him; but the Roman see still recognized Paulinus as true Bishop of Antioch. Paulinus dying in 388, Evagrius was chosen in his place; but the Eustathian party had by this time dwindled to insignificant proportions, and Evagrius obtained little recognition either in East or West. At the death of Evagrius, Flavian succeeded in preventing the election of a successor, and was himself admitted to communion as Bishop of Antioch by Pope Siricius in 398. But a small Eustathian party lingered on for some years, until the vigorous action of Alexander, the second successor of Flavian, about 414, finally extinguished them. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 81.)

EUTYCHIANS. [See MONOPHYSITES; CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF.]

EVANGELIARIUM or EVANGELISTARIUM. A book containing the sections of the Gospel to be read at Mass. Such a book is called by the Greeks *εὐαγγέλιον*; they give the name *εὐαγγελιστάριον* to a book which merely marks the beginning and end of each Gospel, but which gives, besides, rules for finding the Gospel on each Sunday, a calendar with canons for fixing the date of Easter Sunday (*πασχάλιον διηνεκές*), the tones of the chant, and the matins for the different Sundays. (See Baudot, "Les Lectionnaires," "Les Evangéliaires"; "The Lectionary," Eng. tr. of the former.)

[1] *De Vi et Ratione Primatus*, p. 331.

EVANGELICAL COUNSELS. St. Thomas thus explains the difference between commandments and counsels. Eternal happiness is the end at which every man is bound to aim, and this end he cannot possibly reach except by the keeping of the commandments. The observance of the commandments, then, is a matter of absolute necessity for all who wish to be saved. He who makes the things of this world his end, and worldly prudence his ultimate rule of action, must needs forfeit eternal life and is laying up for himself everlasting misery in the world to come. However, a man may wish to do more than what is absolutely necessary to secure heaven. Instead of asking simply, "What *must* I do to be saved?" (Mt. xix. 16), he may inquire what are the readiest and surest means of securing his salvation. He knows that if he makes the good things of this life his end, he has no hope of life in the world to come, and, recognizing the danger there is in earthly pleasures, he tries to see how far he can keep from them. He has learned from the commandments how to avoid being blinded by the god of this world, and to take the indispensable means of securing his salvation. Now the counsels come to his help. They teach him the shortest way to heaven, the most perfect manner of serving God. The great objects which men pursue are riches, pleasure and honour, the desire of the eyes, the desire of the flesh, the pride of life, spoken of by St. John (1 Jn. ii. 16). The three evangelical counsels encourage us, so far as we can, to renounce all these desires—to renounce riches for voluntary poverty, pleasure for perfect chastity, our own self-will and love of power for obedience to a religious superior.

The distinction between precept and counsel, although denied by the Protestant Reformers, is recommended by the common sense of mankind. We all feel and recognize in our ordinary language the difference between a man who simply does his duty and another who does acts of singular generosity. Moreover, this distinction is clearly marked by Christ. He told the young man that "if he would enter into life" he must keep the commandments, but that if he wished to be perfect he was to sell all h[illegible]d give it to the poor (Mt. xix. 21). S[illegible] strict precepts on the Corinth[illegible] staining from immo[illegible] married state if they[illegible] But he gives his "[illegible] chastity on the [illegible] is easier for th[illegible] an undivid[illegible] to dwell [illegible] In fact, [illegible] with [illegible]

[1] tra[illegible] κ[illegible]

measure from the high estimation in which the Fathers held the evangelical counsels. So strong was the feeling of the early Christians in favour of these counsels, that even in Apostolic times the danger was that men would refuse to see, not the excellence of virginity, but the lawfulness of marriage. (See 1 Tim. iv. 3.)

An objection is made to the whole idea of "counsels" on the ground that we cannot even keep the commandments perfectly. At the best we are "unprofitable servants" (Lk. xvii. 10). How, then, can we pretend to do more than the law of Christ requires? Now it is most true that no one can perfectly observe either the precepts or the counsels of Christ. No one can observe either the one or the other at all without God's help, so that a man who thought he did his duty perfectly, and could therefore go on to do more than his duty, would show that he had not learnt the rudiments of Christian humility. But the saints who practised the evangelical counsels were of all men furthest removed from such Pharisaical pride. They attributed all that they did to grace, and sincerely acknowledged the imperfection of their best actions. Moreover, it is an obvious fallacy to speak as if by following the counsels, men take on themselves fresh difficulties, whereas the observance of the commandments is hard enough. On the contrary, a man who, being called to it by God's grace, embraces evangelical perfection, removes from himself numberless temptations to break the commandments. Indeed, all Christians find the necessity of following the counsels to a certain extent. Such is the weakness of human nature that a man who never gave away money he could keep without positive sin, never thought of foregoing a lawful pleasure of sense, never submitted to another except under the constraint of positive duty, would infallibly fall into sin. It is easy to imagine special cases in which a man finds that the religious life is the only one in which he can save his soul.

Again, it is urged that if the whole world followed the evangelical counsels, society would be disorganized and would rapidly come to an end. The answer to that is, that the evangelical counsels are not meant for most, much [illegible]or all. The state most perfect[illegible]ld increase temptation [illegible] of those who lack the [illegible]o the strength, to [illegible]e the strength have [illegible]hen who cared for [illegible]hemselves, and corrupt and RELIGIOUS; [illegible]8, a. 4; 2ª [illegible]here the [illegible]gelical [illegible]lity;

liques; St. Francis of Sales, "Treatise of the Love of God," bk. viii., *The Evangelical Counsels*.)

EVANGELISTS. The authors of the four gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The breviary office of Evangelists, says Gavantus, is the same as that of Apostles, except that they differ from each other in the prayer and in the lessons of the three nocturns; and he adds that the same arrangement is to be found in the most ancient MSS. of the Breviary.[1]

From the second century at latest the living creatures mentioned in Ezekiel and the Apocalypse were believed to typify the four evangelists. Commonly Matthew is supposed to be signified by the man, since he begins with the human origin of Christ; Mark by the lion, on account of the "voice of one crying" in the wilderness, at the opening of his gospel; Luke by the ox, the beast offered in sacrifice, since he sets out with the history of the priest Zachary; John by the eagle, because he wings his flight at once beyond all created things to the contemplation of the eternal Word. This interpretation is found in Jerome,[2] and has been generally adopted. Irenaeus,[3] however, assigns the lion to John, the ox to Luke, the man to Matthew, the eagle to Mark. Augustine, followed by Bede, makes Matthew the lion, Mark the man, Luke the ox, John the eagle. These symbols appear for the first time in Christian art on the mosaic of S. Pudenziana, assigned by De Rossi to the time of Pope Siricius, 384–398.[4]

EVE OF A FEAST. [See VIGIL.]

EVIL, ORIGIN OF. The Church [illegible]es of combated and condemned two extren[illegible]valent error on this point. The Gnostics a[illegible]it only Manichees, in early times, denied tha[illegible]which could be in any sense the author o[illegible]major Hence, observing the patent fact th[illegible], mere does exist in the world, they attribut[illegible]ce of creation of material things to an in[illegible]licly God; to a principle ignorant and defect. or even, as some of them asserted, positive[illegible] wicked and malicious. Again, the Reformers, especially Calvin, went to the other extreme. Rightly maintaining that God is the author of all that exists, they made Him the author of sin. They shrank, at least after a time, from asserting this in plain words, but the Calvinistic doctrine that God predestines some men to eternal ruin, leaves them without the grace which is essential for good actions, and even instigates them to wicked actions ("Dei impulsu"),[5] is in fact tantamount to a

[1] Gavant. tom. II. § viii. cap. 1.
[2] *Proœm. in Matt.*, *PL*, xxvi. 10.
[3] iii. 11, 8, *PG*, vii. 887.
[4] Kraus, *Real-Encyklop.*
[5] "Homo justo Dei impulsu agit quod sibi non licet." Calvin, *Instit.* I. iv. 18, § 2. Beza and Zwingli teach the same doctrine in still more offensive terms. So did Melanchthon at first, but he and the Lutherans generally altered their doctrine on this point for the better. See the accurate and interesting account in Möhler's *Symbolism*, i. 1, § 4.

declaration that God is the author of sin. Before stating the doctrine of the Church, which is opposed to the error of the Manicheans on the one hand, of Calvinists and Lutherans on the other, it will be well to give a brief sketch of St. Thomas's teaching on the nature of evil.

Evil according to the Thomist theology has no positive existence. It is the privation of good—*i.e.* not the mere absence of it,[1] but its absence in a person, an action, or thing, when the integrity or perfection of the person, action, or thing demands it. It is evil, *e.g.*, for a man to be blind, for sight is a sense necessary to man's physical integrity: evil for wood to be subjected to the action of fire, because in such a case the wood is corrupted and soon ceases to be wood altogether: evil for a man to get drunk, because the drunkard secures a certain sensual pleasure at the cost of taking from his action that rectitude which would belong to it if it were moderated by reason and directed to God. The reader will now be able to understand the way in which St. Thomas classes the different kinds of evil. Evil may arise in the natural course of things in such a manner that it need not have any connection with the free will of creatures. Substances are corrupted, animals die, by the mere operation of natural laws. This is what St. Thomas calls "malum in corruptione rerum." Modern writers usually call it physical evil. Again, evil may be a privation inflicted just because it is contrary to the free will of him who has to endure it. This is "malum poenae," evil inflicted as punishment. Lastly, evil may consist in that the agent being free to conform actions to God's law, refuses to do so. This is "malum culpae," the evil of sin—evil in the strictest sense of the word.

There is no difficulty in admitting that God causes physical and retributive evil. He does not, indeed, intend even this kind of evil for its own sake, but He causes corruption and death because they subserve the order and perfection of the universe. The power of God is manifested, and the beauty of the world enhanced, by the constant changes which bring life out of death. So, again, God inflicts punishment because His justice requires that sinners should suffer, and that fear of God's judgments should lead men to take refuge in His infinite love. But God cannot be the author of sin; if so, God would Himself be responsible for it and would cease to be God, for holiness is His very essence. Sin arises only from defect in the free will of creatures who will not correspond to God's grace and order their actions to Him their last end. God does, indeed, for wise and holy ends, permit moral evil, and brings good even out of sin. The malice of persecutors occasioned the heroism of the martyrs, and enabled them to win their crowns.

It only remains to confirm the above by the testimonies of Scripture and the authority of the Church. Scripture, then, constantly declares that there is one God, who is the creator of all things, and is therefore the cause of physical evil from the very fact that He has made creatures subject to corruption. "The Lord killeth and maketh alive" (1 Kings ii. 6). "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" (Amos iii. 6). It also in numberless places speaks of God as inflicting punishment. He "renders to every man according to his works" (Rom. ii. 6). Vengeance is His, and He "will repay" (Heb. x. 30), though He has "no pleasure in the death of him who dieth" (Ezech. xviii. 32). These truths have been enforced by implication in the Nicene Creed and more explicitly by the Fourth Lateran Council. But God is not and cannot be the author of sin. His "works are perfect, and all his ways are judgments" (Deut. xxxii. 4). He is not a God that "wills iniquity" (Ps. v. 5). "Is there injustice with God? God forbid" (Rom. ix. 14). The contrary error is anathematized by the Council of Trent, sess. vi. De Justif. cap. 16. (See St. Thomas, 1ª, qq. 48, 49.)

EX CATHEDRA. [See CATHEDRA.]

EXALTATION OF CROSS. [See CROSS.]

EXAMINATION OF BISHOPS. A bishop-elect has to make a profession of faith according to the formula prescribed by Pius IV. in the constitution *In Sacrosancta*, and to answer eighteen questions, which may be read in the Roman Pontifical. These questions relate to the obedience due to the authority of the Church, to the moral conditions of a life truly episcopal, to the profession of revealed verities, and to the rejection of the opposite errors. To the first question the bishop-elect replies, "So with my whole heart it is my will to consent and obey in all things"; to the eight following questions he answers *Volo*, "I will"; to the rest, *Credo*, "I believe." At the end the consecrator says "May this thy faith, most beloved brother in Christ, be increased by the Lord unto true and everlasting beatitude." There is also a liturgical examination, which may be described as the formal outcome of the more strict inquiry into the canonical qualifications of the bishop-elect, already made in the process of information instituted in every such case by order of the Holy See.

EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE. It is necessary to ascertain the nature of the disease before remedies can be applied; and in the moral and spiritual life persons have to search their conscience in order to ascertain their past and present sins, that they may

[1] Eugenius IV. in the decree for the Jacobites teaches that "evil is not a positive entity (nullam mali esse naturam), because every natural thing as such is good."

confess them to God, repent, and be forgiven, and take precautions against future falls. Spiritual writers recommend that this examination should be made at least every evening, in order to ascertain and to repent of the sins committed that day. Such examination is a matter of absolute necessity before approaching the sacrament of penance. The penitent must try, with such reasonable care as he would use in any other matter of grave importance, to ascertain at least all the mortal sins he has committed since his last confession; otherwise he is incapable of absolution.[1] (Concil. Trid. sess. xiv. cap. 5.)

St. Ignatius, followed by many other ascetical writers, also recommends a particular examen to be made, at least daily, not on sin in general, but on that particular sin into which the individual most frequently falls. (Rodriguez, "Christian Perfection," I. vii.)

EXAMINERS, SYNODAL. [See SYNODAL EXAMINERS.]

EXARCH (ἔξαρχος, ruler). A bishop having charge of a province, and next in rank to a patriarch. The terms "Metropolitan," "Archbishop," "Exarch," and "Patriarch" are used by the early ecclesiastical writers with little discrimination; thus, in the First Council of Constantinople, we find the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, who in later times were only known as patriarchs, denominated "exarchs." In the "Notitia Imperii" (supposed to have been compiled about the beginning of the fifth century) the (civil) diocese of Asia has ten provinces; the ecclesiastical "exarchia" of the same, eleven; and so in other cases. The Bishops of Ephesus, Heraclea, and Caesarea in Cappadocia, were exarchs, and claimed to exercise jurisdiction over the metropolitans of their respective provinces. This brought them into conflict with the Patriarch of Constantinople: the subject was considered at the Council of Chalcedon; and the result was that the jurisdiction of these three exarchs was abolished, though they retained the title and the rank, and were allowed to sit in council next after the five patriarchs. The Exarchs of Ravenna frequently mentioned in the Ecclesiastical Annals of the period following the fall of the Western Empire were not the Bishops of that city, but the representatives there of the Byzantine Emperors to whom certain provinces in Italy continued still to belong. (Ferraris; Thomassin, "Vetus et Nova Eccl. Disciplina.")

EXCARDINATION. [See INCARDINATION.]

EXCLUSION. [See CONCLAVE.]

EXCOMMUNICATION. An ecclesiastical censure by which a Christian is separated from the communion of the Church. It is a power included in the power of the keys, or of binding and loosing, given by Christ to Peter and the Apostles, and may be deduced from our Saviour's words (Mt. xviii. 17)—"If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." For to treat a man as a heathen and a publican is to repel him from the Church and all things sacred—that is, to excommunicate him. We find it put in practice by St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 3), when he said of the incestuous Corinthian—"I . . . have already judged . . . him that hath so done, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one to Satan," &c. St. Augustine explains: "Because outside the Church is the devil, as within it is Christ, and accordingly he who is separated from the communion of the Church is as it were delivered to the devil."

Excommunication until recently was of two kinds, the major and the minor. The minor kind was an ecclesiastical censure, by which a Christian was deprived of the right to participation in sacraments, and indirectly, as a consequence, of the right of receiving a benefice. It was incurred by communicating with a person under major excommunication, in any case where such communication is not excused. The Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis," issued by Pius IX. in 1869, makes no mention of minor excommunication; hence canonists have concluded that it no longer exists. This has been formally ratified by the Holy Office (Jan. 6, 1884). (See Ferraris; Taunton; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vii. 165; Boudinhon in "Cath. Enc.")

The major excommunication depriv[es] all ecclesiastical communion, and is equi[valent] in substance to *anathema*, from which [it] differs in regard to the formalities by [which] the latter is surrounded. For the excommunication can be inflicted by force of law, or by the written sente[nce] a judge, whereas an anathema is pu[blished] pronounced, and "cum strepitu."

Those under major excommunicatio[n] again fall into two classes: *tolerati*, whom the faithful are not bound to avoid; and *non tolerati* (*i.e.* those excommunicated by name and publicly denounced, and those notoriously guilty, by themselves or others, of violence to clerics), with whom the faithful are forbidden to hold either religious or civil communication. Civil intercourse is, however, permitted, for the sake of the faithful themselves, under various circumstances and to various classes of persons.

Excommunications are also divided—and this is a most important distinction—into those *ferendae sententiae*, and those *latae sententiae*. In the case of the former it is enjoined that a sentence of excommunication be pronounced (*e.g.* "we forbid this on pain of excommunication; whoever does it, let him be excommunicated," or "will incur excommunication," &c.), but the delinquent

[1] Of course peculiar circumstances may excuse the penitent from the fulfilment of this obligation.

does not actually incur the sentence till it has been inflicted by a competent judge. In the second case, the words of the law or other instrument are so chosen that upon a given act being done the doer of it falls at once under the ban of the Church, as when it is said—"let him incur excommunication *ipso facto*." Nor are such sentences unjust, as some have argued, on the ground that the delinquents who incur them have not been duly warned, as the Gospel requires, of the nature of their offence; for the law itself, which they must be presumed to know, is a standing and perpetual warning. At the same time, the excommunication *latae sententiae* is operative only in the internal forum and in the sight of God; to make it effectual in the external forum also it is necessary that the guilt be proved before, and declared by, a competent judge.

Excommunications are also divided into those reserved to the Pope, those reserved to the bishop or ordinary, and those not reserved. Those of the first class now in force are enumerated in the constitution "Apostolicae Sedis," in which are also specified all excommunications *latae sententiae* and *ipso facto* incurred henceforth in vigour.

If it be asked, Who can excommunicate? it may be answered, those who possess ordinary or delegated jurisdiction in the external forum in regard to those subject to them; but not parish priests (who have as such only jurisdiction in the forum of conscience), and never laymen or women. To the question, Who can be excommunicated? the answer is, that only Christians, alive and of sound mind, guilty of a grave offence and persisting in it, and subject to the judge giving sentence, can be excommunicated. Not Jews, therefore, nor Pagans, nor the unbaptized heathen, nor the dead; but the sentence may justly be inflicted on heretics or schismatics.

The effects of excommunication are thus summed up: "As man by baptism is made a member of the Church, in which there is a communication of all spiritual goods, so by excommunication he is cast forth from the Church and placed in the position of the heathen man and the publican, and is deprived accordingly of sacraments, sacrifices, sacred offices, benefices, dignities, ecclesiastical jurisdiction and power, ecclesiastical sepulture—in a word, of all the rights which he had acquired by baptism—until he make amends, and satisfy the Church." [1]

EXEAT. [See INCARDINATION.]

EXECRATION. [See DESECRATION.]

EXEMPTION. A privilege by which persons or places are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the ordinary and immediately subjected to the Holy See. It may be compared to dispensation, the object of both being the same—viz. to avoid friction in government. It differs from dispensation, in that this last withdraws persons from the operation of a law, while exemption withdraws them from the authority of a ruler. To take familiar instances—religious are exempt in many respects from the jurisdiction of the bishops in whose dioceses their convents are; the Spanish people is dispensed, by a special Papal indult, from the observance of the general law prescribing abstinence from meat on Fridays.

The exemption of regulars from the jurisdiction of the ordinary is, however, carefully limited by the law; were it otherwise, the abuses and conflicts that would inevitably arise would more than counterbalance the benefits of the freedom of action which exemption confers on those possessing it. Speaking generally—in what relates to property and to delinquencies (unless attended by public scandal), and to their rule and conventual life, regulars are exempt; in what relates to preaching and the administration of the sacraments they are not exempt. For details treatises on canon law must be consulted. An important contribution to the latest law on this subject was made by the Constitution "Romanos Pontifices," published by Leo XIII., on May 8, 1881, in which the relations between the bishops and the regular clergy in this country were more accurately defined. (Ferraris, *Regulares*, art. 2.)

EXEQUATUR. The right claimed on behalf of bishops or temporal rulers to examine Papal bulls and constitutions, and judge of the expediency of admitting them before suffering them to take effect and pass into execution in their dioceses or territories.

With regard to this claim, so far as bishops are concerned, Benedict XIV.[1] laid down that it could have no reference to Papal constitutions treating of faith or morals, or of sacred rites, ceremonies, sacraments, and the life of the clergy, since such Constitutions cannot in any way be subjected to the judgment of inferiors. In regard to other matters, it is held that if a bishop is of opinion that the execution of a particular Constitution in his diocese would, on account of the existence of special circumstances, produce serious inconvenience or scandal, he may be justified in delaying its execution for a while, until he has laid these circumstances before the Pope, if at the same time he have the firm intention of obeying the final direction of the Holy See in the matter, whatever it may be.

The *exequatur*, as claimed on behalf of temporal rulers, differs little from the *placitum regium*, on which see under CANON LAW, p. 104. In England, the extreme doctrine of *exequatur* was carried out in the statute of *Praemunire* (1393), which "vindicated the right of the State of England to

[1] Soglia, lib. iv. cap. 4.

[1] See Soglia, *Inst. Can.* i. 1, § 24.

prohibit the admission or the execution of all Papal bulls or briefs within the realm."[1] Martin V., the able Pope elected at the Council of Constance, protested against this statute, but without effect; it was, however, greatly restrained in its operation by the exercise of the dispensing power of the Crown. In later times the sovereigns of Naples and Piedmont were conspicuous for their vexatious assertion of the *exequatur*: see a letter of Clement VIII. (1596), quoted by Ferraris, to Olivarez, the Viceroy of Naples. The Holy See has never admitted as a matter of right the claim of the State to impede the execution of Papal rescripts; but *de facto*, and to prevent greater evils, it has often patiently borne with, and does so at the present day, the exercise of this power. Thus, the Roman Pontiff allows Italian bishops on their election, that the churches may not be widowed of their chief pastors, to apply for the *exequatur*.

Among the writers on canon law who have been favourable to the *exequatur* are Oliva (a celebrated Portuguese doctor), Salgado, and Van Espen. On the other side are Bellarmine, Suarez, Zallwein, Zaccaria (author of "Antifebronius Vindicatus"), Droste zu Vischering, and John de Dominis (writer of the treatise "Il Regio *Exequatur*," Naples, 1869). Tarquini, "De Regio Placet." (Ferraris, *Placitum Regium*.)

EXERCISES, SPIRITUAL. A name given by St. Ignatius of Loyola to a series of meditations on the truths of religion, accompanied by examination of conscience and considerations respecting present or future duty in the choice of a new state of life, &c., &c. Meditation and retirement had always been practised by pious persons, but the admirable order of the meditations, the judicious choice of maxims, and the marvellous knowledge of the human heart shown in the book belong to St. Ignatius himself. The person who makes the Exercises is supposed to receive them from a director, and the Exercises are arranged for a retreat of four weeks; they can, however, be adapted for a much shorter time. The exercitant begins with meditations on the end of man, and on the penalties of sin, that he may flee with horror from it; passes next to those on Christ's life and death, Christ being the model which we have to copy; and ends by contemplating the resurrection of Christ, happiness of heaven, &c., that he may learn to unite himself to God. The Exercises were written originally in Spanish, translated into Latin, revised and published at Rome in 1548; "all and every thing" which they contain having been solemnly approved in a bull of Paul III. The original of the "Exercises," as the saint wrote them, is no longer in existence; but a copy in Spanish, with marginal notes in his writing, is preserved. This is what is commonly known as the "Autograph." It was translated into Latin by Fr. Roothaan in 1834. There is an English translation taken directly from the Spanish, but diligently compared with Roothaan's Latin version, by Fr. Rickaby.

[1] Milman's *Latin Christianity*, bk. xiii. ch. 6.

It is the glory of the Jesuits to be "men of the Exercises," which have been from the first an instrument of extraordinary power for good in the hands of those apostolic men and great masters of the spiritual life.

EXORCISM and EXORCIST.[1] 1. The custom of attempting to drive out the devil from possessed persons was familiar to the Jews, as appears from Mt. xii. 27, Acts xix. 13. For this end they employed magical forms said to be derived from Solomon. Our Lord gave His disciples the real power of driving out demons, and in the earliest times this power was exercised by such persons, whether clerics or lay people, men or women, as had received the special grace (*charisma*) which enabled them to do so. However, in the middle of the third century Pope Cornelius (apud Euseb. "H.E." vi. 43) speaks of the Exorcists as a special order of the clergy; and the Council of Laodicea, can. 26, forbids those who have not been ordained to exorcize either in church or in private houses. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 1014.) The so-called Fourth Council of Carthage (anno 396) prescribes a form for the ordination of exorcists the same in substance as that given in the Roman Pontifical and used at this day. The bishop gives the book of exorcisms into the hand of the person to be ordained, bidding him learn them by heart and receive power of laying his hands on the possessed. Innocent I. (Ep. i. ad Decent.) prohibited exorcists from exercising their ministry on the possessed without express permission from the bishop, and this law is still in force. The order of Exorcist is the third of the minor orders. Power is still given to drive out the devil, but the exercise of this power is restrained, and the order of Exorcist has come to be regarded chiefly as a step to the priesthood.

2. Catechumens, even if not possessed, still belonged in a sense to the kingdom of darkness, and exorcisms were from early times employed, as they are in our present Ritual, to snap the band between the soul of the candidate for baptism and the devil. As even baptism does not completely destroy the devil's power over the soul, these exorcisms are supplied after baptism, when *e.g.* a child in danger of death has been baptized without the ceremonies and afterwards recovers. In the case of a child over whom the ceremonies of baptism are supplied

[1] Ἐξορκίζω in classical Greek means to put a person on oath. So LXX, Gen. xxiv. 3. In LXX, Jud. xvii. 2, it means to take an oath. Then in ecclesiastical Greek it has the sense of driving out by adjuration, and ἐξορκιστής is so used in the Acts.

the true reason of the Exorcisms &c. seems to be that the ceremony is treated as morally one thing with the actual baptism—just as the Bishop's "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," *after* a priest has been ordained and has even concelebrated with him, does not confer anything beyond what the priest has already received. Hence the exorcists of the ancient Church came to exercise a general superintendence over the catechumens as well as over the possessed. It would be their business, for example, to remove energumens and catechumens before the more solemn part of the Mass. This probably serves to explain the words the bishop addresses at this day to those who are to be ordained exorcists when he tells them it is their office to see that those who do not communicate "give place." [1]

3. Exorcisms are also used at this day by priests over inanimate objects—*e.g.* in blessing water, &c. This practice is also very ancient, for Cyprian (Ep. 70, ed. Hartel, 76) alludes to it. It springs, not from any Manichean idea that matter is evil, but from the Christian doctrine that all creation, since the fall, has been marred by the powers of evil. There is or was a distinction between things exorcisable and others not so. It is difficult to state the precise rule, but it would seem that matter requiring material purification before being fitted for human use was primarily subject to exorcism. Thus, salt, water, oil, &c., are exorcized, but not bread or wine or even candles or ashes. The distinction is notable in the rite of dedication of a church in the Roman Pontifical; still more so in the injunction given to the Exorcist at his ordination to prepare the water for the Holy Sacrifice. This Exorcism is now represented by the sign of the cross the priest makes over the water cruet only at the Offertory to the exclusion of that containing the wine. (See ENERGUMEN; POSSESSION, DEMONIACAL; Ferraris; Probst in "Kirchenlex."; Forget in DThC.)

EXPECTATION OF THE B.V.M. This feast, though not universal in the Latin Church, has been up to our own time kept very generally on December 18, but is now no longer observed except in special cases. It arose from the custom of the Spanish Church, which transferred the feast of the Annunciation from March 25 to this date. When the Annunciation was put back to its original date, the expectation of the speedy birth of Christ was kept on December 18. It is called "Nuestra Señora de la O," but it has nothing to do with the great Advent "O's" of the Roman breviary. (See Holweck, "Fasti Mariani.")

EXPECTATIVE. The right of being collated to a benefice not at present vacant. If the right be determined to a particular benefice, it is a survivorship; if not, it is simply a provision. The Popes began to create expectatives about the twelfth century, by issuing *mandata de providendo* to bishops and chapters in favour of clerks not ordained to particular benefices. These recommendations usually had reference to prebends and other preferment in capitular patronage. Kings followed the example of the Holy See, and began to claim the *jus primarum precum*, by which was meant the right of claiming for their nominees the collation to the first prebend in each chapter which might fall vacant after their accession. Chapters themselves gave the survivorships to some of their prebends to particular individuals, often on the ground merely of noble birth and social influence. The Third Council of the Lateran (1179) abolished all survivorships, but did not touch Papal expectatives, because they were indeterminate. The Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. can. 19. De Ref.) abolished these last also; but the decree was never carried into complete execution.

EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. The Church has adored Christ in the Eucharist ever since that great sacrament was instituted, as has been shown in another article (see EUCHARIST), but it is only in times comparatively modern that the most Holy Sacrament has been publicly exposed for the veneration of the faithful. The origin of the practice is connected with the great outburst of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament after the controversies about the Real Presence in the twelfth century. In the art. ELEVATION we have seen how the custom of holding up the consecrated Host for the veneration of the people arose about this time. The faithful attached great importance to the privilege of gazing upon the Body of their Lord. What we now call Exposition is after all only a prolonged elevation, enabling those present to enjoy this privilege to their heart's content. The procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Corpus Christi was probably introduced some time after the institution of the feast, under Pope John XXII., who died in 1333. We cannot be sure that even then the Blessed Sacrament was exposed, for the earliest vessels in which it was carried seem to have hidden it completely from view. However, Thiers found in a vellum Missal [1] dated 1373 a miniature portrait of a bishop carrying the Host in procession, the monstrance in which it is borne having sides partly of glass. We may thus reasonably conclude that in the fourteenth century the Host was exposed at least on Corpus Christi. In the sixteenth century it became common to expose the Host at other times—on occasions, *e.g.*, of public distress—and generally the Blessed

[1] See Vales., *Not. in Euseb. Mart. Palest.* c. 2.

[1] The Missal is a Roman one, and the MS. written by a native of Bologna.

Sacrament was exposed for forty continuous hours, known as the Quarant' Ore or Forty Hours. This devotion is familiar to Catholics throughout the world as the usual form for the more solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The Host after High Mass (the Mass of Exposition) is placed on a throne above the altar in the monstrance. Persons are appointed to relieve each other night and day in watching and praying before it. On the second day a Mass "for peace" is sung, and on the third the Host is again placed in the tabernacle after a High Mass (that of Deposition). In some few places the custom still exists of exposing the Blessed Sacrament for forty consecutive hours only, and of terminating the Exposition at the expiry of that period, no matter at what hour of the day or night.

The first introduction of this devotion was due, so far as can be ascertained, to Fr. Joseph, a Capuchin of Milan (died 1556). He arranged the forty hours' exposition in honour of the time that our Lord spent in the tomb. In 1560 Pius IV. approved the custom of an association called the Confraternity of Prayer or of Death. They exposed the Host for forty hours every month. In 1592 Clement VIII. provided for the public and perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament on the altars of the different churches at Rome. The forty hours in one church succeeded to those in another, so that the Blessed Sacrament was always exposed in some church the whole year round. Earlier than this, in 1556, the Jesuits in Macerata exposed the Blessed Sacrament for forty hours in order to meet the danger of disorders prevalent at that time, and St. Charles adopted this devotion for Carnival with great zeal.

In the "Instruction" of Clement XI. and the decrees of the Congreg. Rit. there are numerous rules with regard to public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. It cannot take place even in the churches of regulars without leave from the Bishop or Apostolic indult. This restriction was caused by an abuse, frequent in the later Middle Ages, of leaving the Blessed Sacrament exposed, unveiled, without special lights or attendants, often both by day and by night. Twelve lights at least must burn before the Host. Relics and images must be removed from the altar of exposition, and no Mass celebrated there, so long as the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, except the Mass of Deposition, and the bell is not rung at the Masses which are said during the exposition at the other altars. The "Manuale Decretorum" contains numerous rules to be observed with regard to exposition. The great authority is Thiers, "De l'Exposition du S. Sacrement de l'Autel"; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," p. 122 *sqq.* (See BENEDICTION).

EXTRAVAGANTS. The fifth and sixth portions of the Canon Law are so called because they wander over various matters not touched upon in the Decretals, and because, till brought into the code, they had no recognized place in ecclesiastical jurisprudence. They consist (1) of the Extravagants of John XXII. (1316–1334), to the number of twenty constitutions, divided into fourteen titles; (2) of the Extravagants Common (so called because they issued not from any one Pope, but from several), divided into five books, containing a number of titles and chapters, each title being devoted to one or more "Extravagant" Constitutions. The term "Extravagants" is by some authors applied even to the Constitutions of later Pontiffs, even though not formally included in the Corpus Juris. [See CANON LAW.] (Ferraris, *Jus.*)

EXTREME UNCTION may be defined as a sacrament in which the sick in danger of death are anointed by a priest for the health of soul and body, the anointing being accompanied by a set form of words.

St. James (v. 14, 15) describes the nature and effects of this sacrament. "Is any man sick among you? Let him call to himself (προσκαλεσάσθω) the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up, *and if*[1] he has committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." Let us see what the passage implies.

Oil was an ordinary means of healing familiar to the Jews, as appears from Lk. x. 34 (*cf.* the "balm" in Jerem. viii. 22, xlvi. 11). However, it is plain that St. James does not here recommend an ordinary application of the medical art, for if so, apart from the objection that unction could only be of use in certain kinds of illness, he would have advised the sick man to summon the physician and not the presbyters of the Church. Nor, again, can we reasonably suppose that the Apostle is referring to those extraordinary gifts of healing (the χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, 1 Cor. xii. 9) common in the primitive Church. There is not the faintest reason for believing that presbyters generally possessed any such powers; and it was imposition of hands, not unction, by which, as a rule,[2] the extraordinary grace of healing was conveyed.[3] Nor does St. James make any allusion to the χάρισμα or grace of healing in this place. The unction, then, of which St. James speaks was intended primarily to heal the soul. The

[1] This is the usual and natural rendering of the Greek. It is right, however, to remark that κἄν in the New Testament never means "and if" (καὶ ἐάν), but only "even if."

[2] Mk. xvi. 18; but sometimes supernatural cures of the body were effected by unction. See Mk. vi. 13.

[3] Probably it is not the sacrament of unction which is mentioned in Mk. vi.; but we may reasonably believe that it foreshadowed the sacrament, and was meant to prepare the disciples for Christ's further teaching on this point, as the Council of Trent observes (sess. xiv. cap. 1).

chief effect of the rite is definitely stated: "The Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." No doubt bodily cure is indicated also as an effect of the unction, for the words "the prayer of faith will save the sick man," "the Lord will raise him up," include bodily healing. But as St. James saw the first generation of Christians dying out before his eyes, he cannot have supposed that this unction of the sick was an infallible remedy for disease. In short, we have all the constituents of a sacrament in these two verses of St. James. There is the outward sign—viz. unction by the priest accompanied with prayer. There is the grace given on condition of faith and repentance—viz. forgiveness of sins, the renewed health and strength of the soul, and, if God sees fit, of the body. There is institution by Christ, for St. James could not have asserted that the unction would convey grace, unless Christ, the author of grace, had promised that the grace of forgiveness and spiritual healing should accompany the use of the oil. Lastly, the effective sign of grace was to be employed permanently in the Church, for St. James recommends its use to Christians generally without distinction of time or place, and we find clear though scarcely abundant traces of its use in Christian antiquity. "Origen," says Chardon (749), "rightly considering this last sacrament as a complement to that of penance, marks it out (Hom. 2 in Levit.) as a means which God has put into our hands in order that we may cleanse ourselves from our sins. St. John Chrysostom ('De Sacerdot.' 1. p. 384) uses the passage of St. James already quoted, to show that priests have received from Jesus Christ the power to remit sins. Pope Innocent I., the contemporary of this last Father, speaks of the sacrament still more clearly in his letter to Decentius.... He puts Extreme Unction among the sacraments, telling Decentius it should not be given to penitents (still unreconciled), because it is a kind of sacrament." We can now pass on to consider one by one different points in the administration and doctrine of the sacrament.

1. The *matter* of the sacrament, according to the Council of Trent (sess. xiv. cap. 1), is "oil blessed by the bishop." Most theologians hold that this blessing is essential, though it suffices for validity if the blessing has been given by a priest who has received jurisdiction to do so.[1] Innocent, in the letter already referred to, says priests are permitted to administer the sacrament if the oil has been blessed by the bishop. The Council of Florence, in the Decree of Union, prescribes that the unction is to be given with olive oil on eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, hands, feet, and reins, and such is the present custom of the Church, except that the *unctio renum* is omitted in the case of women. Some theologians hold that without unction of the five senses the sacrament is invalid. On the other hand, Chardon proves that the discipline of the Church on this matter has varied at different places, and in different times, to an extraordinary degree. The common practice was to anoint the five senses, but sometimes the unction was given only on one place—*e.g.* on the breast or on the seat of the malady. According to the Roman ritual the oil is applied in the form of a cross. The outside of a priest's hands is anointed, the inside of a lay person's, probably because the inside of the priest's hands has already been anointed in ordination.

2. The *form* of words used in the Roman Ritual is (at the unction of the eyes), "By this holy unction, and by his most tender mercy, may the Lord forgive thee whatsoever sin thou hast committed by sight," the same words being repeated at each unction, except that for "by sight," "by hearing," &c., is substituted. The Greek unction is also accompanied by prayer. Still, although a vast number of mediaeval theologians have maintained that the words must be precatory, and although both Latins and Greeks[1] do in fact employ a form of the kind, the ancient Rituals contain sometimes precatory, sometimes absolute forms, sometimes such as are partly precatory, partly absolute; and hence the best critics (Ménard, Martène, Chardon, &c.) deny that a precatory form belongs to the essence of the sacrament. It seems to be enough if the unction is given "in the name of the Lord" and the words indicate the grace conferred.

3. The *minister* of the sacrament is a priest. "Let him bring in the presbyters of the Church." It is certain that a priest only can give this sacrament, and the present discipline of the Church forbids anyone but the parish priest,[2] or some other priest with his leave, to do so. Some difficulty has been caused by the letter of Innocent, in which he lays down the principle that the oil of the sick is to be blessed by the bishop and then used by all Christians in their need: "*Quod*" (sic apud Chardon 768) "ab episcopo confectum, non solum sacerdotibus sed et omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut in suorum necessitate inungendum." At first sight, no doubt, these words seem to mean that

[1] The Greek priests bless the oil of the sick by commission from the bishop, and this custom of theirs was approved by Clement VIII. in a Constitution dated 1598. See Billuart, *De Extrem. Unct.* art. 2. It is not however improbable that Christians in early times used the oil blessed for Extreme Unction as a sacramental, just as they do nowadays with the water blessed on Easter-Eve as matter of the Sacrament of Baptism. The tradition (if it be such) is perpetuated in the anointing of bells (see Roman Pontifical) with the *Oleum Infirmorum*. And that the above explanation is a likely one results from the Roman Ritual (Tit. vii. c. 19), which in the same way as it provides a simple form for the blessing of water as a sacramental, still permits priests to exorcize and sanctify oil to be used by the faithful themselves in time of infirmity.

[1] The Greek form is Πατὲρ ἅγιε, ἰατρὲ τῶν ψυχῶν κ.τ.λ.: "Holy Father, physician of souls and bodies, heal this thy servant from that infirmity of body and soul which possesses him."

[2] In England, the rector of the mission.

Christians generally could apply the holy oil, and Tillemont thought it impossible to take them otherwise. Chardon, however, and many other authors, explain the words to mean that with the oil consecrated by the bishop all Christians might be anointed in their need—viz. by the priest. In ancient times all over the world several priests jointly administered the sacrament, though examples are not wanting of the administration by a single priest, so that clearly the ancient Church did not consider the presence of more than one priest essential. Among the Greeks the sick man is anointed by seven, or if that is impossible, by three priests. "Sometimes," says Chardon (750), speaking of ancient usage, "one priest applied the holy oil while the other pronounced the form of prayer; sometimes all together anointed the different parts of the body, each reciting the same form. Sometimes several priests anointed one part, others other parts, the prescribed prayers being recited by the anointing priests in each case."

4. *The persons who may receive the sacrament.* (*a*) They must be sick, as St. James declares, and the Council of Trent understands the Apostle to speak of dangerous sickness. Hence the sacrament is not intended for persons ill but not dangerously ill, or, again, for such as are in danger of death but not from sickness. After a sick man, among the Orientals, has been anointed, the priests anoint each other and the bystanders with the holy oil, but Renaudot points out that the prayers are said only over the sick man, so that evidently there is no intention of administering the sacrament except to him. (β) The sacrament being intended to remit sin, it cannot be received, according to the common opinion, except by those who have committed sin after baptism. Infants, therefore, and all such other persons as have never had the use of reason, are incapable of the sacrament. (γ) In order that it may be received with profit, the recipient must be in a state of grace. All the Oriental Rituals, according to Renaudot, prescribe previous confession.

5. The effects of the sacrament are thus stated by the Council of Trent (sess. xiv. c. 2): "The inner part (*res*) and effect of this sacrament is set forth in these words—'And the prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he be in sins they will be forgiven him.' For this inner part (*res*) is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose unction wipes away sins, if any are still to be atoned for, and the remains of sin" (*i.e.* the proneness to evil, torpor, and weakness left by past and forgiven sins), "raises and strengthens the soul of the sick man, by awakening a great confidence in the divine mercy, by which confidence the sick man being relieved bears more patiently the troubles and pains of his sickness, more easily resists the temptations of the devil, . . . and sometimes obtains health of body when it it expedient for the health of the soul." Similarly, if a sick person in a state of mortal sin has that imperfect sorrow for sin which is called attrition and for any reason priestly absolution be not given him, he would be justified by grace of Extreme Unction. (St. Thomas, "Suppl." q. 30, a. 1; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. vi. *n.* 731.)

Of course the sacrament cannot be contemned without great sin, and very often a person may be under a grave obligation of receiving it, on account of the care he is bound to take of his eternal salvation. Still the sacrament is not in itself necessary to salvation, and this may account for the fact that we hear so little of it in the first ages of the Church, when the heathen persecution made its administration a matter of serious difficulty. Some authors of the twelfth century held that it could only be received once by the same person; and, on the other hand, some ancient Rituals show that it was once customary in certain parts of the Church to reiterate the unction during seven successive days. Chardon (759) refers to several ancient Rituals in proof, and St. Rembert, bishop of Hamburg, was anointed, as we learn from a contemporary Life, on several consecutive days. It is now certain, from the words of the Tridentine Council, that the sacrament may be received again and again by the same person if he recovers from a dangerous illness and afterwards falls into another; but once only by the same person while he remains under the same danger of death.

6. *The time of administration.* The present custom of the Church is to give it after the reception of Viaticum. Formerly, it was usual to administer it before Viaticum, and Chardon gives numerous instances from the churches of England, France, and Germany. St. Thomas evidently was accustomed to see Extreme Unction administered first, for he says (3^a, q. 65, a. 3), "By extreme unction a man is prepared worthily to receive Christ's Body." Even from ancient times, however, instances of the present order may be adduced, so that the matter cannot be of any great moment. (Chiefly from Chardon. The dogmatic and moral theologians treat of Extreme Unction when dealing with the Sacraments, and in their commentaries on St. Thomas, "Suppl." qq. 29–33; Ruch-Godefroy, in DThC, an admirable art. with bibliography.)

EXUCONTIANS. [See ARIUS, p 60.]

EXULTET. [See HOLY WEEK, p. 420.]

F

FABRIC. A church—that is, a building set apart for the public divine worship of the faithful—can only be erected with the approval of the bishop of the diocese, and after due provision has been made, by endowment or otherwise, for the permanent sustentation of the cure. Once built, canon law adopts many precautions with a view to its fabric being kept in good repair. The Council of Trent ordered that bishops, on their annual visitations, should see that churches which required repair received it,[1] and a later decree[2] specified the funds on which, and the persons on whom, this obligation rested. A parish church fallen out of repair was to be repaired, first of all, out of the fabric endowment fund, if such existed. If there were no such fund, or it were insufficient, the charge was to fall on the patron or patrons, and other persons deriving any benefit from the parochial endowment. If these resources were insufficient, the bishop was to compel the parishioners by every means in his power, to defray the cost of the necessary repairs. Finally, if the poverty of all concerned were such as to disable them from meeting the outlay required, the bishop was to annex the parish either to that of its mother church (*matrici ecclesiae*) or to some neighbouring parish, with leave to use the dilapidated church for secular purposes not of a mean or degrading character, after having erected a cross there. The erection of a cross is not now required.

The actual state of the law as to the reparation of the fabric is stated by Ferraris to be this. Those are bound to it in the first place on whom either custom or a statute imposes the burden. If there be no such custom or statute, the part of the endowment, if any, reserved to the fabric must be resorted to. If there be no such part, the legal obligation next falls on the revenue derived by the parish priest from the benefice, after deducting what is sufficient for his decent maintenance. Next, all others deriving benefit from the parochial revenues —*e.g.* lay impropriators of tithe—are bound to contribute. Under this head many disputed questions have arisen, on which special treatises must be consulted. These disputes resemble, in certain points, the long controversy between the Anglican clergy and the nonconformists respecting *church rates* —a controversy settled by an Act (1874) which relieved the latter from the burden.

In the case of a cathedral church, the bishop is bound to put and keep it in repair, reserving to himself the right of taking legal steps against those who are bound to aid him in doing so (*e.g.* the chapter, or, in the last resort, the inferior clergy), or against those on whom the obligation is imposed by custom. (See Taunton; Forneret in DThC, *Biens Ecclésiastiques*; Van Hove in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Sess. vii. c. 8, De Ref. [2] Sess. xxi. c. 7, De Ref.

FACT, DOGMATIC. [See DOGMATIC FACT.]

FACULTY. 1. A constituent part of a university, being the body of professors, lecturers, teachers, graduates, and students engaged in the study of a particular department of learning (*e.g.* medicine, law, theology &c.), or stamped as proficients in the same. In a narrower sense, the term "faculty" is restricted to the professors labouring in this department of learning. These, in a normal state of things, form a council which meets periodically, under a dean elected by themselves, to arrange all questions respecting the due ordering and development of the studies of the faculty. If a university be fully organized, it has five faculties, viz. theology, arts (or, philosophy and letters), law, medicine and natural science. [See UNIVERSITY; DEGREES.]

2. An authorization properly authenticated, addressed to any person or persons by the Roman Pontiff or some Catholic prelate, empowering him or them to perform some act or occupy some position which they could not otherwise legally perform or occupy is called a *faculty*.

In popular language the word "faculties" is taken to mean power or permission to hear confessions: in the case of secular clergy jurisdiction and approbation, and in the case of religious, approbation. [See PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF, p. 648; ABSOLUTION; CONFESSION.] (See Taunton.)

FAITH. An act of divine faith is the undoubting assent given to revealed truths, not because of the evidence which can be produced for them, but simply because they are revealed by God. Thus the truths which faith accepts are not evident in themselves, or if evident, as is the case with the truths of natural religion, are not accepted with divine faith, because so evident.

Divine faith excludes all doubt. So much is implied in the very word, for nobody would say that we put faith in a man's statement if we doubted its truth; and the faith required in the New Testament is clearly incompatible with doubt. "I know," St. Paul says, "in whom I have believed, and I am certain" (2 Timothy i. 12).

Yet this exclusion of doubt is not caused by the mere force of the evidence. No words are needed to show that the truths of the Christian religion—such, *e.g.*, as the divinity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Ghost, the atoning efficacy of Christ's death—are

not self-evident. Moreover, the evidences of Revelation, which is in the first place an historical fact, are not of such a nature as absolutely, like metaphysical or mathematical reasoning, to compel assent. No doubt, from the fulfilment of prophecy; from the way in which the Gospel triumphed; from the moral character and teaching of Christ; and from other grounds of a like kind, we get an accumulation of arguments, *certissima signa et omnium intelligentiae accommodata*, "most certain proofs, and suited to the intelligence of all," as the Vatican Council says,[1] which, taken together, make it perfectly certain that Christianity is divine, and are abundantly sufficient to convince a prudent man that he ought to assent undoubtingly to the truths which the Church of Christ propounds. Still, all this evidence is not enough in itself to account for the certainty of divine faith, the very highest of all certainty.

We must, then, make a sharp distinction between the "motives of credibility" on the one hand, and faith on the other. On account of these motives we prudently judge that the truths faith accepts are deserving of belief. If some knowledge of the arguments in favour of Christianity did not prepare us to believe it, our belief would be unreasonable and fanatical; nor could anyone be justly condemned for lacking faith. The arguments are not, however, of such a nature as to constrain assent, and men will form very different opinions of their strength according to their moral dispositions. That Christ, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount, "spake as never man spake" is a strong argument for the divinity of our religion, but it will scarcely come home to a man who cares little for moral excellence. In short, the "motives of credibility" are necessary: a man incurs great moral responsibility by the way in which he deals with them; but they cannot produce the absolute and perfect certainty of faith.

When the mind is convinced that the objects of faith are worthy of belief and that here and now there is an obligation of accepting them, the grace of God fills the soul with a pious inclination to believe ("pia affectio ad credendum"), having for its motive that duty and obligation of believing which has been brought home to it by the motives of credibility and then, putting aside all doubt and looking away from all human arguments and motives, it assents simply on the authority of God who reveals the truth in question. God cannot deceive and cannot be deceived. He is the eternal essential truth, and hence truths received on His word are more certain than any of those which present themselves to natural reason.

The reader will observe that the Catholic Church is not mentioned in the definition with which we began. The reason is that faith does not rest on the authority of creatures. It is a theological virtue—*i.e.* one which relates immediately to God, and therefore it is founded ultimately upon His word and on that alone. The Church is the ordinary and the infallible means by which we know what the truths are which God has revealed. The testimony of the Church is the rule by which we can distinguish between true and false doctrine. In other words, we learn from the Church that God has spoken, and then because of His word, not because of the Church's authority, we believe without doubt. It is possible, moreover, for a man who does not believe in the infallibility of the Church to possess true and divine faith. He may have assured himself on good grounds—*e.g.* by the reading of Scripture—that God has revealed certain truths; he may without fault of his own be ignorant of the Church's authority, and be perfectly willing to accept the whole of divine revelation so far as he knows it. If such a man, moved by the grace of God, receives the revealed truths with which he is acquainted on the divine word, then he has done all that is necessary to constitute an act of faith.

"Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). Man is intended for a supernatural end; he must know this end, for otherwise he cannot direct his actions so as to reach it, and this knowledge can never be attained by natural reason. Ignorance may excuse a man for living in heresy and schism; nothing can excuse the lack of faith, and God gives every man the means of attaining it. No man can be saved who does not at least believe with divine faith that God exists and that He rewards those who seek Him (Heb. xi. 6). A great many theologians say that under the present dispensation it is absolutely necessary for salvation to know and believe the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. This is a doubtful point, but it is certain that all who have the opportunity are bound to acquaint themselves with the primary truths of religion contained in the Creed, and to know the commandments of God and the Church, as well as the most essential truths regarding the sacraments and their use. Moreover, all are bound (and can only be excused from doing so by invincible ignorance) to believe all that the Church teaches. (See Capéran, "Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles.") Of course a person is not bound to ascertain all the definitions of the Church, but he must believe that the Church cannot err, and that whatever it teaches is infallibly true. Although faith is necessary, it is not sufficient for salvation unless it is perfected by charity. In the latter case it is the "faith working by charity" of which St. Paul speaks (Gal. v. 6) as opposed to that "faith without works which is dead" (James ii. 26). Still faith without charity is a true faith, for a man

[1] De Fide, cap. iii.

immersed in vice may accept the truths of revelation with a supernatural belief. The virtue of faith, however, is destroyed by a single act of disbelief[1] in revealed truth previously accepted on the authority of God.

(Any of the treatises "De Fide" in dogmatic theologians may be consulted, and also Concil. Trident. *De Justific.* sess. vi., Concil. Vatic. *De Fide*, cap. iii, and the corresponding canons. The possibility of a habit of faith in infants is explained in the article on BAPTISM, the rule of faith in those on the CHURCH and on the POPE. The best work on the latter Council is Vacant, "Études Théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican"; Bainvel in DAp; Harent in DThC, *Foi*; Gardeil in DThC, *Crédibilité*—two excellent articles.)

FAITHFUL (*fideles*) in itself means, persons who have the faith; but even in Acts x. 45 (*οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ*) we find the word used as a technical expression for persons incorporated by Baptism and Christian profession into the Church, and this use of the word has been continued ever since. A catechumen was entitled to be called a Christian, but he was not looked upon as one of the "faithful." "Ask a man 'Are you a Christian?' If he is a pagan or a Jew he answers 'No.' But if he says 'Yes,' ask him again 'Are you a catechumen or one of the faithful?'" (St. Aug. "In Joan." xliv. 2, PL, xxxv. 1714). Thus the "Mass of the Faithful" was distinguished from the "Mass of the Catechumens," although catechumens might of course have faith; and in the same sense the Church constantly prays in the Mass and office for the faithful, living and dead.

FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS. An Institute which, like those of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Notre Dame, was raised up by Divine Providence to fill the void on the continent of Europe caused by the dissolution of convents and their attached schools, the disastrous work of the great French Revolution. The Foundress, Madame d'Houet, sprung from a noble French family, was born in 1781, and had been since 1805 a widow when in 1820 she opened her first convent at Amiens. Overcoming many difficulties she succeeded before her death in 1858 in propagating her Society in France, Switzerland, Italy, England and Ireland, and it now has houses in America and Australia also. The constitutions of the Society are modelled on those of St. Ignatius, and the work of the Sisters consists mainly in the directing of schools, in which they have been exceptionally successful. The cause of the canonization of their Foundress is being promoted in Rome. (Stanislaus, "Life of the Viscountess de Bonnault d'Houet," tr.; Mrs. Philip Gibbs, "A Valiant Woman: Madame d'Houet.")

FAITHFUL VIRGIN, SISTERS OF THE. A Congregation of Religious women founded in 1830 at La Délivrande in Normandy by a pious French lady of noble birth, Henriette d'Osseville, and having for its primary object the sheltering and educating of orphan girls. Especially in their large establishment at Norwood in South London they have rendered great service to the Church by their zeal and perseverance in the care of the little ones of Christ. ("Life of the Rev. M. Ste. Marie, Henriette le Forestier d'Osseville," tr. by Phillipson.)

FALDSTOOL (*faldistorium*). The word *Faldistorium* sprang not from a Latin, but a Teutonic root meaning a folding stool. A seat which can easily be moved, and which is used by bishops and other prelates in the sanctuary when they do not occupy the throne. The faldstool is much more simple than the throne, the latter being covered with a baldacchino and furnished with a back and arms. Moreover, the faldstool, unlike the throne, may be occupied by a prelate who has no ordinary jurisdiction. Thus the Congregation of Rites requires auxiliary bishops and administrators when assisting pontifically at Mass to content themselves with the faldstool. However, a bishop in his own diocese sometimes sits in or kneels at a faldstool—*e.g.* in giving Confirmation, in making his thanksgiving after Mass, &c. As a faldstool is so constructed that it may be used not only as a seat but as a prie-dieu or kneeling desk, and in fact so serves a prelate, especially during litanies and the like, it is often in English termed a Litany stool. (Rock, ii. 209-213.)

FALSE DECRETALS. This collection ostensibly made by Isidorus Mercator, in the middle of the ninth century, passes by his name. [See CANON LAW.] The exact date of its first appearance cannot be determined. It could not have been before 829, because it quotes a canon of a Council of Paris held in that year.[1] Before 845, according to Möhler,[2] it was well known and often quoted; he therefore dates its composition between 829 and 845; the place of origin he believes to have been Mayence. Hinschius, on the other hand, thinks that the place of origin was Rheims, and that the work was compiled between 847 and 853. It is quite uncertain who wrote it. It has been variously ascribed to Benedictus Levita of Mayence, to Paschasius Radbert, to Otgar, archbishop of Mayence, and to Agobard, archbishop of Lyons. All that is known on the subject is

[1] So that, *e.g.*, if a Catholic ceases to believe in Transubstantiation but continues to believe in the Trinity, his acceptance of the latter is merely a natural assent and does not proceed from divine faith. This is the general, though not the universal, teaching of Catholic theologians.

[1] This is Möhler's view, but Hefele thinks it as likely that the council quoted from the Pseudo-Isidore as the other way. This is a sample of the inextricable difficulties by which the determination of date and authorship is surrounded.

[2] *Kirchengesch.* ii. 174.

that the writer chose to call himself Isidorus Mercator ("Peccator," in some MSS.), probably after the great St. Isidore, who had made a similar compilation [CANON LAW, p. 104]; that (if his preface speaks the truth) he had been strongly urged by many ecclesiastics of rank to make such a collection, and that the frequent miscarriages of justice which he had seen, owing to uncertainty as to the law and the jurisdiction, had powerfully impelled him to undertake the work.

The collection, as soon as made, passed into immediate acceptance and use; it met a palpable want, and no one thought of questioning the genuineness of the Papal letters which it contained. It opens with the fifty Apostolic Canons [see that article] received and published by Dionysius Exiguus; then it proceeds to give a quantity of decretal letters written by early Popes, from Clement of Rome, one of the Apostolic Fathers, to Melchiades, at the end of the third century. None of these letters are genuine. A quantity of concliiar decrees, beginning with those of Nicaea, and ending with the second Council of Seville (619), are next inserted; many of these are unauthentic. To the decrees of councils a fresh series of decretal letters of Popes succeeds, beginning with Sylvester (who succeeded Melchiades) and ending with Gregory the Great. In this series the first that is genuine is a letter of Pope Siricius (384-399). The last thing in the compilation is a copy of the canons passed by Gregory II. (†731) at a council held at Rome.

According to a Protestant writer, this famous collection comprehends "the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy, from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations, on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross; the discovery of the reliques of the Apostles; on chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments." [1]

Of the unknown author, Möhler writes:—"Pseudo-Isidore seized exactly that in his own age which corresponded to the wishes of all the higher and better order of men. Thence it was that this legislation was so joyfully received. No one suspected anything false, because it contained so much that was weighty and true. If we examine carefully these invented decretals, and try to characterise their composer in accordance with their general import and spirit, we must confess that he was a very learned man, perhaps the most learned man of his time, and at the same time an extremely intelligent and wise man, who knew his age and its wants as few did. Rightly he perceived that he must exalt the power of the centre—that is, of the Pope—because by that way only was deliverance possible. Nay, if we would pass an unconstrained judgment, we may venture even to call him a great man." ("Gesammelte Schriften," i. 311 *sqq.*)

Nevertheless, the work is in great part what we now call a forgery; anachronisms and blunders have been discovered in it, which force this conclusion on the mind of every fair critic. But at the time of its appearance, and for many centuries afterwards, it was in such thorough harmony with the prevalent temper of European society, and with the ecclesiastico-political ideas which were held to indicate the true path of human progress, that those who appealed to it, and even those whose action was thwarted by it, never troubled themselves to question the authenticity of the documents which it contained. Supposing some one in the twelfth century had anticipated the labour of the moderns, and announced the spuriousness of a great part of the decretals; what then? The feeling would have been: what Fabian, Cornelius, Sylvester, &c., are made to say is true and useful; if they did not actually write it, they might have written it; if these are not the genuine letters, then the genuine letters which they did write, and which would have been to much the same effect as these, have been lost; finally, if the Popes of the third century did not command all this, the Popes of the twelfth century are ready to command it, because it is true, wholesome, and highly necessary to be observed. If in the fourteenth century some one had demonstrated the spuriousness of the charters (see the "Chronicle of Ingulfus") by which Croyland Abbey held its lands; what then? The lands had unquestionably been given to the abbey; but the title-deeds had been lost or destroyed during the Danish invasions; and when a litigious race like the Normans, who would not be satisfied except by the production of actual documents, got possession of England, the monks had to manufacture charters, utterly false as to the form, but true as to the substance, or they would have been ousted from their possessions. A passage in the preface of the Pseudo-Isidore shows plainly enough that some similar motive was present to him in making his compilation. "Most good Christians," he says, "keep silence [when wrong is done] for this reason, and put up with the sins of others which they know, because they are often unprovided with documents by which they could prove to the ecclesiastical judges things which they themselves know; since, although certain things may be true, those things only are to be believed by judges which are demonstrated by certain proofs, established by a clear sentence, and published in judicial form and order." To supply "documents" so

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 192.

desirable, and also to provide for the use of the faithful generally a store of authoritative statements on matters affecting Christian life within the Church, seem to have been the principal objects of the writer.

The first note of doubt respecting the genuineness of the work came from Nicholas of Cusa, an eminent theologian of the fifteenth century. The Magdeburg Centuriators [CHURCH HISTORY] took up the matter eagerly, and many Protestant writers following them have shown much zeal in demonstrating the unauthentic character of most of the decretals, imagining that they were in some way sapping the foundations of the Papal power by doing so. The fact really is that the authority of the Popes derives no confirmation from the False Decretals, but that the False Decretals derived the currency and influence which they once had from their agreement with the idea of the Papal power pre-existing in the minds of men. The life of our own St. Wilfrid, the story of the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon and German churches, the letters of St. Leo the Great, and innumerable other evidences, show that there is absolutely nothing new in the doctrine of the Pseudo-Isidore on the Papal power.

Moreover, as has been shown by Phillips and Hefele, it is certain that the greater number of the spurious documents incorporated by the Pseudo-Isidore in his colletion were not manufactured by him, but had been in existence, some for a longer, others for a shorter period of time. Such are the Apostolic Canons, the Donation of Constantine, the Letter of Pope Sylvester, &c., &c.

The names of the principal writers on this question are:—the brothers Ballerini, Dumont, Eichhorn, Gfrörer, Hefele, Hinschius, Knust, Möhler, Noorden, Phillips, Rosshirt, Spittler, Walter, and Wasserschleben.

(Schneider in "Kirchenlex." *Pseudoisidor*; Saltet in "Cath. Enc." *False Decretals*; Paulus Hinschius, "Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae," Leipzig, 1863; Fournier, "Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales"; Villien in DThC *Décrétales* (*Fausses*).)

FAMILIAR. The *familiaris* of a Pope or bishop is a person belonging to his household, who is supported by him or at his table, and renders him domestic, but not menial, services. It is not necessary that he should live under the same roof with his master, but the law will not treat him as his familiar if he lives habitually out of the diocese or in a distant city. The nephews and cousins of a bishop living in his palace, in order to be considered his familiars, must render him real serice.

For eight centuries previous to the French Revolution, the clerical profession—owing to the largeness of the clerical immunities and the wealth and power possessed by the Church—was the object of desire to many whose motives were mixed, or altogether worldly. An easy way by which such persons could obtain ordination was by entering the household or family of a bishop. It was commonly and reasonably held that a bishop ordaining members of his own family knew what he was about, and would not lay hands on unworthy persons; great freedom, therefore, in respect of these ordinations was for a long time allowed. But abuses arose; a class of ecclesiastics without benefices appeared, who hung about Rome and the great episcopal cities, and were importunate petitioners to the holders of preferment. Hence the Council of Trent decreed[1] that no bishop should be able to ordain his familiar, who was not his *subditus*,[2] unless he had first lived with him three years, and unless the bishop, immediately and actually, conferred a benefice upon him.

The familiars of the Pope [CURIA ROMANA —*Famiglia Pontificia*] enjoy many privileges. Cardinal priests have the right of conferring on their familiars, if they have lived three years with them, the tonsure and the minor orders. A Constitution of Innocent XII. ("Speculatores domus Israel") adds to the requirements of the Council of Trent the condition that before ordaining his familiar, if not his *subditus*, the bishop must make him produce testimonial letters from the bishop of origin or domicile. [See DIMISSORIALS.] (Ferraris, *Familiaris.*)

FAN (*flabellum muscarium*; whence *esmoucher*, *mouchoir*; ῥιπίς, ῥιπίδιον) is mentioned as a liturgical instrument in the Apostolic Constitutions, viii. 12. There the rule directs that between the offertory and communion two deacons stand by the altar and use fans of linen, fine skin, or peacocks' feathers to drive away insects and keep them from touching the sacred vessels. The use of the fan during the consecration is also mentioned in the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom (Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," 409). Indeed, ancient writers speak of the "holy" or "mystical fan" (ἅγιον ῥιπίδιον, μυστικὴ ῥιπίς), and regard it as one of the insignia of the deacon's office. Although the fan is not mentioned in the ancient Roman "Ordines," its liturgical use was undoubtedly known in the West, for we find it noticed in ancient monastic rules—*e.g.* in that drawn up by St. Benignus of Dijon, and in the Dominican ceremonial. The Western Church does not seem to have reserved its use to deacons. After the fourteenth century it fell into disuse throughout the West. However, magnificent fans of peacocks' feathers are still carried by the attendants of the Pope in solemn processions, and in several Italian churches—according to the writer of the article on this subject

[1] Sess. xxiii. c. 9, De Ref.
[2] Belonging to his diocese.

in Kraus' "Real-Encykl."—the use of the fan is still retained, not only in processions but also at the altar. (Rock, iv. 229; Kraus, "Geschichte der Christl. Kunst," i. 522.)

FANON. "The word 'fanon' is sometimes used for the maniple; but here it has quite another meaning and signifies that hood-like kind of appendage now exclusively confined (in the Latin part of the Church) to the Roman Pontiff's use, though all bishops who follow the Syriac liturgy may wear it" (Rock, i. 379). It is worn only when the Pope celebrates pontifical Mass. The material is white silk, ornamented with narrow stripes of red and gold, and it is put on over the alb and finally arranged over the shoulders like a collar. Pope Innocent III. calls it the *orale* and states that it was peculiar to the Pope ("De Sacro Altaris Mysterio" i. 53, PL, ccxvii. 793). Some think it is a development of the *anabolagium* or primitive amice worn at least on festival days even by deacons. Under this name it is mentioned in the oldest Roman Ordines. Fanons, Amices, Anabolagia, &c., are essentially no more than ornamental collars or shoulder cloths. (See AMICE; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," p. 52.)

FAST. 1. *The Principle of Fasting.*—Theologians distinguish the natural from the ecclesiastical fast. The former consists in total abstinence from food and drink, and is required of those who are about to communicate; the latter, which alone concerns us here, imposes limits both on the kind and quantity of our food. What these limits are will be explained in the course of this article, but the definition given is sufficient for our immediate purpose—viz to justify the Catholic practice from reason and revelation. Experience tells us that there is a perpetual struggle between the spirit and the body, and that mortification of the flesh is a great means of preventing it from inciting us to rebellion against God's law. Again, by denying ourselves the lawful pleasures of sense, we are able to turn with greater freedom and earnestness to the thought of God and virtue, so that spiritual writers speak of fasting as one of the wings of prayer. Lastly, our conscience tells us (and even heathens have felt and acknowledged it) that we ought to suffer for our sins and mortify the flesh which has offended God.

However, we are not left to the mere exercise of reason on this point. Fasting as a means of grace has been approved by God Himself. A day of fasting—viz. the Day of Atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month—was imposed by God on the Israelites. Moses and Elias, those great servants of God, fasted for forty days: so did Christ Himself before beginning His public ministry. It is true that only Atonement Day was commanded as a Fast in the Law, but custom has introduced other public fasting days before St. Paul's time—for instance, that of the anniversary of the taking of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. And see Zach. vii. 5, 6.

The Breviary Hymn for Lent (Matins) has it:

> "Lex et prophetae primitus
> Hoc praetulerunt, postmodum
> Christus sacravit. . . ."

The allusions are of course to Moses and Elias—and the assertion is that our Lord by His forty days fast sanctioned and hallowed a Jewish use. Notice too how Jonah gives the Ninivites *forty* days to fast and do penance in. There is no sign of Lent having to be kept every year, much less at any particular period in the year; but the "fast of forty days" was no novelty among the Jews. The curious usage in early times of keeping various Lents has left its vestige in the practice of certain Religious Orders. It was during Michaelmas Lent that St. Francis of Assisi received the Stigmata. Christ takes for granted ("when ye fast," Mt. vi. 16) that His disciples will fast, and warns them against doing so ostentatiously. The distinct statement made by Him (Mt. ix. 15) that after His own departure from them His disciples would fast, implies a command to them to do so. The Apostles fasted (Acts xiii. 2, xiv. 22, 2 Cor. xi. 27), and St. Paul expressly speaks of fasting as a means by which Christians are to commend themselves as servants of God.[1] It may, indeed, be objected that, after all, no fasting days are imposed under precept in the New Testament, and that therefore the Catholic is different from the Apostolic idea of fasting. To this it may be answered that of such Protestants as make this objection scarcely any ever fast at all, and most of them would regard the practice as superstitious, a plain proof of the Church's wisdom in providing for the weakness of human nature by positive legislation. Besides, as St. Thomas points out, secular princes have the right of making regulations more strict and definite than the precepts of the natural law, in order to promote the welfare of their subjects. The natural law requires us to pay just debts: the prince may order them to be paid within a certain time and with certain formalities. The Church surely may take similar means of securing the spiritual well-being of its subjects. The law of nature imposes the duty of fasting: our spiritual rulers determine the time and the way in which this duty is to be performed.

2. *The Present Law of the Church.*—All baptized persons who have completed their twenty-first year are bound under mortal sin (see Prop. 23 condemned by Alexander

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 5; νηστείαις can only mean voluntary abstinence from food, as Meyer, *ad loc.*, proves. In xi. 27, fasting (ἐν νηστείαις) is clearly distinguished from involuntary want of food (ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει).

VII.) to observe the days of fasting. On these days they are required not to eat more than one full meal, which must not be taken before midday. They may, however, take wine, &c., at discretion, for drink, according to the maxim received among theologians, does not break the fast, unless the drink be really intended to nourish rather than to satisfy thirst or maintain the animal spirits. Of course a person may by drinking wine in large quantities act against the spirit of the law and forfeit the advantages which fasting is intended to secure. Even at the full meal flesh meat is prohibited. Eggs, milk, cheese, &c., are only forbidden during Lent. Besides this single meal, the Church permits a collation of about eight ounces, consisting of fruit, vegetables, bread, &c., or even of fish, provided that the fish are small, or that not more than two or three ounces of larger fish be taken. Custom, moreover, at least in England, allows about two ounces of bread to be taken at breakfast. Persons engaged in hard labour; the poor who have a difficulty in obtaining sufficient food at any time; those who are over sixty years of age (women over fifty); persons in weak health, &c., are excused from the law of fasting.

By an indult granted to the English bishops the use of milk, butter, and cheese at collation on fasting days is permitted; and yearly at the approach of Lent concessions for that season are announced in each diocese.

3. *History of Fasting.*—From the earliest times Catholics have observed fasting days of precept. Tertullian, contrasting the numerous fasts of the Montanists with the less strict observance of Catholics, says of the latter, "They think that in the Gospel those days are marked out for fasting during which the bridegroom was taken away"—*i.e.* the days of Holy Week, alluding to Lk. v. 35. St. Jerome (Ep. 54, al. 41, PL, xxii. 475), making the same comparison between Montanists and Catholics, says "We fast one Lent according to the tradition of the Apostles." St. Ambrose (Serm. 23, PL, xvii. 649) asserts that he who does not keep the fast of Lent is guilty of prevarication and contumacy. The Greek Fathers hold similar language; and one of them, St. Epiphanius ("Haer." 75, PG, xlii. 508) tells us that Aërius the heresiarch was condemned because he maintained that all fasting on particular days was a matter of devotion, not of obligation. For the varying duration of Lent in different times and places see LENT.

As to the manner of fasting, it may be said generally that there was less formal precept and therefore greater variety of custom; but that still fasting in the early was much more severe than in the modern Church. Throughout East and West, Catholics abstained on fasting days from wine as well as from flesh meat, the former as well as the latter being only permitted in cases of weak health. The Fathers constantly put abstinence from wine and animal food on the same level. The days of Holy Week were known as days of xerophagy, or dry food (Epiphan. in "Exposit. Fid." n. 22; "Constit. Ap." v. 17), because then the faithful were accustomed to feed on bread and salt, to which some added vegetables. The meal was not taken before sunset (Greg. Nyss. "Orat. in Princip. Jejun."): till that time an absolute fast even from water was observed. Hence the ancient custom in the Latin Church of celebrating Mass during Lent in the evening and encouraging all the faithful to communicate at it. Dinner—*i.e.* the midday meal—and fasting were regarded in ancient times as incompatible; so much so that, in order to comply with the law of the Church which forbade fasting on Sundays, the ancient monks took their single meal on that day at noon. Usually the faithful went to church on weekdays in Lent at 3 P.M. for none, followed by Mass and vespers, after which they were at liberty to eat. We find the first traces of relaxation near the close of the eighth century. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, in a Capitulary of 797, blames people who began to eat at the hour of none (3 P.M.) without waiting for office or Mass. This and similar remonstrances had no effect, save to bring about an evasion of the law by anticipating the recital of none (the office of the ninth hour) to midday, so that, as soon as it was said, food might be taken. From this practice is derived our English word "noon." About the same time Charlemagne introduced the custom of having none sung at his Court an hour before the usual time, in order to spare the courtiers, who dined after him at several tables in succession according to their rank. Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, in the middle of the tenth century, speaks of this custom of dining at noon as already established. St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 147 a. 7) fully recognizes the lawfulness of this usage. He even considers it enough if the meal was taken about the hour of none, and makes allowance for persons in weak health who were unable to fast so long and needed dispensation to eat earlier in the day. The offices of none, Mass, and vespers were all concluded in the later part of the Middle Ages before three o'clock, and Paludanus and other schoolmen were so little aware of the ancient discipline of the Church on this point that they regarded the old prohibition to eat before evening ("ante vesperam") as meaning simply that the fast was not to be broken before the vesper office; thus completely ignoring the fact that the hour of vespers during Lent had been changed. Lastly, the rule of St. Thomas that the fast might be broken *about* none was interpreted more and more loosely till, in 1500, we find the synodal decrees of Paris approving the modern custom

of taking the meal at midday. The Greeks, according to Goar, have adopted the same relaxation.

The word "collation," in its present sense, marks another important change in the manner of fasting. St. Benedict in his rule requires his religious to assemble after supper and before compline and listen to "collations" —*i.e.* conferences (of Cassian), the Lives of the Fathers, or other edifying books which were then read aloud by one of their number. Now, in an ancient monastic rule known as the "Regula Magistri" we find the religious permitted on the special fasts of the order to partake together of wine and water in very moderate quantity; and in a chapter-general of abbots and monks held at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 817, the monks were permitted to drink before compline, even on fasts of the Church, if wearied by manual labour, the recitation of the office of the dead in addition to the ordinary office, or the like. This refreshment was taken just before the reading of the "collations"; and in 1308, in a statute of the congregation of Clugny, we meet with the word "collation" used for this refreshment. It was not till a still later date that any solid food was taken on fasting days in the Western Church, except at the single meal. The Greeks, indeed, even in the eleventh century, ate of fruits and vegetables in moderate quantity over and above the single meal, but Cardinal Humbert reproached them with breaking the fast by this very practice. St. Thomas only permits the use of "electuaria" out of the single meal on the ground that they were taken as medicine, not as food. In Gerson's time, a collation of vegetable food was approved by custom. The rule of the Theatines, drawn up under Clement VII., mentions these collations and the spiritual reading which accompanied them. The quantity permissible at collation has been gradually enlarged. St. Charles, in the rules which he made for his servants, only allows them a glass of wine with an ounce and a half of bread to be taken as a collation on the evening of fasting days.

(See LENT. The present rules of fasting will be found in any modern treatise on Moral Theology, under the heading "Commandments of the Church," *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, lib. iv. *n.* 1004 *sqq.* The principle of fasting, and the practice of his own time, are explained by St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 147. The sketch of the history of fasting given above, and the references, are taken from the "Traité sur les Jeûnes," by Thomassin.)

FATHER (TITLE OF) was given in early times to all bishops. The title of spiritual father was also used to designate confessors, and thus an early Benedictine rule provides that none of the religious should become a spiritual father without leave from his abbot. Lastly, the head of a monastery was called "Father," this name being of course a translation of the Oriental word abbot [*q.v.*]. [See also the beginning of the art. POPE.]

In English-speaking countries the title Father is now universally given to all priests alike whether secular or regular in addressing them or as a prefix to their surname, though within the memory of hundreds of living Catholics the secular clergy were invariably spoken of as Mr. so-and-so and addressed "Sir." The innovation in England originated with the immigration from Ireland, in which country the present use of the style "Father" had long obtained. Despite a lively newspaper controversy and much opposition, especially in the North of England, the Irish custom (thanks especially to its encouragement by Cardinal Manning) became established and will probably not in the future be departed from.

It should however be noted that the usage is strictly local. In Rome and on the continent of Europe generally, the Regulars of Mendicant and allied Orders are called "Father" (*Padre, Père*); the secular clergy (and with them Canons Regular and monks) *Domnus* or *Dominus* in Latin, and in the vernacular their equivalents, *Signore, Don, Monsieur* and the like [see DOM]. So far has this gone that in the Constitutions (approved by the Holy See) of some Benedictine Congregations it is strictly enjoined that the monks be not styled "Pater" (Father) but *Don* or *Dom*, in contra-distinction to Mendicant Friars. In regard to Bishops, however, as was said above, the term "Father" or "Father in God" has been in use from the earliest ages. It connotes not so much sacerdotal dignity as the position of teacher and master. Hence Eliseus (Elisha) so addresses Elias (4 Kings ii. 12). Liturgically, in formulas having relation to the Sacrament of Penance, the word pater (father) has always been employed when any priest is addressed, whence its use in the Confiteor. In general, nevertheless, the old style "Domnus" is retained as in "Iube domne benedicere." Such forms as "Benedicite, *Pater* reverende" are comparatively recent.

FATHERS OF THE CHURCH. The appellation of Fathers is used in a more general and a more restricted sense. In a general sense it denotes all those Christian writers of the first twelve centuries who are reckoned by general consent among the most eminent witnesses and teachers of the orthodox and Catholic doctrine of the Church. Taken in this sense, it includes some names on which there rests more or less the reproach of heterodox doctrine. Origen, whose works, as we have them, contain grave errors frequently condemned by the highest authority in the Church, is one of these. Nevertheless, his writings are of the highest value for their orthodox contents. Eusebius of Caesarea is

another. Tertullian became an open apostate from the Catholic Church; yet his writings as a Catholic are among the most excellent and precious remains of antiquity. There are some others included among the Fathers in this greater latitude of designation who have not the mark of eminent sanctity.

In its stricter sense the appellation denotes only those ancient writers whose orthodoxy is unimpeachable, whose works are of signal excellence or value, and whose sanctity is eminent and generally recognised. The following list includes the names of the most illustrious Fathers, according to the most exclusive sense of this honourable title:—

First Century—St. Clement of Rome. Second Century—St. Ignatius, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus. Third Century—St. Cyprian, St. Dionysius of Alexandria. Fourth Century—St. Athanasius, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ephrem, St. Ambrose, St. Optatus, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom. Fifth Century—St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Leo the Great, St. Prosper, St. Vincent of Lerins, St. Peter Chrysologus. Sixth Century—St. Caesarius of Arles, St. Gregory the Great. Seventh Century—St. Isidore of Seville. Eighth Century—Ven. Bede, St. John Damascene. Eleventh Century—St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm. Twelfth Century—St. Bernard. A complete collection of the works of the Fathers contains many more names than these. Moreover, it is plain that the Fathers of the first six centuries, by the mere fact of their priority in time, are much more valuable witnesses to primitive faith and order, and that their writings are in a stricter sense sources of theological tradition, than the works of those who came later, however illustrious the latter may be. There is also a gradation of rank among the Fathers, some having a much higher authority than others. As private doctors, no one of them has a final and indisputable authority taken singly, except in so far as his teaching is warranted by some extrinsic and higher criterion, or supported by its intrinsic reasons. As witnesses, each one singly, or several concurring together, must receive that credence which is reasonably due in view of all the qualities and circumstances of the testimony given. Their morally unanimous consent concerning matters pertaining to faith has a decisive and irrefragable authority. It has always been held that God raised up in the earlier ages of the Church these highly gifted, learned, and holy men, and endowed them with special and extraordinary graces that they might be the principal teachers of the mysteries and doctrines of the faith. Their writings are the great source of light and truth in theology, after the Holy Scriptures. The authority of their doctrine, in the proper sense of that word, is nevertheless derived from the sanction of the Ecclesia Docens, the only supreme and infallible tribunal. (See Franzelin "De Divina Traditione," p. 177 *sqq.*; Bardenhewer, "Patrologie"; id. French ed. by Godet and Verschaffel; Migne, "Patrologiae Cursus Completus":—"Series Latina," 221 vols.: "Series Graeco-Latina," 162 vols. The Vienna "Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum" and the Berlin "Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderten" are both in progress. Among smaller collections may be mentioned Hurter, "SS. Patrum Opuscula Selecta"; Vizzini, "Bibliotheca SS. PP. Theologiae Tironibus et Universo Clero Accommodata"; Hemmer and Lejay, "Textes et Documents pour l'Étude Historique du Christianisme," Texts, Fr. Translation, and notes; these last three collections may be strongly recommended for their handiness and cheapness as well as for their excellence. The Cambridge series of "Patristic Texts" has made a good beginning.)

FEAR OF GOD falls into two great divisions. Servile fear is the fear such as a slave might have for his master, and it looks to the punishments which God inflicts. Filial fear is the fear of sons; it consists in dread of offending God who is worthy of all love, and of being separated from Him by sin.

If servile fear be so utterly servile that it is united with the will to sin if only it were possible to do so without risk of punishment, it is of course evil. But the fear of God's punishments proceeds, according to the Council of Trent (sess. xiv. ch. 4), from the Holy Ghost, disposes the sinners to justification, and remains even in the saints while on earth and still liable to fall. "Perfect charity" does, indeed, "cast out fear" (1 Jn. iv. 18), but it does this only so far as a man perfected in the love of God has a growing knowledge that his conscience is free from sins which will incur the judgment of God, and has also an increasing confidence in God's mercy. The fear of God's judgment still remains, and the saints more than other men were ready to make the Psalmist's words their own: "Pierce my flesh with thy fear: for I am afraid because of thy judgments" (Ps. cxviii.).

Filial fear increases with the increase of charity, since the more a soul loves God the more it will fear offending Him, so long as there is any danger of doing so. Even this filial fear of offending God is absent in the case of the blessed, because they are not exposed to any such peril. But they are still said to fear God in the sense that they constantly recognise their own nothingness, and revere God's infinite majesty. (See St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 19; Estius on 1 John iv.)

FEASTS OF THE CHURCH. Days on which the Church joyfully commemorates particular mysteries of the Christian religion

or the glory of her saints. Such days have not been imposed on us, as on the Jews, by the express enactment of God, and in this as in other respects the Christian law is one of liberty. The whole life of a perfect Christian is, as Origen says, a perpetual feast, on which he dies to sin, rises with Christ, and receives the gifts of the Holy Spirit. But the Church has wisely instituted recurring festivals, which impress the great truths of religion on our minds, and bid us remember that "we are the children of the saints." [1]

At first the number of the Church's feasts was small. Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost were celebrated in St. Augustine's time, and, as he believed, by Apostolic tradition. He was familiar with the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany. The feasts of martyrs were at first only local, and those of confessors were of later introduction even as local feasts. We may form some idea of the number of feasts during the first five centuries from a Calendar of the African church published by Mabillon. It is, according to that great critic, the most ancient which we possess, and it agrees in a remarkable degree with a list given by Possidius of St. Augustine's sermons on the festivals. This Calendar notes feasts of African martyrs, and of some confessors. It mentions also the feasts of certain martyrs not Africans—*e.g.* St. Stephen, St. Laurence, St. Vincent, SS. Gervase and Protase, of St. James the Greater, of "the Holy Apostles," of St. John Baptist, the Holy Innocents, St. Andrew, St. Luke, and the Maccabees. It gives no feast of the Blessed Virgin, nor is there a word in St. Augustine's genuine works which would lead us to believe that such feasts were known to him. Neither is any found in the fragment we have of the Leonine Sacramentary (fifth century), though there is reason to believe that in that age, or earlier, the Octave day of Christmas (January 1) was celebrated as a feast of our Lady. The ancient office and Mass still in use testify to this. Thomassin thinks the multiplication of feasts and their more solemn observance must be attributed in great measure to the monastic orders.

(1) Feasts are divided into holidays of obligation ("festa fori"), on which the faithful are bound to hear Mass and rest from servile work, and holidays which the Church observes in the Mass and office without imposing any obligation on the faithful; some of these again being known as "days of devotion" or "festa suppressa," because formerly holidays of obligation.

(2) Again, feasts are divided, according to their rank, into doubles, semi-doubles, simples, &c. The following seems to be the origin of these names. Lanfranc speaks of double, simple, and semi-double offices. It was the custom, till late in the Middle Ages, always to recite the office of the feria [see FERIA], in spite of any feast which might occur on it. Hence on greater solemnities, clerics were obliged to recite a double office—one of the feria, another of the feast. These double offices were few in number: even the office for the feasts of the Apostles was not double. On lesser feasts the office was simple—*i.e.* the feast was merely commemorated—and on a third class of feasts the office of the feria and feast were welded into one, much after the fashion of the modern breviary offices for certain Sundays in the Octave—*e.g.* of the Ascension. These last offices were called semi-double. As time went on, the ferial gave way more and more to the festal offices, and we find Durandus, who died in 1296, using the words "double," "semi-double," "simple" in a new sense. He applies the word "double," not to the two offices recited on one day, but to the single office of a feast on which the antiphons were doubled—*i.e.* repeated fully at the beginning and end of a psalm. On semi-doubles, half of the antiphon was repeated before, the whole after the psalm: in other words, it was half doubled. The office for simple feasts differed little from that of the feria. The practice of taking the hymn on simples from the common of saints and reciting the Sunday psalms at lauds only dates from Pius V.

Recent legislation (1911–1914) has effected many changes in the manner of reciting office and Mass on Saints' and other feast-days. These changes tend in the direction of giving greater prominence to the non-festal elements of the Liturgy—a movement still in progress.

In the modern office-books the doubles are further subdivided into doubles of the first class, doubles of the second class, greater doubles, and ordinary doubles. The object of this division is to determine which of two feasts must give way to the other, should both fall on the same day. The inferior feast is either transferred to some other day or commemorated at certain portions of the office—*e.g.* Mass, lauds, &c. Further, certain great feasts have octaves—*i.e.* are celebrated throughout eight days, and on the eighth with special solemnity. Lastly, feasts are moveable or immoveable, according as the time of their celebration is fixed for a particular day of the civil year, or calculated from Easter.

The Pope or General Councils may make feasts of obligation for the whole Church. But a bishop cannot, on his own authority, institute new feasts, alter the breviary or missal, nor can he change the rank of feasts —*e.g.* by making a semi-double a double—

[1] St. Paul reproaches the Galatians (vi. 10) for observing "days" (such as the Sabbath), "months" (such as the Feast of the New Moon), "times" (*καιρούς*, annual festivals, such as the Passover), "years" (such as the Sabbatical Year and Year of Jubilee, &c.). The reference is clearly to Jewish feasts. The Apostles themselves observed "days," viz. Sundays; and St. Paul "hasted to keep the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem" (Acts xx. 16).

except by Apostolic indult or leave from the Congregation of Rites.

(See Thomassin, "Traité des Festes"; Gavantus with Meratus' notes; and Probst, "Brevier und Brevier-gebet." There was a celebrated controversy between Grancolas, who explained the origin of the terms "double," "simple," &c., from the old practice of reciting two offices, and Guyet "Heortologia," who argued that the term "double" referred to the doubling of the antiphon. An account of the arguments of both is given by Meratus on Gavantus, p. ii. sec. iii. cap. 2. The view of Probst, which we have followed, does justice to the facts adduced on either side. Duchesne, "Christian Worship," chap. viii.; Kellner, "Heortology"; Holweck, "Fasti Mariani"; Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter" for the recent changes relating to the office on feasts.)

FEBRONIANISM. A name given to certain views on the constitution of the Church and the relations of Church and State, which may be roughly described as an exaggeration of Gallicanism. They were propounded in the middle of the 18th century by an author who assumed the name of Febronius.

His real name was John Nicolas von Hontheim. He was born at Treves in 1701, and studied canon law at Louvain, under the famous Van Espen. The principles which Hontheim learned from his professor evidently left a lasting impression on his mind, for Van Espen was remarkable for his spirit of opposition to Rome [1] no less than for his undoubted talents and learning. Having taken his Doctor's degree in law, Hontheim returned to his native city and lectured on the "Digest" in the University of Treves from 1732 to 1738. Ten years later, he was consecrated suffragan or auxiliary bishop of Treves with a title *in partibus*, and under three successive Prince-Archbishops exercised great influence, both on the spiritual administration of the arch-diocese and on the temporal government of the electorate. He was justly esteemed for his exemplary life, and, in spite of engrossing occupations, he found time to write and publish two learned works on the history of Treves; nor was it till he had reached old age that he did anything to tarnish his fair name. In 1763 a book appeared under the following title:—"De Statu Ecclesiae et de legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis, liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christianos compositus. Bullioni." The real name of the author remained for a considerable time unknown, and at this day the name of Febronius, which occurred to Hontheim as a *nom de plume* because his niece was called Febronia in religion, is familiar to many who never heard of Hontheim himself. The book, however, soon became notorious. It put into shape opinions which were exceedingly popular at the time—nowhere more so than among German Catholics.

Christ, according to Febronius, had conferred the power of the keys on the whole body of the faithful, although it was to the prelates of the Church that the actual administration of the power was committed. Each bishop, as a successor of the Apostles, received his power straight from God, and had unlimited authority to dispense, judge heresy, and consecrate other bishops. Peter, indeed, and his successors, were endowed by Christ with the primacy, but through this primacy —which, by the way, was not necessarily attached to the Roman see—the Pope was superior to his brethren in the episcopate, only so far as a metropolitan is superior to the other bishops of his province. Moreover, although the Pope was superior to any single bishop, the body of the episcopate was superior to him. He could do nothing against the canons, his power being confined to watching over their execution. An appeal might always be made from the Pope to a general council, since the Pope was not a supreme, and much less an infallible, judge; nor could it be said that a council without the Pope was like a body without its head, since the Pope had to exercise his primacy in the Church, not over it. Without the consent of the Church, he could issue no laws of universal obligation, and it was idle to try to enforce such laws by threatening the disobedient with excommunication. True, partly by the concessions of the bishops themselves, still more by Papal extortion, the power of the Holy See had grown to monstrous dimensions; but it was high time to restore primitive discipline. To effect this, it was the duty of the bishops to refrain from publishing in their dioceses such Papal bulls as were injurious to episcopal authority, while secular princes ought to promote the same end by convoking General Councils, and by availing themselves of the Placet and *appel comme d'abus*, and by open refusal to submit.

These propositions are manifestly opposed to Catholic doctrine, and they are not even consistent with each other. The book, moreover, was every way unworthy of its author, for it shows no sign of the learning which he actually possessed. What he said, had been said before by Richer and by the Spaniard Tostatus, but Febronius does not seem even to have had recourse to them, and was content to draw from Dupin. Clement XIII. condemned the book on February 27, 1764, although only some of the German bishops—among whom, however, was the Archbishop of Treves—prohibited it in their dioceses. Many refutations appeared, of which the most famous are the "Antifebronio" of the Jesuit Zaccaria (Pisaur. 1767, 4 vols. 8vo., "Antifebronius vindicatus," Caesen. 1768,

[1] He would not accept the bull "Unigenitus," and had to flee from Louvain.

4 vols. 8vo), the "Italus ad Febronium" of the Capuchin Viator a Cocaleo (Luc. 1768, Tridcnt. 1774), and the "De Potestate Ecclesiastica Summorum Pontificum et Conciliorum generalium liber, una cum vindiciis auctoritatis pontificiae contra opus Just. Febronii," by Peter Ballerini (Veron. 1768, 4to). Febronius defended himself under various new pseudonyms, such as Justinianus Novus, Joannes Clericus, Aulus Jordanes, &c.

So things stood till 1778, when Pius VI., feeling the need of more stringent measures, pointed out to the Archbishop of Treves that Febronius must make a formal recantation or else fall under the censures of the Church. With great difficulty Febronius was persuaded to give a general explanation of his meaning, which explanation was sent to Rome and returned as insufficient. At last the Pope and the Archbishop persuaded him to make a specific retractation of erroneous propositions in his book, which by this time had grown to six volumes. Unfortunately, the documents printed by Wyttenbach and Müller in the third volume of their "Gesta Trevirorum" show that Febronius did not really and thoroughly renounce his errors. In 1781 he published a commentary on his retractation ("Justini Febronii Juris-consulti Commentarius in suam Retractationem Pio VI. Pont. Max. Kal. Nov. Ann. 1778 submissam." Francof. 1781, 4to) which contained many propositions which must have been highly offensive to the Pope. Pius VI. handed it for examination to Cardinal Gerdil, who replied to it in his treatise headed "In Commentarium a Justino Febronio in suam Retractationem editum Animadversiones," and to be found in volume xiii. of his collected works. But Febronianism appealed to prejudices and interests against which learned treatises could avail little. The notorious Church reforms of Joseph II. may be fairly called Febronian, and the Ems Congress in 1786 acted on similar principles. The Archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Mayence—all of them secular princes as well as ecclesiastical dignitaries—and the Archbishop of Salzburg were offended at the sending of a Papal nuncio to Munich, and the activity of the nuncio Monsignor Pacca at Cologne. Accordingly, they appointed representatives who met at Ems and drew up a "Punctation" in 23 articles, the object of which was to make the archbishops practically independent of Rome. The threatened schism came to nothing, and in 1789 the three episcopal Electors acknowledged the right of the Holy See to give dispensations and send nuncios. Febronius, who was already a very old man, does not appear to have taken any active part in the contest. He died in peace with the Church on September 2, 1790. In a short time the French Revolution changed the face of Europe, and Febronianism, though remnants of it lingered on to our own day, has never since been the occasion of any serious danger in the Church. (See Brück in "Kirchenlex."; Lauchert in "Cath. Enc."; Stumper, "Die Kirchenrechtlichen Ideen des Febronius"; Ortolan in DThC.)

FEE. A retribution for services rendered. It is expressly forbidden for clerics to demand payment for the administration of the sacraments or funerals. But as those who serve the altar have to live by the altar and "they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 14), and "the labourer is worthy of his hire" (Lk. x. 7), the Church has commanded the faithful to contribute to the support of their pastors. One of the authorized ways of doing this is to make an offering on the occasion of receiving certain sacraments (*e.g.* baptism, matrimony) or when the priest has rendered some service. "Although the Church detests all filthy lucre in extorting or exacting money from the faithful for the celebration of the sacraments, yet the Fourth Council of the Lateran prescribes that the laudable customs, in accordance with which offerings were made by the faithful to the ministers of the altar on occasion of the administration of the sacraments, should be observed" (II Council of Westminster, xv.). "Priests should beware of receiving any retribution from penitents on account of confession" (I Westm. xix. 7).

In like manner certain taxes or fees may be received by the Papal and episcopal chanceries for the time and trouble taken in expediting favours, dispensations, &c. (See the regulations drawn up by Innocent X in 1678.) As regards stipends for Masses see MASS, p. 568. (See Taunton; Ferraris, *Taxa.*)

FERIA. A name given in the ecclesiastical calendar to all days of the week except Sunday ("Dies dominica") and Saturday ("Sabbatum"). It seems strange that the title of Feria or feast should be given to days which are not feasts, or at least are not considered as such, so far as they are called Feriae. The explanation given in the breviary (Feast of St. Silvester, lect. vi.), that clerics are to be free from worldly cares and keep a perpetual feast to God, scarcely suffices, and perhaps is not intended, to account for the actual origin of the name. The true explanation is probably this. The Jews were accustomed to name the days of the week from the Sabbath and thus we find in the Gospels such expressions as "unam sabbati," μίαν τῶν σαββάτων,[1] "the first day from the Sabbath," or, in other words, the first day of the week. The early Christians reckoned the days in Easter week in the same fashion: only as all the days in that week were holy days, they called Easter Monday, not the first day after Easter Sunday, but the second feria or feast-day; and as every

[1] In Rabbinical usage, the word "Sabbath" became equivalent to week, and hence in Rabbinical language (adopted in the Gospels) אֶחָד בְּשַׁבָּת is our Sunday.

Sunday is a lesser Easter, the practice prevailed of calling each Monday "feria secunda," each Tuesday "feria tertia," and so on.

The recent Constitution, "Divino Afflatu" (Nov. 1, 1911), made important changes in the rules for ferias and vigils. When a double feast (not of the first or second class) or a semi-double occurs on a ferial in Lent (or Ember day or Rogation Monday) priests celebrating private Mass may take their choice and celebrate either (1) the Mass of the feast with commemoration and last Gospel of the feria; or (2) the Mass of the feria with commemoration of the feast. But they are forbidden to say private votive Masses or private Mass for the dead. An exception is granted in favour of Masses for the dead in Lent, which may be said on the first free day in each week. Some, moreover, of the greater ferias are privileged, and this is the case with the days of Holy, Easter, and Whitsun weeks, as also with Ash Wednesday. They exclude any feast of however high a rank, and cause it to be transferred to another day. This must be understood of the celebration in choir, for the obligation of resting from servile work and hearing Mass on holidays of obligation usually [1] remains, even if that holiday falls on a greater feria. (Gavantus, with Meratus' Notes, p. ii. sect. iii. cap. 5; Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter.")

FERRARA. [See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.]

FEUDUM ECCLESIASTICUM. By an ecclesiastical fief was meant, strictly speaking, a domain belonging to the Church, which the bishop, abbot, or other possessor, granted as a fief to a prince, baron, knight, or other secular person, in return for protection, escort, and other similar services. The bishop, &c., retained the suzerainty in the name of the Church, and the infeoffed person did homage to him as his vassal. Tithes were also regarded as a *feudum ecclesiasticum*. By an improper use of the term it was extended to the secular estates granted in fief to the Church. (Ferraris, *Feudum*.)

FEUILLANTS. [See CISTERCIANS.]

FILIOQUE. [See CREED, p. 239.]

FINAL PERSEVERANCE is defined by Billuart ("De Grat." diss. viii. a. 5) as that great and special gift in virtue of which a man remains in a state of grace till the moment of death. The Council of Trent (Sess. vi. can. 16 and cap. 13) teaches that no one without special revelation can know for certain that he will persevere, and also that we are utterly unable to secure this gift by merits of our own. It comes from the grace of God, "who is able to establish him who stands so that he may continue to stand, and to re-establish him who falls." The teaching of the council is confirmed by reason and Scripture. To merit a gift from God, it is necessary that God should promise to bestow the gift in question, as a reward for good works. No such promise has been made. On the contrary, Scripture reminds the just that they must work out their salvation "with fear and trembling," and warns him who stands "to take heed lest he fall."

It is possible, however, to obtain this gift by prayer and good works, which appeal, not to the justice, but to the liberality and kindness of God; and some theologians speak of final perseverance as obtained in such cases by merit "de congruo." In this sense St. Augustine ("De Dono Persever." cap. 6) says we can merit final perseverance by prayer ("suppliciter emereri"). (See St. Thomas, $1^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 114, a. 9; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." II. 242; and the ordinary text-books "De Gratia.")

FINDING OF CROSS. [See CROSS.]

FIRE. Blessing of. (See HOLY WEEK, p. 418.)

FIRE. (See HELL, PURGATORY.)

FIRST-FRUITS. By the law of Moses the first-fruits of man, of animals, and of "whatsoever thou hast sown in the field," [1] were owed to the Lord. A command was given to Aaron, as representing the priestly caste—"For the first-born of man thou shalt take a price, and every beast that is unclean thou shalt cause to be redeemed." [2] In another place [3] the Levites are said to be taken by the Lord in commutation of this price ("I have taken them instead of the first-born that open every womb in Israel"), but it was still required that a first-born son should be presented to the Lord in the Temple, and redeemed by the payment of five shekels.[4] The firstlings of clean beasts—cows, sheep, and goats—were not to be redeemed, but offered in sacrifice; and of the meat, the consecrated breast and right shoulder were assigned to the sons of Aaron. Of this meat only the males in the priestly families were to partake; [5] but the first-fruits of the produce of the land were given "to thee, and to thy sons, and to thy daughters, by a perpetual law." The Levites themselves, though, being without land, they could not offer "first-fruits of the barn-floor and the wine-press," [6] yet were instructed to offer the first-fruits of the tithes paid to them by the children of Israel to the Lord—that is, "the tenth part of the tenth."

A Hebrew tradition mentioned in the body of the canon law assigns some part of the crop, not less than a sixtieth, and not more than a fortieth, as the proportion which ought to be given as first-fruits. In substance, the obligation to offer first-fruits, which is equivalent to an intention of sustaining the

[1] Usually; for if the Annunciation falls on Good Friday or Holy Saturday, all obligation of observance is transferred.

[1] Ex. xxiii. 16.
[2] Num. xviii. 15.
[3] Num. viii. 16.
[4] Grotius, *ad Luc.* ii. 23.
[5] Num. xviii. 10.
[6] Num. xviii. 30.

Church and its ministers with our temporal goods, is still valid under the new law; but in form it is not binding, except in cases where they are demanded under an ancient custom. (Ferraris, *Primitiae.*)

FISCAL, PROCURATOR. (See PROCURATOR FISCAL.)

FISTULA (also called *siphon, calamus, pugillaris*). A pipe or reed through which the faithful used to receive the Blood of Christ from the chalice. This manner of communicating is mentioned in the most ancient Roman Ordines (the oldest is attributed by Mabillon to the time of Gregory the Great), and a curious relic of this custom remains to this day. At Papal Masses, the deacon brings the Precious Blood to the Pope, who takes it through a fistula. (See Rock. i. pp. 128-132; Kraus, "Real-Encykl." i. 529.)

FLABELLUM. (See FAN.)

FLAGELLANTS. So called from the scourges (*flagella*) which they carried in their processions, and with which they lashed their bare arms and shoulders. They first appeared in the thirteenth century, an age when Christian architecture reached a height of glory and perfection never since equalled, and extraordinary sanctity revealed marvels of grace and divine power before unsuspected, but in which, also, the reign of law being but imperfectly established, the world was often startled from its propriety by the apparition of monsters of cruelty and lust, like Eccelin da Romano and his brother, whose touch was contamination and their very existence a curse. No human arm seemed able to reach far enough, or strike hard enough, to punish a twentieth part of the crimes that were committed. God appeared to be the one refuge left. Numbers of persons—men, women and children—collected together; they veiled their faces and uncovered their shoulders; in each town that they entered, forming a melancholy procession, they sought by tears, groans, and voluntary penance—singing penitential songs the while—to appease the divine wrath; the sound of the lash was continual, and blood flowed abundantly. The first association of Flagellants appeared in Perugia in 1260. The sympathy and agitation which their proceedings at first excited would almost surpass belief; everywhere they were joined by crowds of fervent neophytes. The rule of the association was that every person should remain a member of it during thirty-three days, in honour of the thirty-three years of the life of our Lord. A contemporary[1] writer says that, whatever might be alleged against them, "nevertheless by this means many who were at enmity were reconciled, and many good things were done." The secular governments, after a time, observing that the Holy See and the bishops in general did not encourage the movement, began to prohibit the Flagellant processions. After the Black Death (1348) the Flagellants again appeared. They now gave way to many extravagances; their leader spoke of a mysterious letter which had fallen from heaven and been found at Jerusalem, in which Jesus Christ promised to be gracious to all penitents in the processions of Flagellants, "because their blood was mingled with His blood." Clement VI. repressed them; but they appeared again, and for the last time, about the date of the Council of Constance, among the canons of which is one condemning their excesses. (See Bareille in DThC; Haupt in "Realencykl. für Prot. Theol." *Geisslerbruderschaften.*)

[1] Quoted by Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book xi. chap. 2.

FLECTAMUS GENUA ("Let us bend our knees"). Words used by the deacon before the collects in the office of Good Friday and in certain Masses. The subdeacon immediately afterwards says "Levate" ("rise," literally "raise them up"), and the ministers at the altar do so, having knelt on one knee for a moment. In ancient times each summons came from the deacon; the people knelt, and a longer space was allowed for silent prayer. (See GENUFLEXION; Benedict XIV. "De Miss." ii. 5.) In accordance with a tradition ratified by the Council of Nicaea (325) the "Flectamus genua" and corresponding kneeling down are omitted on all Sundays and during Paschal Time.

FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.[1] Several remarkable attempts to heal the schism of the East and West were made during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In 1339 Andronicus III. Palaeologus sent the Abbot Barlaam to negotiate with one of the Avignon Popes, Benedict XII.; but the Pope would not listen to Barlaam's proposal—viz. that the churches should be united, while the dogmatic differences remained as they were. New attempts at reconciliation were made by John V. Palaeologus, who was hard pressed by the Turks. The emperor himself became a Catholic in 1369, but his example was not followed by the clergy or the people. At last John VI. Palaeologus was reduced to straits which made him see the impossibility of saving the Byzantine empire without help from the Western Christians. The Turks had taken Adrianople (1360), and his throne was already tottering beneath him. In his extremity he was willing to negotiate for peace with the Catholic Church. Nicolas of Cusa went to Constantinople and smoothed the way for reconciliation. No doubt, there was also a real desire for unity and doctrinal agreement among many of the Greeks, apart from the political motives which induced them to come to terms with the Latin Church. One of the Greek ecclesiastics expressly said at a council held for preliminary consultation at Constantinople that a union on merely political

[1] This is the usual name, because at Florence the chief work of the council was done; but in reality it met first at Ferrara and ended at Rome.

grounds would not last. At the end of November 1437, 700 Greeks sailed from the Bosporus. The emperor, the Patriarch Joseph of Constantinople, deputies from the other Patriarchs, entrusted by them with complete power to act as their representatives, and Bessarion, the famous archbishop of Nicaea, were among their number. On February 8, 1438, they landed at Venice. Early in March they reached Ferrara, to which the Council of Basle had been transferred, and were received with great solemnity by the Pope, Eugenius IV. On April 9th the council was opened, and the discussion on the addition of the word "Filioque" to the Creed began. It lasted for fifteen sessions, after which, partly because the plague had broken out at Ferrara, partly because the Florentines wished to have the council in their city and offered to supply the Pope with money, which he sorely needed for the maintenance of the Greeks, the council was transferred thither. At Florence the council continued to sit from 1439 to 1442.

First of all the great dogmatic question on the procession of the Holy Ghost was decided. The Greeks accepted the Latin terminology—viz. that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, when its real meaning was explained to them. The Latins fully admitted and the council defined that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle and by a single spiration. The Latins, moreover, fully allowed the orthodoxy of the Greek terminology—viz. that the third Person proceeds from the Father through the Son; and this expression also was approved by the Council. Other points of difference were next discussed. It was defined that the Body of Christ is truly consecrated either with leavened or unleavened bread, Latins and Greeks being required to follow in this matter the custom of their respective churches; further, that such souls as have departed in God's grace, but without having done penance enough for their sins, are detained in Purgatory, and, while there, are assisted by the sacrifices, prayers, and good works of Christians on earth; that, on the other hand, souls perfectly purified or, like infants just baptized, needing no purification, go straight to heaven and see God face to face, whereas the souls of those who die in mortal sin descend at once to hell. The discussions on the primacy of the Roman bishop were much more long and keen. John of Torquemada (Turrecremata), John of Ragusio, and Ambrose Traversari were the great advocates of the Papal prerogatives. At last, however, the council defined that "the Holy Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over all the world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter, prince of the Apostles; that he is the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in [the person of] blessed Peter full power has been committed by our Lord Jesus Christ of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church; as also (*quemadmodum etiam*, καθ' ὃν τρόπον)[1] is contained in the acts of oecumenical councils and in the holy canons." On July 5, 1439, all the members, except Mark of Ephesus and the bishop of Stauropolis, signed the Decree of Union containing the above definitions. On the evening of the same day the Greeks again appeared before the Pope, and Bessarion declared their belief that the transubstantiation of the bread and wine in the Mass is effected by the words of consecration, thus abandoning the opinion which ascribed the change to the ἐπίκλησις or invocation of the Holy Ghost. [See CONSECRATION.] The Decree of Union was solemnly published next day (Sunday) in the Cathedral of Florence, being read aloud by Cardinal Julian in Latin, and by Bessarion in Greek. On August 26, 1439, the Greek emperor left Florence.

The union effected was of short duration. Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople, had died during the council; his successor, Metrophanes, who was well disposed to the union, died shortly after it, in 1443. Mark of Ephesus and other enemies of unity were active in their intrigues, and it was not till 1452 that Cardinal Isidore, the fugitive metropolitan of Kiew and legate of Pope Nicolas V., succeeded in having the Florentine decrees acknowledged and promulgated in the church of St. Sophia. But on May 29, 1453, the Turks took Constantinople, and the Sultan Muhammed II. appointed the anti-Roman Gennadius to the Patriarchate. In 1472 the decrees of Florence were formally repudiated by a schismatical council at Constantinople.

Other Orientals besides the Greek schismatics were reunited with the Church during the course of the council. In 1439 the Armenians, in 1440 a part of the Jacobites or Monophysite Christians, were received into Catholic communion, and Eugenius IV. issued special instructions for them which are still extant. After Eugenius had returned to Rome, in 1443, the council was still continued and sessions held in the Lateran church. At the second session of the council after it had been transferred to Rome, in 1445, Timothy, the Chaldaean or Nestorian Metropolitan of Tarsus living in Cyprus, with his clergy and people made their submission to the Pope, and about the same time the Maronites in that island became Catholics.

For a time Gallican divines denied the claims of Florence to rank as a General Council, because they held that the Pope

[1] Recent examination of the original document signed with the autograph of the Greek emperor, and preserved at Florence, removes all shadow of doubt that this is the true reading. Four or five original copies bear the same witness (see *infra*, p. 675 note).

exceeded his power in transferring the Council from Basle to Ferrara. Even at Trent the French refused to admit the Florentine definition on the Papal authority. But the learned Gallican Natalis Alexander points out that the Pope has the right to modify and dispense from the canons of councils, if public necessity or the good of the Church requires him to do so. He argues further that the "sounder part" of the Fathers of Basle consented to the removal of the assembly from Basle to Ferrara. It is scarcely necessary to say that such doubts have long since ceased to be possible among Catholics.

The Acts of the Council have perished, but we possess (1) a minute history in the form of Acts, written in Greek, and evidently by a Greek member of the council. Hefele, Frommann, and other scholars attribute the history to Dorotheus of Mitylene. It will be found in the collections of Mansi or Hardouin, with a Latin translation by the Cretan Caryoptilus. (2) A history agreeing in all the most important points with the one just mentioned was published, in 1638, by Justiniani, Custos of the Vatican Library. This history is drawn up, partly from notes made by the Papal advocate Andreas de Sta Cruce, who was present at the council, partly from other documents in the Vatican archives and in other Roman libraries. Hardouin has printed Justiniani's history in his collection. (3) A history by Syropulus, a Greek priest and dignitary of Constantinople. Syropulus was present at the council and signed the Decree of Union, but he was from the first a secret, and soon became an open and most bitter, enemy of the council. A very inaccurate Latin translation from a Paris MS. was published by the Anglican Robert Creyghton, at the Hague, in 1660. The best modern history of the council is by Hefele-Leclercq (vol. vii.). (Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," i. 312 *sqq.*, Eng. tr.; Vogt in DThC; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," ii.)

FLORIDA PASCUA. [See PALM SUNDAY.]

FONT. A vessel to contain the baptismal water. In the early ages Baptism was given by immersion out in the open in rivers or in pools of water (*e.g.* Acts viii. 38); sometimes indoors (*e.g.* Acts ix. 18, xvi. 33). In the course of time the latter came to be the prevailing practice, and the artificial pool or cistern for Baptism became an important adjunct to the Christian place of worship. The neophyte stood in it with feet immersed, while the water was poured over his head. This mode of baptizing regulated the size and shape of the vessel. When the custom of immersion ceased in the West, and infusion came to be the rule, the font took the form of a large vase mounted on a pedestal of sufficient height for the infant to be held over it.

For the blessing of the Font see HOLY WEEK, p. 420. Tertullian speaks of the water being hallowed by the invocation of God (*invocato Deo*, "De Bapt." iv., PL, i. 1204). St. Cyprian, St. Basil, and St. Ambrose refer to this blessing (Chardon, *Baptême*, ch. iv.). (See BAPTISM, p. 64; BAPTISTERY; Peterson in "Cath. Enc."; Ferraris, *Baptismus*, i. 991, 1003-8; Leclercq in "Cath. Enc." *Holy Water Fonts.*)

FORTITUDE. [See CARDINAL VIRTUES.]

FORTY HOURS. [See EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.]

FORUM ECCLESIASTICUM. The tribunals of the Church are of two kinds, internal and external. The internal forum is the tribunal established in the sacrament of penance, where the coercive power is the Holy Ghost acting on the conscience, the penitent is his own accuser, and the confessor, guided by the principles of Moral Theology, remits or retains sin, exacts satisfaction, and directs restitution, according to the circumstances of each case. [PENANCE.]

Under the name of *forum externum* is included every exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction external to the tribunal of penance. The judicial office in the external forum belongs to bishops in their respective dioceses, metropolitans in the cases assigned to them by the canons, and supremely and universally to the Holy See. But a previous question arises—viz.: Is the exercise of an external coercive jurisdiction a right inherent in the constitution of the Church? Is it not rather an encroachment on the rights of the civil power? It will be found on a close examination that this is part of a larger question—viz.: Whether the Church instituted by Jesus Christ really possesses a native and supreme authority, parallel—not subordinate—to the supreme authority of the State? If the Church is and ought to be thus independent, then the right of making laws for the government of her children, not liable to the revision of the civil power, cannot be denied to her; and if she has the right of legislation, she must also possess that of coercive jurisdiction, since in human society it is useless to pass laws if one has not the power of enforcing them. But if Christ never meant His Church to be an independent society, these rights could not be claimed for her. Among Protestants it is generally held that the Church possesses no power originally and absolutely independent of that of the State. The view of Puffendorf, or some modification of it, is still generally accepted, according to which the Christian Church is a kind of college or society within the State—in which all the members, *qua* Christians, are equal, and can meet together as in other colleges to elect officers, transact business, adopt rules and by-laws, and so on—but which has no power of passing laws, administering justice, condemning, or punishing.

Catholic teaching, grounded on Scripture and tradition, rejects so degrading a view of the Church which God Incarnate founded upon earth and endowed with supernatural power and grace. To Peter and the other Apostles Christ gave the power of binding and loosing. He commanded them to go and teach all nations; He promised to be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world; He said that while the things of Caesar were to be rendered to Caesar, the things of God were to be given to God; finally he declared, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." [1] He promised to build His Church on Peter, and that against this Church, which St. Paul calls "the pillar and the ground of truth," [2] the gates of Hell should not prevail. There is not the slightest hint anywhere that Christ intended that these powers should be exercised in subjection to the civil power. We find abundant evidence that the Apostles and the early Church freely exercised the powers thus committed to them, not in preaching, converting, and working miracles only, but also in the three specific modes with which we are concerned—viz. in making laws, in judging, and in punishing. At a synod publicly held in Jerusalem to decide whether the Gentile Christians were to be obliged to receive circumcision, a decision was arrived at which was to all intents and purposes a *law*—which was promulgated under the formula "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" [3]—and which St. Paul enjoined his converts to obey, as being "precepts of the apostles and ancients" (Acts xvi. 4). The powers of judging and punishing were exercised in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, Elymas the sorcerer, and notably in that of the incestuous Corinthian.[4] Following the example of the Apostles, the bishops in the first and every succeeding age of the Church have been accustomed to meet in synod and enact canons—that is, ecclesiastical laws concerning every religious interest and duty of man; and they never considered it incumbent on them to submit these laws for the approval of the civil power The emperors themselves often endorsed the doctrine of ecclesiastical liberty. Arcadius and Honorius, in one of their Constitutions,[5] say "Whenever the cause is one of religion, it belongs to the bishops to judge"; and the Theodosian Code contains an explicit direction in the same sense.[6] In the early ages of the Church the judicial office was largely exercised by episcopal synods, in which important cases of heresy, immorality, &c., were tried and decided, and the punishment of excommunication, deposition, suspension, degradation, or imprisonment was inflicted. In course of time ordinary cases came to be heard in the individual bishop's court, whilst *causae majores—e.g.* those of bishops—were reserved to the Holy See. At the same time a settled mode of procedure with regular officials became established in the episcopal courts. By the twelfth century this change had been generally effected, and still continues substantially in force, though, in some cases, the regular officials and procedure are necessarily dispensed with to a greater or less degree, according to the position of the Church in different countries.

It will be admitted that the right of legislation draws with it the judicial power; if the Church possesses one, she possesses also the other. But it has been contended that the sanctions of her judicial decisions ought to be of a spiritual nature only, and as such should involve no suffering to the criminal except either within the self-accusing conscience, or in another world. The Church may have courts, it is said, but she may not enforce the decisions of these courts by temporal penalties; if these are required, she must ask the civil power to apply them. Marsilius Ficinus maintained that "the Pope, or the whole Church taken collectively, cannot punish any man, however wicked he may be, with a coercive punishment, unless the Emperor give them authority to do so." [1] But this was condemned as erroneous by John XXII., and a similar opinion promulgated by the too famous synod of Pistoia was censured by Pius VI. in the bull "Auctorem fidei." To admit such a doctrine would be tantamount to condemning the heroic bishops of the early Church, who feared not to depose an Arius or a Dioscorus against the opposition of the civil power. For certainly deposition is a "coercive punishment," and in numerous instances, if the leave of the State had been waited for before inflicting it, it would never have been inflicted at all. Even while all along asserting her independence, we know what the Church has had to suffer at the hands of heretical and despotic princes; what, then, would have become of Christianity if she had admitted that she had no right of punishing except by their hands?

The punishments inflicted in the *forum externum* are of various kinds: besides those already enumerated (excommunication, deposition, &c.), they include, or have included, stripes, fines, and relegation to a monastery. It is the general opinion of canonists that they should be such as not to involve the shedding of blood—*citra sanguinis effusionem*; and this because the Church can never, like human justice, merge the consideration of the possible reformation of the offender in that of what is required for the safety of society, and to deter others from doing the like. The Holy Office, in the day of its most unsparing severities, did not itself inflict

[1] Lk. x. 16.
[2] 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[3] Acts xv. 28.
[4] 1 Cor. v. 3.
[5] Soglia, lib. iv. cap. 1.
[6] Soglia, *ubi sup.*
[1] Soglia, iv. 1, 6.

the death-penalty on those whom it sentenced, but delivered them over to the secular arm. Practically it amounted to much the same thing; but the reason of this was that secular governments in those days sincerely believed that the heretic not only sinned against God, but was also a dangerous offender against human society. It may be rejoined that the ecclesiastical authorities not only shared in this opinion of the rulers, but by their writings and exhortations partly caused it. This cannot be denied; nor were they wrong in their belief and action; but it may probably be held that they did so in their civil capacity, as members of a community, rather than in their ecclesiastical capacity, as churchmen. With regard to stripes, the change in manners scarcely permits of its being included at the present day among ecclesiastical punishments. With regard to fines, the canonists prescribe that they should be imposed with great caution, and so that no suspicion can arise that the judges or officials derive any benefit from them.

Lay encroachment and usurpation have laboured to destroy the network of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which formerly overspread Europe. In the day of their power the canonists, speaking generally, comprehended well the limits of the two jurisdictions, and never encroached systematically on the temporal domain; the lawyers, on the contrary, taking advantage of the decline of faith, and the confusion caused by the heresies of northern Europe, have everywhere encroached on the ecclesiastical domain, and laboured to substitute their various systems of local law for the jurisprudence founded on divine revelation, the tradition of the Church, and general reason. They say, indeed, that their jurisprudence is guided by the principles of universal morality, and ask what more is needed? Even if this were true to the fullest extent, it would not follow that the civil courts should assume jurisdiction in spiritual causes. Morality—justice—must be the norm of every endurable jurisdiction set up amongst men; but it will not take us far enough: for man is not only *capax morum* but also *capax religionis*. Jurisprudence requires not only a rule but an end. This end, for the Roman jurists, was found in the arbitrary pleasure of the prince (*quod principi placuit*, &c.); for modern jurists it is found in the arbitrary pleasure of a majority. In either case the general good of the community is the real end, which is supposed at one period to be best attained through despotism, at another through universal suffrage. This, which is the highest end of man conceived as living in time, is treated by the unbelieving governments of the day as if it were his sole end. His religious destiny is absolutely ignored, and the jurisprudence which rests on the assumption that he has such a destiny is trampled upon and suppressed. In the Middle Ages the lawyers admitted that the jurisprudence of the Church was informed by a loftier aim than their own, and the two systems were administered side by side with—on the whole—extraordinary success and advantage. (Ferraris, *Forum Ecclesiasticum*; Tarquini, "Juris Eccl. Publici Institutiones.")

FOSSOR. [See CATACOMBS.]

FOUNDATION. [See BENEFICE, ENDOWMENT, ESTABLISHMENT.]

FRANCE, CHURCH OF. In the articles CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE CLERGY and CONCORDAT, the transition during the French Revolution, from the ancient ecclesiastical order in France to a new state of things was briefly described. Some account of the organization and working of the modern Church of France will be attempted in the present article, both during the working of the Concordat and since its dissolution (Dec. 11, 1905).

Since the commencement of the Second Empire in 1852, the dioceses of Metz and Strasburg have been lost to France; on the other hand, the Savoyard dioceses of Annecy, St. Jean de Maurienne, and Tarentaise, with the archdiocese of Chambéry, have been annexed to it, and Algiers, which was then subject to the Archbishop of Aix, has been erected into an archiepiscopal see, with the suffragan sees of Constantine and Oran. There are now in France and her dependencies eighteen archbishoprics,[1] and seventy-two bishoprics. The bishopric of Lille was added by Pius X. in the last year of his pontificate. The parish priests are divided into Curés and Desservants, and the distinction between the two classes is important. The Concordat between Napoleon and Pius VII. made no mention of Desservants; it merely stipulated that the priests serving the cures should receive certain emoluments. In this, nothing but bare justice, or rather a small instalment of justice, was asked from the state; for the "traitement" or annual grant was to replace the far larger income from tithes and other Church property, which had been confiscated during the Revolution. But if every parish priest should receive a decent stipend, the government considered that it would not have made a good bargain. It was accordingly resolved to recognize as priests for the purposes of the above-mentioned article, speaking generally, only the *curés* of the chief places in the several cantons[2] in France. These *curés cantonaux* were about 3500 in number; they were divided into two classes, the stipend for the first class being 1500, that for the second 1200 francs per annum.

[1] Viz. Aix, Alby, Algiers, Auch, Avignon, Besançon, Bordeaux, Bourges, Cambrai, Chambéry, Lyons, Paris, Rheims, Rennes, Rouen, Sens, Toulouse, and Tours.

[2] A canton is a division of an *arrondissement*, containing usually from ten to twenty communes.

Under each *curé cantonal* are usually several *vicaires*. The priests serving all the other churches within the canton are called Desservants. They are first mentioned in the Organic Articles [CONCORDAT], where it is said that they shall be under the surveillance of the curés—*i.e.* the *curés cantonaux*. They were so for a time, but their real canonical position gradually prevailed, and a desservant is now immediately under his bishop, and is commonly called, and is, "M. le Curé" in his own parish, as much as the dignitary in the *chef lieu de canton*, to whom alone the law allowed the title. Their position, however, was so far different that, while the curé proper can only be appointed, and perhaps removed, by the bishop, with the approval of the government, the desservant is appointed by the bishop alone, and can be removed by him, on his own sole authority. But see below, the changes since the abolition of the Concordat.

The religious orders and congregations which adorned the modern French Church were very numerous: it is estimated that their members amounted to 140,000, of whom about 20,000 were men and the rest women.

The total amount of the annual grant from public funds for the support of the French clergy somewhat exceeded 2.000.000*l.* sterling. The ecclesiastical buildings were in the hands of *Conseils de Fabrique*. The annual salary of a desservant was 900 francs, or 36*l.* The commune was bound to provide him with a residence rent-free; if it was too poor to do this, the State sometimes gave assistance; but in most cases private subscriptions had to be resorted to. Every diocese had a great or upper seminary for the education of priests, and there were also about a hundred and fifty little seminaries which gave an education corresponding to that given in the State lycées, but under ecclesiastical management, to boys destined either for clerical or for secular life. Of the orders and congregations, some—*e.g.* the Lazarists, the Sulpicians, the Sisters of Charity, &c.—were recognized by the State, and could possess property and also acquire it by bequest, but under close and constant inquisition on the part of the Department of Public Worship. The unrecognized congregations also of late years acquired a great amount of property; it is said that, taking the recognized and unrecognized congregations together, the value of their property exceeded a thousand million francs. With regard to political privileges, the French law recognized no distinction between cleric and layman; hence bishops and priests were capable of being elected to the Chambers. Chapters of canons were attached to the cathedrals but the canonries were regarded chiefly in the light of a dignified provision for aged or distinguished clergymen; the canons had no share in the government of the diocese. The old Church tribunals, abolished at the Revolution, were not revived; the bishops acted *ex informata conscientia*, and there was no appeal for the inferior clergy except to Rome. Of the close, vexatious, and almost ridiculous character of the surveillance which the lay power exercised over the Church, some idea may be formed from the fact that the Department of Worship undertook the furnishing of a bishop's palace, and required a yearly inventory, that it might know what to expend in repairs and new purchases!

Such was generally the state of things in France until some years after the foundation of the Third Republic. Gambetta openly expressed his hostility to the Church in his famous utterance (Sept. 8, 1878) "Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi." In 1880 the Religious Orders were expelled and in 1889 the exemption of ecclesiastics from military service was repealed. The anti-Catholic action of the government in many other directions naturally caused opposition to the Republic, in spite of the repeated admonitions of Leo XIII. that the Church had no objection to that particular form of government. The Pope went so far as to write to President Grévy begging him to use his influence to procure moderation. In an encyclical letter to the clergy and laity (Feb. 10, 1892) His Holiness besought them to remember the distinction between the form of government and the particular laws which it might make—the former should be accepted even if the latter might be opposed. This policy of "rallying" to the Republic met with considerable adhesion among moderate men of all parties, but was vehemently opposed both by extreme monarchists and by anti-clericals. In the elections of Oct. 1893, a moderate Republican ministry was formed under Casimir-Périer and Spuller. The good feeling subsisting between the Vatican and the Republic was the subject of a letter from the new President, M. Félix Faure (Feb. 5, 1896) to the Pope, wherein, however, he pointed out, with regret, that the enlightened counsels of the Pontiff had not met with acceptance on the part of those who might have been expected to obey them. Under the Méline ministry (1896–8) the moderate action of the government made these relations still more friendly. Unhappily, the continued dissensions between the "ralliés" and the "non-ralliés" led to the triumph of the anti-clericals and the successive ministries of Waldeck-Rousseau (1899–1902) and Combes (1902–5). On July 1, 1901, the Law of Associations dissolved the religious congregations and confiscated their property. Grave difficulties also arose as to the nomination of bishops. According to the terms of the Concordat, the State nominated the persons to be made bishops, and the Pope

granted them canonical institution. In the episcopal bulls the Pontiff stated that the State "nominated to us" (*nobis nominavit*) such and such a person. In 1901 the government objected to the word "nobis," as implying that the State had not the sole right of nomination. After prolonged discussion a compromise was effected, and it was agreed that in future the President's letter asking for canonical institution should contain the words "We nominate A.B. and present him to your Holiness." It must be admitted that Leo XIII. had gone to the utmost limit of concession. But there was a point beyond which even he could not go. It had been customary for the Nuncio and the Minister to come to an informal understanding as to the suitability of the candidates before they were presented to Rome. Combes did away with this custom, and insisted that the persons whom he nominated should be instituted without any inquiry. And to bring matters to a head, he did in fact nominate persons utterly unsuited. Consequently, a number of sees remained vacant. We necessarily omit mention of various other difficulties in the relations between the Church and the Republic during the period 1899–1904, until we come to the incident which precipitated the crisis—the visit of the President, M. Loubet, to the King of Italy in Rome (April 1904). On the following July 30 diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See were broken off, and on Dec. 1, 1905, the Law of the Separation of Church and State was published. Beginning from December 1906, the State no longer paid to the ministers of Catholic worship the emoluments which the government had in 1801 undertaken to pay as compensation for the revolutionary spoliation of the Church's property. On the other hand, the State gave up all right of interference in the nomination of bishops and parish priests. As regards the *matériel*, the whole of the bishops' palaces and all the seminaries have become the property of the State. The presbyteries are the property of the communes, but as a rule they are let to the parish priests at a low rental. "The Law of Separation ordered that all edifices used for worship, as well as all ecclesiastical property, should be put in the hands of *associations cultuelles*, 'drawn up,' said the fourth article of the law, 'according to the regulations of the general organization of worship.' For Catholics this evidently meant associations approved by the bishops and by bishops in communion with the Pope. Since then, the *Conseil d'État* has always interpreted the law in this sense. For reasons for which he alone is the judge, Pius X. forbade Catholics to form such associations"—(Fonsegrive in "Dublin Review," Oct. 1913). Hence by law the bishops and parish priests have no rights whatever over the cathedrals and parish churches. As a matter of fact, however, the State has not ventured to carry out the full consequences of the Law of Separation. The clergy continue to use the churches just as before. The *Conseil d'État* has even guarded the right of the Catholic *curé* against would-be intruders who had formed *associations cultuelles*. But troubles arise as to the upkeep of the buildings, and before long it is expected that some means will be found to make these over to the effective control of the parish priests. The support of the clergy has been carried on with great difficulty by voluntary effort, but we understand that in some of the larger towns the difficulty is becoming less. It will take time for the thrifty Frenchman to realize that religion cannot be continued without his generous support. The Law of Separation has naturally led to a marked diminution in the number of seminarists, and consequently in the number of priests. But here again the more hopeful condition of the Church has induced parents to allow their sons to enter upon a career which is not wholly without means of support. "The general tendency of the French episcopate seems to be to organize Catholics into associations—of the parish, of the canton, of the diocese, absolutely dissociated from any party and from any political point of view; solely occupied with the development of Catholic life and the defence of Catholic interests." (Fonsegrive, *loc. cit.*) It is too soon to judge of the effect of the great war (1914–6); but the noble conduct of the clergy and nuns has worked a vast change in popular feeling towards the Church. (See CONCORDAT; Goyau in "Cath. Enc."; Bonet-Maury in DThC., *France, État Religieux Actuel*; Fonsegrive in "Dub. Rev." Oct. 1913.)

FRANCISCANS. This order takes its name from its founder, St. Francis of Assisi, who died in 1226. The Life of St. Francis has been so frequently written that we shall confine ourselves to the mention of those incidents in it which are connected with the rise and growth of the order. The saint had entirely broken with the world in 1206, when, being then in his twenty-fifth year, he had stripped himself of the clothes which he wore belonging to his father, and embraced a life of strict poverty. He lived for several years in a cottage near Assisi, in the practice of almost continual prayer accompanied by severe bodily discipline. In 1209 Bernard of Quintavalle, a rich merchant of Assisi, and Peter of Catana, a canon in the cathedral of the same city, who had long witnessed and admired the heroic virtue of the saint, openly joined themselves to him; this is considered the date of the foundation of the order. Another disciple soon appeared in Giles of Assisi, who was afterwards beatified. The rule which the saint at first prescribed to his followers is not now extant: it consisted, says Alban Butler (October 4), "of the gospel

counsels of perfection, to which he added some things necessary for uniformity in their manner of life. He exhorts his brethren to manual labour, but will have them content to receive for it things necessary for life, not money." In the later editions of the rule the prohibition against the handling or use of money, even by the intervention of a third person, was maintained.[1] "He bids them not to be ashamed to beg alms, remembering the poverty of Christ; and he forbids them to preach in any place without the bishop's licence." (See also Fr. Cuthbert, "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," p. 86 *sqq.*, and Appendix I.) In a larger (extant) version of the rule he laid down twenty-seven precepts, all of which several Pontiffs have declared to be binding on the friars of the order under pain of mortal sin. They prescribe the particular means by which the vow of poverty is to be carried out, regulate the dress to be worn, order that the friars shall go barefoot, specify the fasts to be observed, and enjoin a blind unlimited obedience to superiors for the love of God. The habit which he gave them was a grey gown of coarse cloth with a pointed hood or capuche attached to it, one under-tunic and drawers, and a cord round the waist. This costume closely resembled that worn by poor shepherds in that part of Italy. After several other disciples had joined him, the cottage at Assisi was found too small to hold them, and St. Francis was in doubt whether it was not the will of God—who had already announced to him in visions that the destined work for him and his company was to preach and labour for the conversion of souls, and bring sinners to penance—that he should establish the order elsewhere. But about this time the Benedictines of the neighbouring monastery of Soubasio gave him a small plot of ground near Assisi called Portiuncula, on which stood an abandoned church dedicated in honour of Our Lady of the Angels. Francis would not accept the land as an absolute gift, but consented to hold it as a tenant-at-will by the tenure of rendering yearly to the Benedictines a basket of little fish, called *lasche*, caught in the stream that flowed hard by. From this humble site, which thus became the cradle of the order, thousands of monasteries were to be planted, missioners were to go forth to all parts of the world to preach, toil, and in many cases suffer martyrdom for the gospel of Jesus Christ, and a vast multitude of doctors and holy prelates, among them even Popes, were to issue, by whom the purity of the faith should be sustained, and its principles methodized and applied. In 1210 St. Francis went to Rome to obtain the confirmation of his rule. The Sovereign Pontiff at that time was Innocent III. At the first interview, he rejected the saint's petition. Francis humbly withdrew; but the same night the Pope dreamt that he saw a palm spring up from the ground between his feet and wax gradually till it became a great tree; at the same time an impression was borne in upon his mind that by this palm tree was designated the poor petitioner whom he had repelled the day before. The Pope ordered that search should be made for him; Francis was found, and, being brought before the Pope and the Cardinals, expounded in simple but glowing language the plan and aims of his institute. The Pope was much moved, but some of the Cardinals thought that the poverty required surpassed the strength of man. Francis betook himself to prayer, and at the next interview Innocent granted him a verbal approbation of his rule. The Pope declared that he had seen in a dream the Lateran basilica tottering to its fall, but saved by a poor despised man, who set his back against the wall and propped it up. "Truly," said he, "here is that man who by his work and teaching will sustain the Church of Christ." The above particulars are taken from the Life of the saint by St. Bonaventure, who heard them from the Pope's nephew. Some years later, St. Francis drew up the rule in a more compendious form, and in this shape it was solemnly ratified by Honorius III. in 1223.

It is difficult to realize in this twentieth century the extraordinary attraction which the example and preaching of St. Francis exercised on his contemporaries. Long before the final confirmation by Honorius III., the Friars Minor[1] (such was the name which the founder in his humility chose for them) had made their way into the principal countries of Europe, preaching penance and founding convents. St. Francis himself visited Spain in 1214, was well received by Alfonso IX., the grandfather of St. Louis of France, and founded houses of his order at Burgos and other places. In 1216 he sent Pacifico, who had been a troubadour (*trouvère*) and was called the "king of verse," to France, Bernard of Quintavalle to Spain, and John of Penna to Germany, besides many others whom he despatched to various parts of Italy. The noble instructions, full of divine light and evangelical fire, with which he dismissed them—instructions on the whole so faithfully observed by his followers—go far to explain the wonderful success which has attended them in every age in doing their Master's work. Amongst other things he said "Let your behaviour in the world be such that everyone who sees or hears you may praise the Heavenly Father. Preach peace to all; but have it in your hearts still more than on your lips. Give no occa-

[1] A curious discussion on the subject may be read in Pecock's *Repressor of over much Wyting* [blaming] *of the Clergy* (1456).

[1] "Minores" (lesser people) was the epithet applied in that age to what we should now term the lower middle classes. Hence "Ordo Minorum" would denote a Religious Congregation ranking with them.

sion of anger or scandal to any, but by your gentleness lead all men to goodness, peace, and union. We are called to heal the wounded, and recall the erring. For there are many who appear to you limbs of the devil, who will be one day disciples of Jesus Christ." [1]

The missions above mentioned all prospered greatly, except that to Germany, which failed, chiefly because the friars did not know the language. England welcomed the messengers, Angelo of Pisa and eight others, whom the saint sent to our shores in 1219: landing at Dover in 1220, they formed their first convent at Canterbury, and another soon afterwards at Northampton. The romantic story of two friars finding their way to Oxford and beginning the great friary there (in St. Ebbe's parish) may be read in the Monasticon.[2] In London, at Coventry, and other places, there were famous Franciscan convents; the list will be given further on. So rapidly did the order increase that at the first general chapter, that called of Mats (because those who attended it were lodged in huts roofed with *strioje* or mats), held at the Portiuncula in 1219, upwards of five thousand friars were present.

St. Francis, after receiving the sacred Stigmata [*q.v.*], died in 1226. The next Minister-General of the entire order was Elias of Cortona. He relaxed the rule of poverty, admitting rents and foundations; he also mitigated the fasts, &c., and oppressed those who desired to keep up the original strictness of the rule. A long controversy arose, which ended in the division of the order into two great branches, Conventuals and Observantines—the former living in large convents and following a mitigated rule; the latter living more in the manner of hermits, in low, mean dwellings, and according to the original rigour of the institute. The Observantines received in France the name of Cordeliers. In the course of time they, too, became split up into four great "families," called respectively Observants, Reformed, Discalced (or Alcantarines), and Recollects; and there was also a separate branch called Capuchins [*q.v.*]. Various attempts have been made to reunite these families, and at length in our own day the task was accomplished by Leo XIII. (Apost. Constit. "Felicitate quadam," October 4, 1897). The Conventuals and Capuchins remain distinct; but the others are all embraced under the name of Friar Minor (Ordo Fratrum Minorum), are bound by the same rule, and are subject to one and the same Minister-General.

In 1380 the number of Franciscan monasteries was estimated at fifteen hundred, containing ninety thousand friars. Hélyot states that in his time—that is, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, long after the destruction of the houses of the order in England and other northern countries, where they were once numerous — there were, of the first and third orders, seven thousand convents, with 120,000 friars; and of the second order [see POOR CLARES], above nine hundred convents, with 28,000 nuns.

No order in the Church has surpassed the Franciscans in zeal for the propagation of the gospel. St. Francis himself visited the Holy Land, presented himself before the Sultan of Egypt (1220) and endeavoured to convert him; and sent five friars to Morocco, who were all martyred. Franciscans preached in Tartary about the middle of the thirteenth century, and in China and Armenia before the end of it. By a bull of Clement VI. (1342) the guardianship of the Holy Places at Jerusalem was committed to the order, and they still retain it. Franciscan missions were established in Bosnia in 1340, in Bulgaria about 1366, and in Georgia in 1370. We find them taking a large share in the conversion of the natives of the Canary Isles in and after 1423; they got into Abyssinia in 1480, and established a mission on the Congo (which for a long time bore great fruit) about 1490. The order was instrumental in the discovery of America. Fr. John Perez de Marchena, guardian[1] of a convent near Seville, himself a learned cosmographer, entered warmly into the designs of Columbus, and used his influence with Isabella the Catholic, whose confessor he had been, to persuade her to fit out the memorable expedition of 1492. In the following year Fr. John himself went to America, and opened the first Christian church in the New World, at a small settlement in the island of Hayti. Not to speak of the Franciscan missions in India, Brazil, and Peru—in all which countries other orders effected yet more—it was Observantine friars who were welcomed to Mexico by Cortes in 1523, and who, under their holy leader, Martin de Valenza, planted Christianity firmly in that empire, whence they went forth to preach the gospel in New Mexico (1580), in Texas (1600), and lastly, in California (1769).[2]

The order of St. Francis has given five Popes, more than fifty cardinals, and an immense number of patriarchs and bishops to the Church. The great statesman Cardinal Ximenes was a Franciscan. Among the schoolmen, St. Bonaventure, the Seraphic Doctor; Duns Scotus, the Subtle Doctor; Alexander of Hales, the Irrefragable Doctor; Roger Bacon, the Wonderful Doctor; and William of Ockham (the last four being natives of the British Isles), were members of

[1] Fleury, *Hist. du Christianisme*, ch. 7.
[2] Dugdale's *Mon. Angl.* vol. iii. p. 1524 (ed. of 1846).

[1] The Franciscans rejected the old titles (Abbot, Prior, &c.) of Religious Superiors in favour of the term "Guardian" (*Custos*—in old English, "Warden") as savouring more of humility.
[2] Henrion, *Hist. Gén. des Missions Cathol.* and "Cath. Enc." *California.*

this order. Its history is recorded in the elaborate "Annals" of Fr. Luke Wadding, an Irish Franciscan of the seventeenth century.

At the dissolution there were sixty-four Franciscan houses in England; the names are given below.[1] The English province was restored by Fr. Jennings, who founded a convent at Douay about 1617; of the friars who went from it on the English mission four (Frs. Bell, Heath, Bullaker, and Woodcock) were put to death for their religion by the Long Parliament between 1642 and 1646.

For the Third Order of St. Francis see TERTIARIES; on the whole Order generally see Fr. Cuthbert, "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," in which the results of recent research are admirably worked up, and a good bibliography is given; Sabatier, "Vie de S. François d'Assise" (non-Catholic); Joergensen, "Den hellige Franz af Assisi" [Danish-Eng.] tr.; Paschal Robinson in "Cath. Enc."; Fr. Edouard d'Alençon in DThC; "Acta Sanctorum," Oct. 4. Nor should the charming collection "Fioretti" be neglected. [For Franciscan nuns see POOR CLARES.]

FRANKFORT, COUNCIL OF. At this, the first national council of Germany, convened by Charlemagne in 794, three hundred bishops and abbots were present.[2] Under the guidance of the English Alcuin, the council confirmed the condemnation of the Adoptionist heresy of Elipandus and Felix, pronounced at Ratisbon two years before [ADOPTIONISM], and also rejected the decrees of the Second General Council of Nicaea which the Fathers of Frankfort knew only in a grossly erroneous translation. [See ICONOCLASTS.] (Baronius, "Annales" ad ann. 794; Hefele-Leclerq, iii. 1045 *sqq.*; also p. 1240 *sqq.* on the rejection of the last-named decrees).

[1] *List of Franciscan Houses in England, taken from Dugdale and Tanner.*

Aylesbury
Babwell (Suff.)
Bedford
Berwick
Beverley
Bodmin
Boston
Bridgewater
Bridgnorth
10 Bristol
Caermarthen
Cambridge
Canterbury
Cardiff
Carlisle
Chester
Chichester
Colchester
Coventry
20 Doncaster
Dorchester
Dunwich (Suff.)
Exeter
Gloucester
Grantham
Greenwich
Grimsby
Hartlepool
Hereford
30 Ipswich
Lancaster
Leicester
Lewes (Suss.)
Lichfield
Lincoln
Llanvaes (Anglsy.)
London
Lynn
Maidstone
40 Newark
Newcastle
Northampton
Norwich
Nottingham
Oxford
Plymouth
Pontefract
Preston
Reading
50 Richmond (Sur.)
Richmond (York.)
Salisbury
Scarborough
Shrewsbury
Southampton
Stafford
Stamford
Walsingham (Norf.)
Ware (Hert.)
60 Winchelsea (Suss.)
Winchester
Worcester
Yarmouth
York

[2] So Baronius, whom other writers have followed; but this number, according to Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 1046, is not to be found in the original accounts.

FRANKS. [See MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN.]

FRATERNAL CORRECTION. An admonition which in certain circumstances we are bound to give our neighbour in order to withdraw him from sin. The duty of so admonishing is founded on the natural law, which obliges us to help our neighbour in the necessities of his soul, and also on the command of Christ (Mt. xviii. 15) "If thy brother shall offend thee, go and reprove him between thee and him alone."

In order to be under such an obligation, we must be certain that the sin has been committed; we must have reason to think that it has not been repented of, and some reasonable hope that the correction will do good. We must also have grounds for supposing that no one else who is equally fit with ourselves to give the correction is likely to do so. The admonition must of course be given with great prudence and charity. Bishops, parish-priests, parents, &c., are more strictly bound than others to the duty of fraternal correction. Many causes, such as inconvenience and loss, or even bashfulness, may often excuse private persons from administering it. (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. iii. tr. 3, *n.* 34 *sqq.*)

FRATICELLI (lit. "little friars"). An heretical sect which issued from the Franciscan order in the thirteenth century, attracted many adherents and caused great confusion, chiefly in Italy and Sicily, but disappeared towards the end of the fifteenth century. The Franciscans were divided, soon after the death of their founder, into two great parties, one of which—represented by Elias, the second general—was favourable to some relaxation of the rule in regard to poverty, while the other vehemently opposed the least abatement of the original rigour. [See FRANCISCANS.] The contention became so warm that the Popes were obliged to interfere, and reserved to themselves the right of interpreting the Franciscan rule. Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Alexander IV., and Nicholas III. successively undertook this task, and settled the rule in such a modified form as to allow the convents to possess the usufruct of landed estates, the property of which was vested in the Holy See. This did not satisfy the rigorists, some of whom were so carried away by a false zeal as to forget the earnest and repeated precept of their founder, that his friars should be obedient to the Holy See, and fanatically to declare that the Pope and the Church were in error. Among their leaders were Peter John Oliva, Raymond, Peter of Macerata, Henry of Ceva, &c. Apostate Franciscans formed at all times the chief strength of the sect, but they were glad to accept the

co-operation of laymen, and even of women. They wandered about Italy, Sicily, Greece, and countries further east, proclaiming that the Popes had ceased to be the Vicars of Christ, and that the Church, corrupted by riches, had failed. They pretended to consecrate popes and bishops from among themselves. In their dress, and all about them that met the eye, they affected extreme poverty and simplicity; but a contemporary writer (Pelagius, the penitentiary of Pope John XXII.) reports that this external austerity was the cloak of abominable vices. The bull of John XXII. against them (1318) attributes to them various errors, some of which were revived by Wyclif sixty years later, and condemned by Gregory XI. and the Council of Constance. For instance, the bull of John XXII. gives as one of their tenets that "those who are regularly ordained lose their power by their sins"; and the council condemned as a Wyclifite error the proposition that "The power of a temporal lord, of a prelate, or of a bishop, is null while he is in mortal sin."[1] Martin V. (1418) published a bull and took other active measures against the sect, employing for this purpose the great preacher St. John Capistran, whose efforts appear to have been crowned with signal success. (See Wadding, "Annales Minorum" ad ann. 1320–34; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes" [Eng. tr.] iv. p. 113 *sqq.*; "Analecta Franciscana" [Quaracchi] ii. 120 *sqq.*; Bihl in "Cath. Enc.")

FREEDOM OF WILL, says St. Thomas (1ª, q. 83, a. 2), consists essentially in the power of choice. We are said to be endowed with free will because we are able to accept one object, rejecting another; which acceptance we call "choice." A few words will explain the doctrine of the scholastic philosophers on this point, and serve as the best introduction to the decisions of the Church.

The will is an appetite which follows upon intellectual cognition, which tends, in other words, to the good apprehended and proposed by the mind. It is therefore proper to intellectual beings, and wholly distinct from the animal appetites, which tend to good apprehended by the senses. Now, if the object apprehended by the intellect be purely and simply good, and seen only as such, the will tends to it of necessity, and there can in such a case be no question of choice or freedom. No man can will to be unhappy or can help willing the objects which he only thinks of as necessary means of happiness. But a vast number of objects apprehended by the intellect are neither perfectly or in all respects bad or good. A virtuous act, for example, may involve self-restraint and suffering; the mind, influenced by the will, may fix its attention chiefly on this element of evil, and the will in its turn may reject the good act because of the physical suffering or evil which accompanies it. So again, stealing may relieve a man from great discomfort, and here, again, the lesser good may be chosen, accompanied though it is by a moral evil. To the metaphysical arguments other very obvious ones may be added from psychological experience, *e.g.* the sense of sin if we choose wrongly, and the general feeling of all societies, in which criminals have been punished precisely on the ground that they were free and therefore responsible agents.

The Reformers generally denied that man, after the fall, possessed free will; or, if they admitted it in words, they explained the freedom of the will to mean, not the power of choice, the power which the will has to determine its own acts, but a mere freedom from external restraint (*libertas a coactione*). The same error was revived, though more cautiously asserted, by Baius and the Jansenists. On the other hand, it was defined under anathema by the Tridentine Council (sess. vi. can. 5), that free will remains really and truly in man after the fall: and the true sense of this definition was frequently enforced, and insisted on by subsequent Popes. (See GRACE; on Determinism, *i.e.* the total denial of freedom of the will, apart from any theological belief, see W. G. Ward, "Philosophy of Theism"; Maher, "Psychology"; and the scholastic philosophers generally in their treatment of the will.)

FREEMASONRY. The system of the Freemasons, a secret society, which professes, by means of a symbolical language and certain ceremonies of initiation and promotion, to lay down a code of morality founded on the brotherhood of humanity only. Some writers, chiefly continental, apply the term Freemasonry not only to the Freemasons proper, but also to all secret organizations which seek to undermine Christianity and the political and social institutions that have Christianity for their basis.

The origin of Freemasonry is disputed. The Freemasons themselves, in the language of their rituals, assume the sect to have begun its existence at the building of Solomon's Temple; but serious Masonic writers, as well as all writers of repute, declare this to be merely a conventional fiction. Nor is any more value to be attached to the attempts that are occasionally made to find a link between the pagan mysteries and Freemasonry. Some writers trace Freemasonry to the heresies of Eastern origin that prevailed during the Early and Middle Ages in certain parts of Europe, such as those of the Gnostics, Manichaeans, and Albigenses, some of whose mischievous tenets are, no doubt, apparent in the sect. The suppressed order of the Knights Templars, too, has been taken to have been the source of the sect; and this theory may have some countenance in the facts that

[1] *Fifteenth error*: "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est praelatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali."

a number of the Knights in Scotland illicitly maintained their organization after the suppression, and that it was from Scotland that Freemasonry was brought into France at the beginning of the 18th century.

But it seems more in consonance with many known historical facts to trace the sect to the mediaeval guild of stonemasons, who were popularly called by the very name of Free Masons. During the Middle Ages the various trades were formed, with the approbation of the Church, into guilds or close protective societies. In general no one was permitted to follow a trade for wages or profit as apprentice, journeyman, or master, until he had been made free of the guild representing that trade. Each guild had its patron saint, and several guilds, it is certain, had each its peculiar ritual, using its own tools and technical language in a symbolical way in the ceremonies of initiation and promotion—that is to say, in entering an apprentice, and at the end of his time declaring him a worthy fellow-journeyman or craftsman, &c. The guild of Free Masons was singular in this: that it was a migratory one, its members travelling under their masters in organized bodies through all parts of Europe, wherever their services were required in building. When first referred to, they are found grouped about the monasteries, especially about those of the Benedictines. The earliest form of initiation used by the guild is said to have been suggested by the ritual for the reception of a Benedictine novice.

The south of France, where a large Jewish and Saracenic element remained, was a hotbed of heresies, and that region was also a favourable one with the guild of Masons. It is asserted, too, that as far back as the twelfth century the lodges of the guild enjoyed the special protection of the Knights Templars. It is easy in this way to understand how the symbolical allusions to Solomon and his Temple might have passed from the Knights into the Masonic formulary. In this way, too, might be explained how, after the suppression of the order of the Temple, some of the recalcitrant Knights, maintaining their influence over the Free Masons, would be able to pervert what hitherto had been a harmless ceremony into an elaborate ritual that should impart some of the errors of the Templars to the initiated. A document was long ago published which purports to be a charter granted to a lodge of Free Masons in England in the time of Henry VII., and it bears the marks in its religious indifference of a suspicious likeness between Freemasonry then and now. In Germany the guild was numerous and was formally recognized by a diploma granted in 1489 by the Emperor Maximilian. But this sanction was finally revoked by the Imperial Diet in 1707.

So far, however, the Free Masons were really working stonemasons; but the so-called Cologne Charter—the genuineness of which seems certain—drawn up in 1535 at a meeting of Free Masons gathered at Cologne to celebrate the opening of the cathedral edifice, is signed by Melanchthon, Coligny, and other similar ill-omened names. Nothing certain is known of the Free Masons—now evidently become a sect—during the seventeenth century, except that in 1646 Elias Ashmole, an Englishman, founded the order of Rose Croix, Rosicrucians, or Hermetic Freemasons—a society which mingled in a fantastic manner the jargon of alchemy and other occult sciences with pantheism. This order soon became affiliated to some of the Masonic lodges in Germany, where from the time of the Reformation there was a constant founding of societies, secret or open, which undertook to formulate a philosophy or a religion of their own.

As we know it now, however, Freemasonry first appeared in 1725, when Lord Derwentwater, a supporter of the expelled Stuart dynasty, introduced the order into France, professing to have his authority from a lodge at Kilwinning, Scotland. This formed the basis of that variety of Freemasonry called the Scotch Rite. Rival organizations soon sprang up. Charters were obtained from a lodge at York, which was said to have been of very ancient foundation. In 1754 Martinez Pasquales, a Portuguese Jew, began in some of the French lodges the new degree of "cohens," or priests, which was afterwards developed into a system by the notorious Saint-Martin, and is usually referred to as French Illuminism. But it remained for Adam Weishaupt, Professor of Canon Law at the University of Ingolstadt, in Bavaria, to give a definite shape to the anti-Christian tendencies of Freemasonry. In 1776, two years after the expulsion of the Jesuits from the university, he brought together a number of his pupils and friends, and organized the order of the Illuminati, which he established on the already existing degrees of Freemasonry. The avowed object of the Illuminati was to bring back mankind—beginning with the Illuminated—to their primitive liberty by destroying religion, for which this newest philosophical invention was to be substituted, and by re-shaping ideas of property, society, marriage, &c. One of the Illuminati, a Sicilian, Joseph Balsamo, otherwise Cagliostro, organized what he called Cabalistic Freemasonry, under the name of the Rite of Misraim. He it was who in 1783 predicted, as the approaching work of the Freemasons, the overthrow of the French monarchy. Indeed, Freemasonry was very active in the French Revolution, and assisted in bringing about many of the calamities which accompanied that great upturning of society.

Freemasonry in the meantime had split up into numerous sects, or "rites," all working to the common effect of destroying a belief

in the divine revelation of Christianity. In 1781 a great assembly of all the Masonic rites was held at Wilhelmsbad, in Hanover, under the presidency of the Duke of Brunswick, which refused to recognise Weishaupt's system, but at the same time permitted the most mischievous tenets of Illuminism to be engrafted on the higher degrees of Freemasonry, especially of the so-called Scotch Rite. About this time the Scotch Rite was established at Charleston, South Carolina, by some officers of the French auxiliary army. The York Rite had been introduced into the United States by English colonists.

Freemasonry in continental Europe has been the hatching-ground of most of the revolutionary societies, many of which were affiliated to the higher Masonic degrees. In France the sect was officially recognized by the government of Napoleon III., but advanced Freemasons bore this unwillingly, as it involved restraint. An avowed belief in God was required for initiation, but this requirement, through the efforts of M. Macé, of the University, was finally abolished in the convention of Freemasons held at Paris, September 14, 1877. It is fair to add that the English lodges had no part in this convention and repudiate its authority.

A recent French writer maintains that Freemasonry is—unknown to most of the craft—managed by five or six Jews, who bend its influence in every possible way to the furtherance of the anti-Christian movement that passes under the name of Liberalism. Throughout continental Europe, in the Spanish-American States, and in Brazil, Freemasonry has of late years again become very active. The war against the Catholic Church in Germany had no more bitter supporter than Freemasonry. If the Kulturkampf was not directed from the lodges, at least nearly all its leaders were Freemasons. During "the Commune" of Paris, in 1871, Masonic lodges took part as a body in the insurrection, marching out to the fight with their red banners. In France and Belgium the lodges have officially commanded their members to assist the *Ligue de l'Enseignement*—a league intended to bring about the complete secularization of the primary public schools.

In the English-speaking countries, however, Freemasonry has hitherto protested its respect for government and established society, and it has not had any immediate action on politics, its members being usually found as numerous in one political party as another. But it has never failed indirectly to use its influence for the advancement of its members over others. English-speaking Freemasons have usually been accustomed to regard the pantheism of their rituals as an amusing mummery rather than as a reality. These Freemasons usually disown for their order any aims but those of a convivial and mutual-benefit society, but no one can fail to see that indifferentism in religion at least is one of the necessary results of English-speaking Freemasonry at its best. But the constant influx into the English-speaking countries of Jews and Continental Freemasons must necessarily impregnate the order with all the poison of the Continental sect.

Freemasonry is essentially opposed to the belief in the personality of God, whose name in the Masonic rituals veils the doctrine of blind force only governing the universe. It is also essentially subversive of legitimate authority, for by professing to furnish man with an all-sufficient guide and help to conduct, it makes him independent of the Church, and by its everywhere ridiculing rank and authority it tends, in spite of its occasional protests of loyalty, to bring all governments into contempt.

The sect has been repeatedly condemned by learned and respectable men of all countries, Protestant and Catholic. Six Papal bulls have been directed against it by name—viz. "In eminenti," Clement XII., 1738; "Providas," Benedict XIV., 1751; "Ecclesiam Jesu Christi," Pius VII., 1821; "Qui graviora," Leo XII., 1826; "Quanta cura," Pius IX., 1864; "Humanum genus," Leo XIII., 1884. (See SECRET SOCIETIES; Gautherot in DThC; Gruber in "Cath. Enc." where the bibliography is given.)

FREQUENT COMMUNION. Although the subject is considered in the art. COMMUNION, a few words may be added here on account of the recent legislation of Pius X.

The Fourth Lateran Council (c. *Omnis utriusque sexus*) binds the faithful to receive Holy Communion at least once a year. This rule is of course intended only as a minimum. Our Lord Himself simply bids us eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, without specifying how often we should do so. But as bread and wine were the ordinary daily nourishment of His hearers, the fact of giving Himself under these forms would indicate His wish that we should communicate daily. Hence in the early Church and in the patristic ages the faithful received, or were expected to receive, whenever the Holy Eucharist was celebrated. This was every day at Jerusalem when the Christians were in their first fervour (Acts ii. 46). Later on, however, it was on the first day of the week (*ἐν τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων*) that the faithful assembled to break bread" (Acts xx. 7; cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 2). So, too, in the "Didache" the breaking of bread took place "on the Lord's day" (*κατὰ κυριακὴν*); and in St. Justin's time "on the day called Sunday" (*τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ*). Tertullian, however, tells us that the Liturgy was celebrated on other days besides Sunday ("De Orat." c. xix, PL, i. 1181; "De Corona" c. iii, PL, ii. 79). Daily Celebration, and consequently daily Communion, is mentioned by St. Cyprian ("De Orat. Dom."

c. xviii, ed. Hartel, p. 280); St. Ambrose ("In Ps. cxviii." PL, xv. 1461-2); St. John Chrysostom ("Hom. iii. in Eph. PG, lxii. 29); St. Jerome (Ep. xlviii. *n.* 15, and Ep. lxxi, *n.* 6, PL, xxii. 506, 672). St. Augustine deals with the matter in his answer to Januarius's inquiries. He first describes the various customs: "Some receive the Body and Blood of the Lord every day; others on certain days; in some places there is no day on which (the sacrifice) is not offered; in others on Saturday and Sunday only; in others on Sunday alone. Under these circumstances it is best to follow the custom of the place where one is living." He then goes on to discuss the question of daily Communion: "Some say that only those days should be chosen on which one is especially pure and continent, while others are of opinion that if our sins are not of such gravity as to deserve excommunication, they should not be deprived of *the daily remedy of the Lord's Body.*" St. Augustine himself thinks that there is much to be said on both sides. Zacchaeus and the Centurion did not set themselves one above the other, though the Publican received his Lord into his house with joy, whereas the righteous soldier said "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof" (Ep. liv, PL, xxxiii. 200 *sqq.*). We should bear in mind that during the Patristic times the system of the catechumenate was in force, and consequently none but the initiated communicated. Moreover, except in times of special fervour, practice fell far short of precept, and hence the faithful were frequently rebuked for so seldom receiving (St. John Chrysostom, "In Ephes. Hom. iii." PG, lxii. 29; St. Ambrose, "In Ps. cxviii." PL, xv. 1461-2). St. Bede laments that the devout received only three times a year. Strange to say, it was in the Middle Ages, "th[illegible]s of faith," that the faithful received [illegible]requently than in any other period of t[illegible]hurch; and it was in consequence of this a[illegible] that the above-mentioned decree of the [illegible]ourth Lateran Council was made. The te[illegible]hing of the great Schoolmen, however, was all on the side of frequent and even daily Communion (St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 80, a. 10). In the later Middle Ages a change for the better began, chiefly through the efforts of Tauler, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Vincent Ferrer, and Savonarola. Their work was carried on in the sixteenth century by St. Antonio Maria Zaccaria, St. Cajetan, St. Ignatius, and St. Philip Neri. The Fathers of the Council of Trent expressed the wish "that at each Mass the faithful who are present should communicate" (sess. xxii. c. 6). Frequent and even daily Communion now became common in Spain and Italy. Arnauld's famous work "On Frequent Communion" (1643) required rigid conditions for reception, such as severe penance for past sins and most pure love of God. These conditions were condemned in 1690. Yet, through Jansenistic influences, the frequency of Communion began to fall off once again, in spite of the sound teaching of Fénelon, St. Alphonsus, and the advocates of devotion to the Sacred Heart. In our own day Pius IX. and Leo XIII. warmly recommended the practice of frequent and daily Communion. Pius X. went further, and warned confessors "not to deter from frequent or daily Communion anyone who is in a state of grace and approaches with a right intention" (December 20, 1905). In this decree of the Congregation of the Council, issued by order of the Pope, the conditions for daily Communion are clearly stated. His action has led to a great revival of the ancient practice of frequent and daily Communion. (See Dalgairns, "The Holy Communion," part III. ch. i.; Hedley, "The Holy Eucharist," ch. viii.; Scannell, in "Eucharistic Congress of Westminster Report," p. 214 *sqq.*; Zulueta, "Notes on Daily Communion"; Bridgett, "Hist. of the H. Eucharist in Great Britain," ed. Thurston; Dublanchy in DThC, *Communion Fréquente*, containing the decrees of Pius X.)

FRIAR. The word is a corruption of the French *frère*, the distinguishing title of the members of the Mendicant orders. The Franciscans and Dominicans, approved by the Holy See in 1210 and 1216 respectively, were the first friars; to these Innocent IV. in 1245 added the Carmelites, and Alexander IV. the Augustinian hermits (1256). Hence Chaucer, writing about 1390, speaks of "alle the ordres foure."[1] The Servites received in the fifteenth century the same privileges as the four Mendicant orders from Martin V. and Innocent VIII.

FRIDAY. [See ABSTINENCE.]

FRONTAL (*antependium, pallium*). An embroidered cloth which often covers the front side of the altar. The colour should vary with the feast or season. In early times the altar was open in front, so that there was no need of such a covering, and even now Gavantus says it may be dispensed with if the altar is of costly material or fine workmanship. (Gavant. P. I. tit. xx.; Rock, I. 183.)

FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLES. [See DOGMA, p. 277.]

FUNERAL (*exequiae*). The following are the chief points in the funeral rite as prescribed in the Roman Ritual. The corpse is borne in procession with lights to the church. The parish-priest assists in surplice and black stole; the clerks carry the holy water and cross; the coffin is first sprinkled with holy water and the psalm "De Profundis" recited; then the corpse is carried to church while the "Miserere" is said. The coffin is then placed in the middle of the building, with the feet to the altar if the dead

[1] *Cant. Tales*, Prol. 210.

person was a layman, the head if he was a priest. Candles are lighted round the coffin, and the office and Mass of the dead, followed by the absolution, accompanied by aspersion and incensation over the corpse, are said. Then another procession, and the corpse is carried to the grave. At the grave the "Benedictus" is sung, with the antiphon "I am the resurrection and the life," and a prayer for the soul of the departed. The body is sprinkled for the last time with holy water, just before the prayer. The funeral of infants is very different. The psalms said are of praise and thanksgiving, nor is there, of course, any prayer for the repose of the soul. The vestments used by the officiating clergy are white, a crown of flowers is placed on the coffin, and the church bells are not rung, or else rung with a joyful tone. The Ritual speaks of these rites as handed down by "most ancient custom"; and with good right. The custom of bearing the dead body to the grave with psalms, and the Mass for the soul of the departed, can be traced back to very early times; indeed, the funeral procession is the oldest of all, being mentioned by Fathers such as Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome and Chrysostom, who wrote in the age immediately following the heathen persecution of the Church. The last of these Fathers (Hom. iv. in Hebr.) notes the custom of carrying lighted torches at these processions, and as early at least as the sixth century (see Greg. Turon. "Vit. Patr." c. 14) the cross was carried. The practice, on the other hand, of tolling the bell at funerals does not date beyond the eighth or ninth age. (See Smith and Cheetham, Article *Burials*.)

In the Greek rite, as given by Goar, the clergy keep vigil and sing psalms by the corpse. The kiss of peace is given to the corpse or at least to the coffin, and at the actual interment the priest sprinkles the coffin with earth and then with oil from the lamp, or else ashes from the censer. (See Thurston in "Cath. Enc." *Burial, Christian*; Catalani, "Comm. in Rit. Rom."; Ferraris, *Sepultura*.)

G

GALILEO. The object of the present article is, not to write a Life of Galileo, but to give an account, as clear as our limits will permit, of the two condemnations of the doctrine of the immobility of the sun and the rotation of the earth, pronounced by the Congregations of the Holy Office (Roman Inquisition) and the Index, with special reference to the teaching and writing of Galileo in 1616 and 1633. After the most material facts have been narrated without comment, it will be necessary to examine three separate points:—1. What was the precise nature of the condemnation pronounced? 2. What was the character of the considerations which appeared to the Pope and the cardinals to justify them in pronouncing it? 3. Was Galileo, as some writers have maintained, really put to the torture?

In 1613 the great astronomer, who had long inclined to the heliocentric[1] system of Copernicus, published a letter addressed to his friend the Padre Castelli, in which he says that it is not the object of God in the Holy Scriptures to teach us science and philosophy, and that the received Ptolemaic system could no more be reconciled to the text of Scripture than the Copernican. Some time afterwards, in 1615, he wrote a much longer and more important letter to the Grand Duchess Christina of Tuscany, in which he may be said[1] to have endeavoured to accommodate to the Copernican theory the various passages in Scripture which seem to be inconsistent with it. This letter was not published till 1636, but its tenor appears to have become known to many persons. Galileo visited Rome towards the end of 1615, and was shortly summoned before the Congregation of the Holy Office. The original minutes, showing exactly what occurred, have been published by M. de l'Epinois.[2] On February 25, 1616, Cardinal Millin reported to the Congregation that the Pope (Paul V.) had ordered that Cardinal Bellarmine should call Galileo before him, and should "warn him to abandon the said opinion [of the immobility of the sun, &c.], and if he refused to obey, the Commissary . . . . was to lay a command upon him to abstain altogether from teaching or defending a doctrine and opinion of this kind, or from dealing with it [in any way]." If he was refractory, he was to be imprisoned—"carceretur." The minutes of the following day show how all this was done, and an injunction, as above, laid upon Galileo: "in which command the said Galileo acquiesced, and promised to obey it." The prohibition of the Pope was identical in intention[3] with that contained in a decree of the Congregation of the Index dated a week later, March 5, 1616. This decree first

[1] The terms "heliocentric" and "geocentric," as denoting the systems which assume the sun or the earth respectively to be the fixed centre round which the planets revolve, are borrowed from two articles in the *Dublin Review* (by W. G. Ward), of which we have made free use in the present paper: one is headed "Copernicanism and Pope Paul V." (April 1871); the other, "Galileo and the Pontifical Congregations" (July 1871).

[1] Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*, iii. 413.

[2] *Les Pièces du Procès de Galilée*, Rome, Paris, 1877.

[3] This is certain; for Bellarmine, in the certificate which he gave to Galileo in 1616—of which we shall again have occasion to speak—says that "the declaratio made by the Pope, *and published by the Sacred Congregation of the Index* [italics ours], was notified to him," &c.

condemns five theologico-political works, and then goes on to say that it has come to the knowledge of the Sacred Congregation "that the well-known doctrine—of Pythagorean origin and wholly repugnant to the sacred Scriptures—concerning the mobility of the earth and the immobility of the sun," formerly taught by Copernicus and Diego of Astorga, "was now being spread abroad and embraced by many; . . . . therefore, lest such an opinion should insinuate itself any more, to the destruction of Catholic truth, it gave sentence" that the books of Copernicus and Diego "should be suspended [from circulation] till they were corrected," that the work of a certain Foscarini upholding the same opinion should be altogether prohibited and condemned, "and that all other books teaching the same thing were to be similarly prohibited."

That this decree was sanctioned and confirmed by the Pope it is impossible to doubt. The writer of the article *Galileo* in the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" maintains that its responsibility rests with a disciplinary congregation in no sense representing the Church, and that it was never confirmed by the Pope. This view is untenable in view of the fact that in any decree of one of the Sacred Congregations confirmed and ordered to be published by the Pope, it is the Pope himself who *speaks*—not the cardinals merely—if not always in his capacityof Universal Doctor yet always in that of Supreme Pastor or ruler. That the decree was not confirmed by Paul V. there is not, so far as we know, the smallest shred of evidence for maintaining; and the *onus probandi* rests on those who make an assertion so improbable.

Galileo was thus estopped by a decision in which he had acquiesced, and which he had promised not to infringe, from publishing anything more on the Copernican theory. Some years passed; Urban VIII. ascended the Papal chair in 1623; he was an enlightened man, of considerable learning, and, as Cardinal Barberini, had had much friendly intercourse with Galileo. The philosopher visited Rome in 1624, and was received with great warmth and kindness by the Pope. Soon after this he began to return to the forbidden subject; in an essay on sun-spots he assumed the fact of the sun's immobility. In his famous *Dialogo* on the "System of the World," published at Florence in February 1632, he spoke out still more plainly. The dialogue is carried on between three persons, Salvati, Sagredo, and Simplicio; the last being a well-meaning ignoramus, who supports the Ptolemaic side by arguments manifestly futile. At the conclusion of the work the question is in words left open; but the whole effect of the treatise is said to be that of a powerful and vehement defence of the Copernican theory. The book reached Rome at the end of February 1632, and caused great excitement. The Pope was very angry; he said that Galileo had been ill advised; that great mischief might be done to religion in this way, greater than was ever done before.[1] Riccardi, the Master of the Apostolic Palace, whose licence Galileo had obtained for the printing of the book by representations which do not seem quite straightforward, complained that arguments which Urban himself had used to Galileo against the Copernican theory were in the *Dialogo* placed in the mouth of Simplicio, a ridiculous personage. The authority of Aristotle was in that age inconceivably great, and Aristotle had believed the earth to be immovable. The Peripatetics—so his followers were called—flocked round the Pope, urged against Galileo the breach of his promise, and the insulting neglect of the prohibition of 1616, and pressed for the condemnation both of the book and its author. Urban, still desirous of keeping the case out of the Inquisition, appointed a commission of theologians to examine and report on the book. Their report was submitted in September 1632; it was highly unfavourable to Galileo. The Pope then wrote to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in whose service Galileo was at the time, saying that the case must go before the Inquisition, and that the accused must come to Rome and stand his trial. After a considerable delay, which produced a stern letter from Urban (December 30, 1632) to the effect that if Galileo could travel at all he was to be sent up to Rome in chains, the philosopher departed from Florence and arrived in Rome about the middle of February 1633, taking up his abode at the Tuscan embassy. The trial came on in April; for ten days after its commencement Galileo was committed to the house of the fiscal of the Holy Office; but on his complaining that from his feeble state of health he could ill bear the confinement, he was allowed to return to the Tuscan embassy.

The minutes of the Holy Office show that Galileo was examined on April 12 and 30, May 10, and June 21. The report of the commissioners, one of whom was Melchior Inchofer, told heavily against him. Melchior said that the author of the *Dialogo* did not put the case in favour of the immobility of the sun "hypothetice," but "theorematice," and that his having written in Italian, so that "vulgares etiam homines" might read it, made the matter worse. The disobedience to the command issued by the Holy Office in 1616 was also much dwelt upon; to which Galileo could only reply by putting in the certificate which he had obtained at the time from Bellarmine,[2] and pleading that as the

[1] L'Epinois, *La Question de Galilée*, p. 114.

[2] The certificate ends thus—after stating that Galileo had made no abjuration, nor been put to penance—"but only the declaration made by the Pope and published by the Sacred Congregation of the Index was solemnly notified to him, in which it is contained that the doctrine attributed to Copernicus that the earth moves round the sun, and that the sun remains in the centre of the world without moving from east to west, is contrary to the Sacred Scriptures and therefore cannot be defended or held. In testimony whereof," &c.

later had not in this expressly referred to the injunction not to write any more on the question, he had forgotten all about it. It is probable that this was not believed, and that some intention other than one purely scientific was ascribed to him, as accounting for his open disregard of the prohibition of 1616. We read in the minutes for June 16, 1633, that the Pope ordered that Galileo should be questioned "concerning his intention, a threat even of torture being used to him; and that if he persisted in his statement (*et si sustinuerit*), his abjuration having been first taken, he was to be condemned," &c.

On June 21 he was examined according to this instruction. Being asked whether he had not held the opinion [of the immobility of the sun] since the decree of 1616, he said, "I do not hold and have not held this opinion of Copernicus since it was intimated to me by authority (*con precetto*) that I must abandon it; for the rest, I am here in your hands: you must do what you please." He was then warned to speak the truth, otherwise the torture would be applied. He answered, "I am here to make my submission, and I have not held this opinion since the decision was given, as I have said." He was then allowed to withdraw. The sentence was pronounced the next day in the convent of the Minerva. A full narrative of what passed may be read in a letter addressed by the Cardinal di S. Onofrio on July 2, 1633, to the Inquisition of Venice.[1] The sentence opened with the words, "Whereas thou, Galileo," &c., and after reciting the proceedings of 1615 and 1616, stated that the Holy Office appointed theologians on that occasion as qualificators, who reported to this effect:—

1. That the sun is the centre of the world and immovable is a proposition absurd and false in philosophy, and formally heretical, as being expressly contrary to Holy Scripture.

2. That the earth is not the centre of the world, nor immovable, but that it moves even with a diurnal motion, is in like manner a proposition absurd and false in philosophy, and, considered in theology, at least erroneous in faith.

The accused is reminded that, after Bellarmine had advised and admonished him, the then commissary of the Inquisition told him that he could not defend or teach that doctrine any more, either orally or in writing. In publishing the *Dialogo* he had manifestly disobeyed the precept, and in consequence of the publication, the tribunal understood, the said opinion was spreading more and more. He had acted disingenuously in saying nothing about the precept when he applied for the licence to print. Mistrusting him, the tribunal had thought it right to proceed to the rigorous examen ("rigoroso esame") in which he had answered as a Catholic should ("rispondesti cattolicamente"). "We therefore," proceeds the tribunal, "say, pronounce, declare, &c., that you, Galileo, have made yourself vehemently suspect of heresy to this Holy Office—*i.e.* of having believed and held a doctrine false and contrary to the sacred and divine Scriptures." He had therefore incurred all the usual penalties; nevertheless the tribunal would absolve him if he abjured and detested the said errors. But, as a warning to others, they ordered: 1, that his *Dialogo* should be prohibited; 2, that he should be "formally" imprisoned[1] during the pleasure of the Holy Office; 3, that he should say once a week, for three years to come, the seven penitential psalms. Galileo then abjured the condemned opinion,[2] and swore never to promote it in future, and to denounce to the Holy Office any whom he might find maintaining it.

Harsh as this sentence sounds, the fact is that Galileo was treated with little that can be called severity for the remainder of his life. He resided at first at Siena, afterwards in his own villa at Arcetri, near Florence. He was so far under restraint that he was not allowed to go into the city, nor to remove elsewhere without permission; but within his own house and grounds he seems to have been left entirely free. Milton visited him at Arcetri in 1638 or 1639. "There [*i.e.* in Italy] I found and visited the famous Galileo, grown old, a prisoner to the Inquisition."[3] Perhaps Milton did not mean to mislead, but the common inference drawn from his words has been, that he found Galileo immured in the dungeons of the Inquisition,[4] instead of living as a private gentleman in his own country house. The philosopher died at an advanced age at Arcetri in 1642.

Such, in brief outline, were the facts of this celebrated condemnation. Before considering the motives actuating those who pronounced it, let us examine what the sentence itself amounted to. Did the Roman Pontiff, at any stage of these proceedings, pronounce *ex cathedra* that the theory of Copernicus was wrong, and that the earth was the fixed centre of the world? The writer in the "Dublin Review" already referred to appears to us to make it quite plain that the Roman Pontiff did nothing of the kind. Whether the decrees of Pontifical congregations on matters of doctrine, in which there is a clause expressly asserting the Papal sanction, are or are not to be regarded as *ex cathedra* and infallible judgments, is a point, according to the reviewer, on which

[1] Printed in Venturi's *Memorie e Lettere Inedite* (Modena, 1818).

[1] Under restraint, but *not* in a material prison.

[2] The clever fiction which makes him say at this point *Eppur si muove* ("And yet it [the earth] does move"), first appeared, according to the writer in the *Enc. Brit.*, in an Historical Dictionary published at Caen in 1788.

[3] *Areopagitica.*

[4] Thus Dr. Johnson says, in his *Life of Milton*, "He had perhaps given some offence by visiting Galileo, *then a prisoner in the Inquisition* [italics ours] for philosophical heresy."

theologians are not entirely agreed; but no one, he adds, has ever doubted that decrees *not* containing this clause are not to be regarded as decisions *ex cathedra*. Now, the decree of the Congregation of the Index of March 5, 1616, does not contain the clause; it cannot, therefore, be regarded as defining *ex cathedra*.

I. What, then, does the decree decide or do? It decides that the theory of Copernicus is "false" and "entirely contrary to Scripture," and that the books which teach it are to be prohibited. To this must be added the language used by the Holy Office in the preamble of their sentence, as given in a previous paragraph. It is abundantly clear that both Pontifical congregations held that the opinion about the earth's motion now universally received was false and contrary to Scripture, and that no Catholic could hold it without falling into heresy. The reviewer maintains that it was natural and inevitable that they should so regard it, seeing that the obvious sense of Scripture is unquestionably opposed to the Copernican theory, and only "some overwhelming scientific probability" (p. 159) could render it legitimate to override the obvious in favour of an unobvious sense. Later researches have supplied this overwhelming probability, and consequently all Catholics now "admit that the Holy Ghost for wise purposes . . . permitted the sacred writers to express themselves in language which was literally true as understood by *them*, but was figurative in the highest degree as intended by *Him*" (*ib.*).

The reviewer moreover contends that, although all Catholics were bound to assent to the decrees, they were not thereby obliged to hold the geocentric theory as an article of divine faith—*i.e.* with an assent excluding all doubt. To maintain the contradictory of this proposition would be absurd, since the heliocentric theor was allowed to be proposed *hypothetically*, but the Church would never for a moment allow even the hypothetical maintenance[1] of an opinion contrary to an article of faith. For instance, what impossibility is greater than that, since 1854, the Church should allow any Catholic theologian to maintain, as a hypothesis, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is untrue? But that the heliocentric theory might be hypothetically propounded after the decree of 1616 is indisputable. For, first, Galileo deposed before the Holy Office in 1633[2] that in 1616 Cardinal Bellarmine spoke approvingly, both as to him and Copernicus, of their holding the opinion of the movement of the earth "*ex suppositione* and not absolutely." Secondly, the same Bellarmine declared in 1620, "that if a scientific proof of Copernicanism were discovered, Scripture should then be Copernically interpreted"[1]; and the theologian Amort, writing in 1734, expressed himself to the same effect.[3] Thirdly, the report of Melchior Inchofer speaks of "the reasons by which Galileo assertively, absolutely, and not hypothetically . . . maintains the motion of the earth"; whence it may be inferred that to maintain it hypothetically would not have been censurable.[3]

II. The meaning and effect of the decrees being what we have described, the question arises, Was there any urgent, and at the same time justifiable, motive for issuing them at all? After all, it may be said, the opinion condemned by the decrees has come to be universally believed; was it not therefore a mistake, to say the least, to attempt thus to suppress it? Has not the logic of events proved that course to be wrong? Such questions as these will be differently answered according to the varying estimates which people may form of the value of a stable religious conviction. The Pope and the cardinals believed in 1616 that if everyone might freely teach, at universities or by printed books, that the earth revolved round the sun, a great weakening of religious faith would ensue, owing to the apparent inconsistency of such teaching with a number of well-known passages in the Bible. They might remember that Giordano Bruno, an ardent Copernican, had also taught pantheism with equal ardour. The standing danger on the side of Protestantism was, they might think, sufficiently formidable, without the addition to it—while it could still be staved off—of a danger on the side of physical science. At the present day the youth of Italy listen to infidel lectures and read bad books without restriction; one single book of this kind, Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, is said to have caused loss of faith to innumerable readers in Spain and Italy. Few Catholics would hesitate to say, even now, that it would have been to the unspeakable advantage of European society and individual souls if the bad book by Renan just adverted to had been summarily suppressed at its birth, and the writer imprisoned, at least "formally." Far be it from us so to disparage the honoured name of Galileo as to suggest for a moment that the two cases are parallel. Galileo was a Christian all along, and could no more have written the sentimental impieties of the *Vie de Jésus* than could Urban VIII. himself. Still there can be no doubt that the Pope and cardinals—besides thinking his personal behaviour censurable, because he had broken a distinct promise and disregarded a solemn warning—believed that the interests of religion required that Copernicanism should be no otherwise taught than as a scientific hypothesis. The decrees,

[1] Except for the purpose of a *reductio ad absurdum*, which of course is not here in question.
[2] L'Epinois, *Les Pièces*, &c., p. 60.
[1] *Dub. Rev.* vol. lxix. p. 164.
[3] *Ib.* p. 162. [3] L'Epinois, p. 76.

it s true, say nothing as to a hypothetical propounding; to them the Copernican theory is simply false. But this is the usual style of all disciplinary tribunals. The words of Bellarmine before quoted leave no doubt as to the Church's mind, and an important step towards their realization was taken when, in 1757—the Newtonian philosophy which involves the centrality of the sun having been favourably received at Rome—Benedict XIV. suspended the decree of the Congregation of the Index above described.[1]

III. One more question remains—whether Galileo was or was not tortured in the course of his examination. It is extremely painful to read of torture being even threatened to a man so warmly loved by a host of friends, and to whom science was under such profound obligations. However, one may feel reasonably confident that it was no more than a threat. M. l'Epinois (*La Question de Galilée*, p. 104) enters fully into the question, and shows (1) that no one in the seventeenth century ever said or thought, so far as appears, that Galileo had been actually tortured; (2) that a special "interlocutory sentence" of the judge must have been given before the application of the torture, and that of such sentence there is no trace; (3) that even if such sentence had been given, Galileo might have legally appealed against it on the ground of age and ill-health, and that his appeal must have been allowed. For these and several other reasons which we have not space to analyse, L'Epinois considers that it is scarcely possible to doubt that the torture, though threatened, was not actually administered. (There is abundant literature on the subject. The article in the "Cath. Enc." by Father Gerard gives a good summary account of the case by one who was a scientist as well as a theologian; De Vregille in DAp: Müller, "Galileo-Galilei"; Vacandard, "Rev. du Clergé Français," October 1904, and, above all, his admirable article in DThC.)

GALLICAN LITURGIES. [See LITURGIES, p. 531.]

GALLICANISM. The tendency to enlarge the prerogatives of a national church—in the particular case, of the church of France—and to restrict proportionately the authority of the Holy See. It was this tendency which was exemplified alike in the Harlays and Le Telliers in France, and the Gardiners, Heaths, and Bonners of our own country. The habit of thinking of Rome as a power to be kept in check rather than loved and obeyed, produces a desire to restrict its authority in all directions, in regard to doctrine no less than discipline. Hence a secondary phase of Gallicanism was—the tendency to exalt the authority of a general council, and to depress correspondingly that of the Pope.

Gallicanism in the first sense is the natural growth of a state of things in which despotic kings and corrupt metropolitans play into each other's hands, in order to dispose of the Church property, patronage and influence as they please. For three hundred years after the death of Charlemagne, such kings and such metropolitans were but too common, both in France and Germany. The wealth of the metropolitan sees being very great, princes used often to contrive that their brothers or their illegitimate sons should be appointed to them; often, too, they would sell the nomination for a large sum; and in that turbulent age the simoniacal intruder was generally able for many years, perhaps for a lifetime, to set the canons at nought and retain the benefice. The bishops, less exposed to corrupting influences than the metropolitans, maintained discipline as well as they could; but episcopal decisions were often referred by appeal to metropolitans, and were reviewed—when these had been appointed in the manner above described—in no equitable or conscientious spirit. A metropolitan decided a cause, perhaps for money, against a bishop; what was the bishop to do? Appeal to Rome, of course, whence he might hope to obtain a final and overriding sentence, quashing the unjust judgment of the metropolitan. Against such appeals the latter, and his prince also, would naturally protest. Why should not the bishop be content with a decision given in the highest ecclesiastical court in the country, and approved by the civil power? Why should he go to Rome? Here we have Gallicanism at its fountain head. The opposite view—that which makes Rome the mother and mistress of all churches, and persists in regarding her as qualified to review all causes and redress all wrongs in matters ecclesiastical—though sometimes called Ultramontane, has been adopted by all the saints, and all clear-sighted Catholics, in every age of the Church. It comes out forcibly in the pseudo-Isidorian compilation [FALSE DECRETALS], a work of the ninth century, and it dictated the celebrated Concordat of Worms (1122) (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 602 *sqq.*), where the right of the Pope to intervene in the appointment of all bishops was distinctly recognized.

For many generations those ecclesiastics in France who desired to uphold the royal power, and strengthen the prerogatives of the national church, were content to appeal to the old canonical practice (*usus canonum, observantia juris antiqui*) against what they regarded as Roman encroachments. Gradually—as a consequence, partly of the contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip le Bel, partly of the declarations made in the Councils of Constance and Basle—two

[1] There need be no question as to the *sincerity* of the Pope and cardinals in repudiating Copernicanism. So far as was then known, the appearances of nature might be equally well explained on either theory, and Scripture in its obvious meaning agreed with one and not with the other. Neither Bacon, nor Tycho Brahe, nor Descartes, accepted the Copernican theory. Milton, in the *Paradise Lost*, wavers between the two systems.

principles began to be enunciated by the national party: one, that the King of France was absolutely independent of the Pope in all temporal matters; the other, that the Papal power was not absolute, must be exercised within the limits of the canons, and was inferior to that of a general council. By the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, passed at Bourges, the Gallican church, in union with the king, adopted the decrees of the Council of Basle abolishing Papal reservations and expectatives, and restricting appeals to Rome to the *causae majores*. Many Popes protested against the Pragmatic Sanction; but it was maintained till the date of the concordat (1516) between Leo X. and Francis I., and although it was then abolished, several of its provisions continued to be in force. On the whole, there was in the sixteenth century a large body of customs and privileges, more or less ancient, which the courtly portion of the clergy delighted to speak of as the "Gallican liberties." A crisis came in the seventeenth century. Through the arbitrary extension by Louis XIV. of the royal right called *Regalia* [see that article], a collision occurred between the Crown and two bishops, those of Aleth and Pamiers. The bishops excommunicated the Crown nominees; the metropolitans of Toulouse and Narbonne, on being appealed to, cancelled the sentences of the bishops; these last then appealed to Rome, and Innocent XI. annulled the decisions of the metropolitans. In these circumstances an assembly of the French clergy was convened. Bossuet, just elected to the see of Meaux, was requested to preach the opening sermon; he delivered the celebrated discourse "On the Unity of the Church," concerning which there is nothing more remarkable than that the man who defended so eloquently the rights of the chair of Peter should a few days afterwards sign the Gallican Articles.

These articles, four in number, were drawn up in March 1682, and are to the following effect:—

The first denied that Peter and his successors had received any power from God extending to civil and temporal affairs, declared that kings were subject to no ecclesiastical power in temporals, and denied the deposing power of the Pope. [DEPOSING POWER.]

The second ratifies the third and fourth sessions of the Council of Constance [see that article] concerning the authority of the council relatively to that of the Pope, and denies that these sessions refer only to the time of the schism.

The third asserts the force and validity of the laws, customs, and constitutions of the realm and of the Gallican church.

The fourth is as follows: "The Pope has the principal share in questions of faith; his decrees regard all the churches and each church in particular; nevertheless his judgment is not irreformable, unless the consent of the Church be added." [1]

The question of the Regalia fell into the background after the publication of the Articles of 1682; besides, the bishops would not oppose the Court, and the Pope could not successfully vindicate the rights of the French church without some help from its leaders. It will be observed that the two tendencies of Gallicanism—that which would limit the action of Rome in discipline, and that which would place its authority below that of a general council in doctrine—were both broadly affirmed in these articles. The Spanish, Flemish, and Italian clergy repudiated them; Alexander VIII.(1690) pronounced them null and void; Clement XI. (1716) and afterwards Pius VI. renewed the condemnation. Louis XIV. withdrew in 1692 the edict by which he had approved the four articles; but he did so, not on the ground that they were condemned by the Holy See, and unsafe for Christians to hold, but because the particular conjunction of affairs which gave rise to them had passed away.

Far from ushering in a period of greater freedom for the French church, the declaration of 1682 was merely another link in the chain which politicians and lawyers had long been forging for the enslavement of the Church to the laity. Fénelon wrote: "In practice the King of France is more the head of the Church than the Pope. Liberty towards the Pope: servitude towards the king. The king's power over the Church has fallen into the hands of the civil tribunals. Laymen lord it over the bishops. Secular judges go so far as to examine even those Papal bulls which relate only to matters of faith." Jansenism, in so far as it fostered insubordination towards the Holy See, co-operated with Gallicanism. When the Revolution came, and the doctrinaires of the Convention produced the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (see CONSTITUTIONAL CLERGY), they were only pushing the worst side of Gallicanism to its logical outcome. But the great majority of the French clergy saw and recoiled from the snare, and from the day that they did so Gallicanism was doomed. In our own day, there has, indeed, been a party among the French clergy which has been less Ultramontane than the rest; hence the "inopportunist" opposition at the Vatican Council. But the definition of the Infallibility of the Pope has made the doctrinal basis of Gallicanism formal heresy; and the breach made by the Revolution in the ecclesiastical traditions of France, the suppression of the old tribunals, and the generally deepened apprehension in Catholic society of the rights and divinely founded authority of the Papacy, combine to render it unlikely

[1] It is scarcely necessary to remark that to adhere to this last proposition of the fourth article, since the promulgation of the constitution *Romanum Pontificem* at the Vatican Council, would amount to formal heresy.

that even the Gallican temper in relation to the supreme ecclesiastical authority on the one hand and the civil power on the other will ever reappear on any large scale in the Church. (See Bossuet, "Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani"; Marca, "De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii"; Picot, "Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique pendant le XVIIIe siècle"; De Maistre, "Du Pape," "De l'Église Gallicane"; Degert in "Cath. Enc.")

GANGRA, COUNCIL OF. We possess twenty-one canons of this council, which was held at Gangra, the capital of Paphlagonia, but its precise date is unknown. The chief intention of the canons is that of condemning the false asceticism of Eustathius of Sebaste, or rather of his followers [see EUSTATHIANS]. Eustathius no longer held the see of Sebaste in 380, and some have thought that he was deposed by this Council of Gangra; if that were so, its date would probably be 379 or 380—not earlier, because St. Basil, who died in 379, makes no mention of it. It anathematizes those who out of spiritual pride and a false conception of purity blamed marriage, and despised those who were married; at the same time it guards itself from being supposed not to honour and admire virginity and continence when embraced with humility and charity. (Fleury, "Hist. Ecclés." book xvii.; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 1029; Smith and Wace, "Christian Biography," art. *Eustathius*.)

GAUDETE SUNDAY. The third Sunday of Advent, so called from the first word of the Introit, *Gaudete*, "rejoice." On this day cardinals are required to wear pale-rose dresses, and the organ and flowers, forbidden on the other Sundays of Advent, are permitted. Rose-coloured vestments are used at high Mass, and the deacon and subdeacon wear the dalmatic and tunicle. (Martène.)

GEHENNA. [See HELL.]

GENERAL (of an Order). From the foundation of the orders of friars it became usual for religious orders and congregations of men to be under the rule of a general superior, usually elected in general chapter for three years, or some other fixed term. In the Society of Jesus the general is elected for life. In the Benedictine order a precedency of rank is accorded to the abbot of Monte Cassino, who is styled "Abbas abbatum," and there is an Abbot Primate at Rome. [See ABBOT.] Most, if not all, of the congregations that have sprung from the Benedictine order, or grown up within it (*e.g.* the orders of Cluny and Citeaux, and the congregation of St. Maur), have established generalates. In such cases the general has been usually the abbot of the mother house, as at Cluny; hence the title "Abbas generalis."

The prelates of regular orders enjoy special powers and privileges. A general has ordinary spiritual jurisdiction over his subjects *in utroque foro*. Generals and provincials have the same power of absolution in reserved cases, in relation to their subjects, which bishops have in relation to their diocesans. Generals can reserve to themselves eleven cases (specified in the decree of Clement VIII., 1593), but not more, without the consent of the chapter general. Although neither abbots nor superiors of orders were summoned to the first six general councils, yet from the date of the seventh onwards, exemptions from episcopal control having been freely granted to religious orders by the Holy See, the custom was gradually established that not only abbots with quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, but also the generals of orders, "should be present at a general synod as judges, and subscribe its decrees, having a decisive vote, and the right of defining."[1] Seven generals of religious orders subscribed the decrees of Trent, and a much larger number attended the Vatican Council.

These powers and privileges of regular prelates are shared in part by the Superiors General of regular and secular clerks, such as the Theatines, Barnabites, Redemptorists, Passionists, &c. Several modern congregations of women have also general superiors, but their canonical position is of course quite different.

Generals are forbidden by the law to enter without necessity the convents of nuns subject to them; their visitations of such convents are, as a rule, to be made not oftener than once a year. Nor can they hear the confessions of such nuns without the approbation of the bishop. Nor can they, on pain of excommunication, grant any office or dignity, or remit any punishment, to one of their subjects at the instance of any person outside the order, whatever the rank of that person may be.

(Ferraris, *Regularis Praelatus, Religiones Regulares*; Tamburini, "De Jure Abbatum," Rome, 1629.)

GENERAL CONFESSION. A confession of sins committed by the penitent since Baptism, so far as they can be remembered. Such a confession is of course necessary in the case of those who have made no previous confession, or whose previous confessions have been invalid—*e.g.* because they wilfully concealed a mortal sin or were wanting in true and supernatural sorrow. It is advisable if the validity of the past confessions is very doubtful. But sometimes persons repeat in a general confession sins for which they have already received absolution, although there is no reason to consider this absolution invalid. Moral theologians and ascetical writers admit the utility of this practice in certain cases. Thus a person may reasonably desire to make such a confession in order to obtain direction when he proposes to enter on a new state of

[1] Tamburini, i. 368.

life; or, again, to acquire deeper humility and a better knowledge of himself. Hence it is common to make a general confession before first Communion, ordination, religious profession, &c. But the practice of frequently making general confessions leads to great loss of time, occasions scruples, and is strongly discouraged by spiritual authors and prudent confessors. (See the moral theologians in the treatise on the sacrament of Penance, *e.g.* Lehmkuhl, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 251 *sqq.*; and the ascetical writers, *e.g.* St. Ignatius, "Spiritual Exercises," on General Confession and Communion.)

GENUFLEXION (the bending of the knee) is a natural sign of adoration or reverence. (Lk. xxii. 41; Acts ix. 40; Phil. ii. 10, &c.) It is frequently used in the ritual of the Church. Thus the faithful genuflect in passing before the tabernacle where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved; the priest repeatedly genuflects at Mass in adoration of the Eucharist, also at the mention of the Incarnation in the Creed, &c. Genuflexion is also made as a sign of profound respect before a bishop on certain occasions. A double genuflexion—*i.e.* one on both knees—is made on entering or leaving a church where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.

The early Christians prayed standing on Sundays, and from Easter till Pentecost, and only bent the knee in sign of penance; hence a class of penitents were known as Genuflectentes. A relic of this penitential use of genuflection survives, according to Gavantus (P.I. tit. 16), in the practice enjoined by the rubric of genuflecting at the verse "Adjuva nos," in the Tract of Masses during Lent. (Leclercq, "Man. d'Archéologie Chrétienne"; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 618; Bergh in "Cath. Enc.")

GHOST. Among the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Germans, the belief in apparitions of departed spirits was widely spread. In the Old Testament there are many allusions to necromancers, who professed to summon up the spirits of the dead; possibly in 1 Kings xxviii. we have the account of a real apparition. Some of the Fathers (*e.g.* Justin and Origen) suppose that Samuel's ghost really did appear to Saul when he consulted the witch of Endor; others (*e.g.* Tertullian and Jerome) regard the supposed appearance of Samuel's spirit as a diabolical imposture. Many apparitions of saints after death are recorded in the history of the Church.

The theological principles on the matter are stated by St. Thomas, "Summ." Sup. q. 69, a. 3. According to the natural course of things, no soul can leave heaven or hell even for a time, or quit purgatory till its purification is completed. But God may permit departed souls to appear on earth for many wise reasons—*e.g.* that the saints may help men; that the sight of lost souls may warn them; that the spirits in purgatory may obtain prayers. St. Thomas even thinks that God has communicated to the saints a permanent power of appearing on earth when they please. [See VISION; SPIRITUALISM.]

GHOST, HOLY. [See TRINITY and MACEDONIANS.]

GIFTS, SEVEN. [See SEVEN GIFTS OF THE HOLY GHOST.]

GIFT, SUPERNATURAL. [See GRACE.]

GILBERTINES. [See SEMPRINGHAM, ORDER OF.]

GILDS, GUILDS (A.-S. *gildan*, to pay). The history of the word is obscure; in the Anglo-Saxon poems ascribed to Cædmon—*Genesis* and *Daniel*—*gild* or *gyld* is used in the sense of "sacrifice," and also of "idol." Among the Teutons of the north its original meaning is said to have been "sacrificial feast."[1] Yet so early as the time of Ina it is used in one of three allied senses attached to it by Christian civilization—namely, that of a society of contributing members associated for mutual help and assurance. By the laws of Ina, no *were*, or compensation for blood, was due to the guildsmen (*gegyldan*) of a stranger whom some one might have slain in the honest belief that he was a robber.[2] At a later period we meet with these Frith-gilds under the names of *Frith-borg* and *Frank-pledge*, when their relation to the existing system of public justice, and responsibility for the good conduct of their members, is the single point in their association considered. The passages in the Laws of Ina which mention *gegyldan*, if carefully weighed, seem to point to a general system of association for the exacting and payment of were-gilds due from or in respect of any of the members, which was probably common to all Teutonic communities, and dated back to the times of paganism. The *conjuratores* of the Salic and Ripuarian laws may be regarded as the Frankish equivalent to the *gegyldan* of Ina.[3] On this ancient foundation were grafted the religious rites and kindly customs, gradually developed in a hundred beautiful ways, of the mediaeval gilds, which in no country of Europe flourished so much as in England.

The *geldoniae* or *confratriae* of the Carolingian times [CONFRATERNITY] were gilds to all intents and purposes, but the imperial legislation discountenanced them, and their precise rules and constitution are little known. The first extant charter of a gild is that by which, in the reign of Canute, Orcy gives the guild-hall (*gegyld-healle*) at Abbotsbury in Dorset, "for God's love and St. Peter's," to the *gyldscipe* of the place.[4] Every gildsman (*gegylda*) was to pay annually, three days before St. Peter's Mass, one penny, or a pennyworth of wax. On the eve of the feast every two gildsmen were to bring

[1] Brentano; see end of art.
[2] *Leges Inae*, 21.
[3] Guizot, *Civilisation en France*, lect. ix. x.
[4] Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 942.

one large loaf, well sifted and raised, for the common almsgiving. Five weeks before the same festival each member had to bring a measure of clean wheat, and within three days afterwards a load of wood. On the death of any member, each of his fellows was to pay "one penny at the corpse for the soul." These were the "Mass-pence," of which we hear so much in later times. Other rules provided for an annual feast, for almsgiving, the nursing of sick members, the decent burial of the dead, &c. The ends of the gild appear here to be purely religious and social; yet, in the somewhat later charter of a Cambridge gild, the old principle of mutual assurance against crime and its penalties receives marked illustration. Gradually this feature disappears, and the gild assumes the aspect of "a voluntary association of those living near together, who joined for a common purpose, paying contributions, worshipping together, feasting together periodically, helping one another in sickness and poverty, and frequently united for the pursuit of a special object,"[1] usually a religious one. These objects the gilds continued to promote down to the Reformation, when they were destroyed and plundered.[2]

The Frith Gilds, as we have seen, came first; out of them grew what some have called the Religious, some the Social gilds. In Norfolk alone there were 909 gilds of this class. Out of these proceeded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Trade Gilds, divided into Gild-merchants and Craft-Gilds.

Every gild had its distinct livery; hence the name of the "Livery Companies" of London. Five of the Canterbury pilgrims, the Haberdasher, Carpenter, Weaver, &c., are described as—

> clothed in oo [one] lyveré
> Of a solempne and gret fraternite,

or religious gild. The Craft-Gilds of a city would often combine together, and each undertake to represent one scene in a great religious drama or miracle-play. Hence came the "Chester Plays," written by Dan Randal of Chester Abbey, and exhibited by twenty-four trades or craft-gilds of the city.[3] (See the interesting volume "English Gilds," containing the original ordinances of more than a hundred of them, and edited by Mr. Toulmin Smith for the Early English Text Society [1870], with a preface by Dr. Luis Brentano; Rock, ii. 319 *sqq.*)

GIRDLE (*cingulum, balteum, ζώνη*). A cord with which the priest or other cleric binds his alb. It is the symbol of continence and self-restraint, as is said by Innocent III., and implied in the prayer which the priest about to celebrate Mass is directed to use while he ties the girdle round his waist. The Congregation of Rites (January 22, 1701) lays it down that the girdle should be of linen rather than of silk, though it may also be (S.R.C., December 23, 1862) of wool. Usually it is white, but the use of coloured girdles, varying with the colour of the vestments, is permitted (S.R.C., January 8, 1709).

As to the origin of the girdle, its use was common among Greeks and Romans in their daily life, and thence took its place, as a matter of course, among the liturgical vestments. It appears to have been employed at the outset merely for the sake of convenience, first by ministering deacons, later by priests and bishops. Hence at ordinations it is not given as part of the liturgical apparel, nor is it worn over the shortened alb which we know as a surplice or cotta. It is not till the beginning of the Middle Ages that we meet with liturgical girdles richly adorned. Anastasius, in the ninth century, mentions *muraenulae—i.e.* jewelled girdles in the shape of lampreys or eels. We also read of girdles variegated with gold, and of others (*zonae litteratae*) with letters or words woven in. The Greek girdle is shorter and broader than ours, and often richly adorned. (See Benedict XIV. "De Miss."; Le Brun; Hefele, "Beiträge"; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," p. 101; Rock, i. 399.)

GLEBE (*gleba*). Land permanently devoted to the sustentation of the incumbent of a particular parish. The word *gleba* is used for a farm or estate in the Theodosian code. In the body of the canon law it means the land which, along with a house, constituted the ecclesiastical *mansus* of right appertaining to a benefice. Mediaeval charters present many instances of this use of the word; thus Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, in a charter dated about 1360, says "Item habebit vicarius duas acras terrae arabilis de dote sibi de gleba ipsius ecclesiae juxta ipsam ecclesiam jacentes" (The vicar shall have as his endowment two acres of arable land adjoining the church, out of the glebe of the church itself).[1] The fee-simple of a glebe was in abeyance; the freehold was in the incumbent. A glebe could not be alienated without the bishop's permission. The canon law recognizes only four justifying causes for such alienation—(1) necessity, as when the church is overburdened with debt; (2) an opening for an advantageous exchange; (3) to redeem captives or feed the poor in time of famine; (4) incommodity—*e.g.* when the land is so far off that its produce cannot be gathered without great expense. (Ferraris, *Alienatio*; Phillimore, "Ecclesiastical Law.")

[1] *Ency. Brit.* art. "Gild."

[2] Mr. Toulmin Smith, who looks with indulgence on the dissolution of the monasteries, is indignant at the spoliation of these *lay* institutions: "a case of pure wholesale robbery and plunder; . . . no page so black in English history," &c. &c.—*Eng. Gilds*, p. xlii.

[3] Wright's *Chester Plays*, edited for the Shakspere Society, 1843.

[1] Twysden, *Decem Script.* p. 2090.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS. [See DOXOLOGY.]

GLORIA PATRI. [See DOXOLOGY.]

GLORY. [See BEATIFIC VISION.]

GLOSSA ORDINARIA and INTERLINEARIS. Originally the word "gloss" (γλῶσσα) was used—*e.g.* by Aristotle—to signify a hard word in the text of an author, the explanation being called *glossema* (γλώσσημα). However, as early at least as Quintilian, we find the difficult word called "glossema," and the interpretation of it "gloss," and the latter use continued during the Middle Ages, and has passed into the languages of modern Europe. A Glossarium was distinguished from an ordinary lexicon by the fact that it contained only the difficult words of the language. Hesychius, an Alexandrian grammarian of the fourth century, published such a Glossarium, though he calls it a lexicon in the preface. The glosses which illustrate the language of Scripture were collected by Ernesti from the works of Hesychius, Suidas (an author otherwise unknown, of the tenth century), Phavorinus (an Italian Benedictine, died 1537, a pupil of the Greek Lascaris), as well as from the "Etymologicum Magnum" (a work compiled by an unknown author of the eleventh century), and published at Leipzig in 1785–6 under the title "Glossae Sacrae Hesychii," &c.

There are two celebrated Glosses on the Vulgate. The former is the "Glossa Ordinaria," by Walafrid Strabo, a German born in 807. He had some knowledge of Greek and made use of many patristic authors, especially of Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, Bede, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, &c. His object is to give the literal meaning, though he adds sometimes the mystical, and here and there the moral, sense. This Gloss is quoted as a high authority by St. Thomas and other schoolmen, and it was known as "the Tongue of Holy Scripture." Indeed, from the ninth to the seventeenth century it was the favourite commentary on the Bible. The "Postillae" of Nicolas of Lyra (died 1340) and the "Additiones" of Paulus Burgensis were merely appended to it.

The second Gloss, the "Interlinearis," by Anselm, Scholasticus and dean of Laon (died 1117), derived its name from being written over the words in the Vulgate text. Anselm had some acquaintance with Hebrew, as well as with Greek, and his Gloss also had a great reputation. Very often the "Glossa ordinaria" was inserted in the margin, at the top and at the sides; the Gloss of Anselm was placed between the lines of the Vulgate; while from the fourteenth century onwards the "Postillae" of Nicolas of Lyra and the "Additiones" of Paulus Burgensis were placed at the foot of each page. A fine edition of the Vulgate, "cum glossis, interlineari et ordinaria, Nic. Lyrani postillis et moralitatibus, Burgensis additionibus et Thuringi replicis," was printed at Venice in 1588. The Douay theologians published an improved edition in 1617. The last and best is that edited by the Benedictine Leander a Sto. Martino, Antwerp, 1634. Each of these three editions is in six folio volumes.

GLOSSATOR (a barbarous word formed from the Greek γλῶσσα, tongue). The writer of a "Gloss" or explicative commentary on the text of some authoritative document, legal or theological. The early gloss-writers only pretended to clear up difficulties connected with the words used, not those of the subject-matter.

On the writers of glosses on the Vulgate see GLOSSA ORDINARIA. In the twelfth century a school of interpreters of the Roman or civil law [CIVIL LAW] arose at Bologna. The first of these, Irnerius, was a native of that city; besides lecturing on jurisprudence, about 1120 he enriched the law books which he used with a gloss, or short running interpretation. Many other jurists took up the same business of glossing the Roman law, an occupation thoroughly practical and useful in an age when politics and trade and every sort of civic activity flourished among the free Italian commonwealths. In the next century the celebrated Accursius, or Accorso, who, though a native of Florence, taught in the university of Bologna, selecting from among the glossers those whose works he thought most suitable for his purpose, compiled his great "Corpus Juris Glossatum," in which, with great acuteness and extraordinary acquaintance with the whole body of Justinian law, he labours to solve difficulties and reconcile apparent inconsistencies. Accursius died in 1260. "His great compilation," says Hallam, "made an epoch in the annals of jurisprudence. It put an end in great measure to the oral explanations of lecturers, which had prevailed before. It restrained at the same time the ingenuity of interpretation. The glossers became the sole authorities, so that it grew into a maxim—No one can go wrong who follows a gloss; and some said a gloss was worth a hundred texts." Yet the writings of Accursius and his forerunners are full of ridiculous philological and historical blunders (such as deriving "Tiber" from "Tiberius," supposing that Justinian lived before Christ, &c.), which, though they have little to do with their value as jurists, appear to have been the cause why, after the revival of learning, they were so much discredited. In the fourteenth century, Bartolus and Paul of Castro rose to eminence as leaders among the "scholastic jurists"; they were thinkers of great power, who invented innumerable distinctions, and imagined and solved every sort of case which the law-text suggested.

After the publication of the "Decretum" of Gratian, gloss-writers began to deal with the canon law as they had with the civil, the great object always being to make it consistent with itself, and workable in the courts. The glosser Paucapalea gave his name to the well-known gloss or commentary called *Palea*. The Decretals were glossed, among others, by Sinibaldo Fieschi, afterwards Innocent IV. Andrea did the same service for the Sext, and Zabarella for the Clementines. Of all these early jurists and their writings, a connected account was given by Pancirolo († 1599) in his "De Claris Juris Interpretibus." (Hallam, "Lit. of Europe," part i. ch. i.)

GLOVES (CHIROTHECAE). A bishop's gloves are blessed and put on his hands at his consecration by the consecrator. Episcopal gloves are mentioned by Hugo of St. Victor, Honorius of Autun ("Gemma Animae," i. 215), and Innocent III. In a monument of the tenth century, the "Missa Vetus ex Codice Ratoldi," the rubric after the bishop has washed his hands says: "Tunc ministrentur ei manicae . . . postea detur annulus in dextra manu desuper manica" (PL, lxxviii. 241). And in an "Ordo Sacramentorum" there is a prayer to be said by the bishop whilst drawing on his gloves (Martène, t. i. c. iv. a. 12). Though there is no positive mention of gloves in our Anglo-Saxon evidences there can be little doubt that they were in use among the A.S. hierarchy. After St. Osmund's time we have abundant proof of their use. In the Eastern liturgies gloves are never used. In the West they are worn only at pontifical High Mass, and are removed at the washing of the hands at the Offertory. They would seem to have been introduced for the purpose of ornament rather than for practical considerations of warmth or cleanliness. (Rock, ii. 132; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 359 *sqq.*)

GNOSTICISM (γνῶσις) is a name given to the doctrine held by a large number of sects which flourished towards the close of the first and during the whole of the second century after Christ. These bodies differed from each other in many important respects, but the words "Gnostic" and "Gnosticism" indicate the common characteristic which united them in a certain sense to each other, and mark the common principle of their opposition to the Catholic Church. In itself, of course, γνῶσις, or Gnosticism, means no more than "knowledge"; but even in the Epistles of St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 8, xiv. 6) it begins to acquire a technical significance, and implies a peculiar insight into the depths of Christian doctrine. St. Clement of Rome (1 Ep. 36 and 40, PG, i. 280, 288), the author of the Epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas (c. 2, PG, ii. 729), and St. Justin Martyr ("Dial. c. Tryph." c. 112, PG, vi. 733), use γνῶσις to describe the gift of understanding the Old Testament typology; and of these the Epistle of Barnabas expressly distinguishes between faith and "knowledge." It is the object of the letter to assist Christians in adding to "faith perfect knowledge (γνῶσιν)." Clement of Alexandria gives the word γνῶσις or knowledge, and its derivative γνωστικὸς, or Gnostic, a still more special and technical meaning. The greatest of his extant works is meant to show that a Christian may do more than believe and keep the Commandments. Beyond the "ordinary faith," he says, we may reach by instruction and the perfect observance of God's law a knowledge [1] which is "the perfection of man as man." [2] The "Gnostic" is his ideal Christian. He is free from the disturbance of passion,[3] contemplates divine things,[4] knows truth with a peculiar accuracy,[5] and can "demonstrate" the things received by faith.[6] He can penetrate the hidden meanings of Scripture,[7] and use all sciences as a means of raising his mind to God. He uses learning as a means of confuting error, and conveying to others exact notions of the truth.[8] He is the champion of "truth and orthodox knowledge," [9] to which faith is as needful as air to natural life,[10] and which is never separate from the practice of Christian virtue.[11]

So far, it is plain, the esteem for superior knowledge is consistent with a loyal adherence to Christianity; it was the fruit of reason exercising itself on the things of faith, and it grew, as a matter of course, with the growth and progress of the Church. But this holds good only of the knowledge which starts with an acceptance of revealed truth. The spirit of speculative inquiry may strike into another path. Reason may set itself above faith; it may criticize and alter the contents of revelation, till it comes to look on faith as a gift for the simple, with which a man of cultivated mind may dispense. This was the line which heathen philosophers had taken with the popular mythology: they were far from denying that it contained some measure of truth; nay, they thought it necessary for the multitude, who were unable to receive truth in its pure and philosophic form. Now, the allegorical method of interpretation which was associated to some extent with this superior knowledge among Christians was very apt to be perverted till it led to a false and heretical assumption of knowledge. It was by this very method that the philosophers had refined the gross notions of popular heathenism. Philo, at the beginning of the Christian era, had chosen the same expedient for adapting Judaism to Greek philosophy. Even in the "Epistle of Barnabas" we may

[1] *Strom.* v. 1, ed. Potter, p. 644.
[2] *Ibid.* vii. 10, p. 864.
[3] *Ibid.* iv. 6, p. 581; vi. 9, p. 775.
[4] *Ibid.* vii. 11, p. 867.
[5] *Ibid.* vii. 16, p. 891.
[6] *Ibid.* vii. 10, p. 865.
[7] *Ibid.* v 9, p. 680.
[8] *Ibid.* vi. 10, pp. 780–1.
[9] *Ibid.* vi. 16, p. 816: τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὴν γνῶσιν.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 6, p. 445.
[11] *Ibid.* ii. 10, p. 445.

discover the germs of this dangerous tendency, for the author, not content with giving a typical sense to the ceremonial precepts of the old law, denies that they ever bound in their literal meaning at all.[1]

Only one step was wanting to turn this "higher knowledge" into the formal principle of heresy. Let the allegorical interpretation be applied to the New Testament, and let its literal sense be put aside as false or worthless, and then, under the plea of higher knowledge, Christianity might be changed at will. A man had but to suppose himself possessed of this higher gift, and then, on the plea of allegorizing, he might explain away every fact and doctrine in the traditional belief. Nor need he even trouble himself about explaining it away. He might, in the confidence of his insight into higher truth, distinguish between elements of truth and falsehood in the received doctrine; he might mutilate the text of the Gospels; he might mix tenets borrowed from the heathen philosophy or religions with Christianity; he might end by treating the moral law as he had treated Christian doctrine, and invent a new code of ethics. All this he might do, and all this the Gnostics actually did. In fact, when the way was once opened, the motives for pressing into it were strong enough. The age of the Gnostics was eager for novelties in religion, and addicted to fantastic superstitions. It was the fashion of the time to mingle philosophy, mythology, and magic. There was the more inducement to amend Christianity by the introduction of foreign elements, because, while it showed a life and power to which neither philosophy nor heathenism could pretend, its teaching on creation out of nothing, on the resurrection of the body, on salvation through the sufferings and death of Christ the Son of God, ran counter to every prejudice of the heathen world. There was not a sect among all the countless sects of Gnosticism which did not deny each one of these doctrines. Above all, the central idea of Gnosticism made it welcome to many who were half-converted from heathenism. It was a knowledge superior to and independent of faith. Faith was for the multitude, knowledge for the few. The aristocratic instinct which was the very soul of Greek and Roman culture revolted at the authority of a Church which imposed the same belief on all, and exacted the same submission from the philosopher and the barbarian slave. In a system of compromise, like Gnosticism, it escaped from this ignominy.

Such, then, was the nature of Gnosticism. It was a false knowledge which threw off the trammels of faith and ecclesiastical authority. It subjected everything, as St. Irenaeus[2] declares, to the caprice of the individual, and made any fixed rule of faith impossible. It "abandoned the faith which the Church proclaimed, and cavilled at the simplicity of the holy presbyters."[1] It destroyed, as Clement puts it, the efficacy of Baptism[2]—that is, it set at naught faith, the gift conferred in that sacrament. The Gnostic professed to impart a knowledge "greater and deeper"[3] than the ordinary doctrine of Christians, a knowledge which forgot the limits of reason and scorned to believe what it could not understand.[4] This knowledge, to those who were capable of it, was the means of redemption; indeed, in most of the Gnostic systems it was the one and sufficient passport to perfect bliss.[5] It is, however, important to observe that Gnosticism was not a philosophy. True, it was as unfettered and unstable as any philosophy could be, and it addressed itself to the same kind of questions. But it kept the semblance of Christianity, for in nearly all the Gnostic systems Christ occupied a central place, and, as a rule, Gnosticism answered the speculative questions which it raised, not in the abstract language of metaphysics, but by the invention of an elaborate mythology. Without its Christian elements, it could not have entered into such close conflict with the Church; without its mythological garb, it would have missed the popularity which made it dangerous.

It was in the East that Gnosticism began, and in its rudimentary form it appears very early in the history of the Church. The Fathers in the latter half of the second century speak of Simon Magus as the first Gnostic. Both Simon and his successor, Menander, were Samaritans;[6] while Saturninus, the disciple of the latter, taught at Antioch in the time of Hadrian (117–138).[7] All three taught that the world was made by inferior powers more or less in antagonism with the supreme God. Either the highest God, or else some aeon (a name the Gnostics gave the spiritual beings who play so large a part in their systems), appeared on the earth in the person of Christ and redeemed man by the "knowledge" He gave from the dominion of matter and of the angels who ruled the world. Menander, however, made important contributions to the development of Gnosticism. He was at least more emphatic than his predecessors in denying that Christ took a real body or degraded Himself by contact with the impurity of matter. Further, he maintained that the angels had made two kinds of men, our Saviour having come that He might

[1] *Vide, e.g.*, cc. 4, 9, 10, *PG*, ii. 731, &c.
[2] *Adv. Haer.* ii. 27, 1, *PG*, vii. 802.
[1] Iren. v. 20, 2, *PG*, vii. 1177.
[2] *Strom.* ii. 3, pp. 443–4.
[3] Iren. i. 31, 3. [4] *Ibid.* ii. 28, 2.
[5] We have explicit evidence on this point with regard to most of the Gnostic systems. Thus see, for the Naasseni, *Philosophumena* (ed. Duncker and Schneidewin, v. 8, p. 162); for the Peratae, v. 17, p. 196; for the Sethians, v. 21, p. 212; for the Gnostic Justinus, v. 24, p. 216; for the Marcosians, vi. 52, p. 336; for the Basilidians, vii. 27, pp. 374–6; for the Valentinians, Iren. i. 6, 1.
[6] Justin, 1 *Apol.* 26. *PG*, vi. 368. On the connection of the three heresiarchs, see Iren. i. 23, 5 *sqq.*, *PG*, vii. 673.
[7] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7. Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* 1, 2, *PG*, lxxxiii. 345.

overcome the evil men and the demons who helped them, and might save the good.[1]

There were two other forms which Gnosticism assumed while still on Asiatic soil. Whereas Simon Magus attributed the Hebrew prophecies to the inspiration of the same lower powers which had made the world, and Saturninus held that the Saviour descended to destroy the god of the Jews; yet Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John the Evangelist, and the Gnostics who are denounced in the Ignatian Epistles, united a leaning to Judaism with their Gnostic speculations. With strange inconsistency they advocated Jewish rites and denied the fundamental doctrine of Judaism—viz. the unity of God.[2] Besides those Judaizing Gnostics, we find a cluster of Oriental sects known as Ophites, or worshippers of the serpent. They betray their Eastern origin by the use they make of Chaldee names, and it is generally supposed that they represent one of the oldest varieties of Gnosticism. To them belonged the Naasseni (from the Hebrew word for serpent), the first of those "who dared to celebrate with hymns the serpent which was the cause of transgression," and boasted that they "knew the depth" of truth:[3] the Peratae, who professed to impart the secret by which the initiated could "pass through the corruption" of matter.[4] If we inquire what was meant by this mysterious knowledge, we find Judaism, Christianity, and heathenism mixed together in the wildest confusion. They held that an æon descended on Jesus and made Him the prophet of the truth. But they also appealed to Moses, Hercules, Homer, Orpheus, Linus, to astrology and to heathen mysteries.[5] Probably Baur is right in regarding the Ophitic doctrine as a mere phase of Oriental heathenism, which ranks as a heresy only because it adopted some Christian terms.[6]

In Origen's time scarcely thirty of Simon's sect were left,[7] and we hear little from early writers about Menander, Cerinthus, or Saturninus. But in Alexandria the Gnostic tendencies gathered life and strength. There Gnosticism learned to clothe the ideas of Greek philosophy in a religious garb; there it formed its elaborate æon systems—partly Christian, partly Platonic, partly mythological. Basilides was the first of the great Alexandrian Gnostics. He had been a companion of Saturninus in Syria,[8] but it was in Alexandria that he began his public life, and the Basilidians were largely indebted to the schools of Greek philosophy in that city. By comparing the original teaching of Basilides, as given by Irenæus, with the later development of his doctrine as reported in the "Philosophumena," we can note the increasing influence which the physical theories of the Stoics exercised on the Basilidians.[1] The Alexandrian Valentinus made a fusion of Christianity with Platonism, much as the Neo-Platonists united the latter with heathenism. Valentinus went to Rome about 141 and stayed there till 157. He had numerous disciples, who formed two great divisions of Valentinianism, known as the Eastern and Western. Many of his followers could boast of fame and influence: one of them, indeed, Heracleon, will be remembered while history lasts, for he wrote the first commentary on St. John's Gospel. Evidently St. Irenæus considered Valentinianism the most formidable heresy of the day.

The Valentinians set out from the Platonic principle that the ideal or heavenly world—the "Pleroma," as they called it—alone possesses reality. God dwelt for countless ages alone with His thought (Ennoea), then after long silence produced two æons, who became the parents of others. Just as Plato pictures the supreme God as dwelling in eternity with the ideas or archetypes of things ever present to Him, so the Valentinians peopled their celestial world with a long series of æons, which are the Platonic "ideas" translated into the language of mythology. The æons are arranged on the Pythagorean and Platonic principles that certain numbers have a mystic efficacy. Some of the names given to them were suggested by the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity or by the divine attributes; others, such as "man," "the church," &c., point to the theory, also Platonic, that things below are shadows cast from a higher world.

So much for the nature of God and the æon world. But how did the material world with its attendant evils come to be? It could not, of course, on Valentinian principles, be attributed to the supreme God. They supposed that the æons were less perfect the further they were removed in the long line of generation from the Father of all. The lowest of them was overcome by desire to comprehend God, and by this fruitless desire gave birth to another æon, Hachamoth (חָכְמוֹת—*i.e.* wisdom), who wandered outside the æon world in helpless misery. Higher æons freed her from her sufferings, and these sufferings thickened into matter, and out of this pre-existent matter men and things were moulded by the demiurge, the "God of this world." This demiurge (here, again, we have both a notion and a name borrowed

[1] Iren. i. 24, 2, *PG*, vii. 674.
[2] Iren. *loc. cit.* The Essenes (see Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 1, 5) and the Judaizing Christians represented in the *Clem. Hom.* (see ii. 38, 50, 51, 52; iii. 46, 49; xviii. 20) made lections from Judaism in the same arbitrary way.
[3] *Philosophum.* v. 6, *seq.*
[4] *Ibid.* v. 16.
[5] *Ibid.* v. 26, v. 7, v. 8, v. 13. Some of them canonized all who were held up to special reprobation in the Old Testament.
[6] *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 195.
[7] *C. Cels.* i. 57, *PG*, xi. 765.
[8] Epiphan. *Haer.* xxiii. 7, xxiv. 1, *PG*, x

[1] Hilgenfeld and Lipsius rightly maintain against Baur and others that the oldest form of Basilidian doctrine is that refuted by Irenæus. See Hilgenfeld, *Jüdisch. Apocalyptik*, p. 287, *seq.*

from Plato) was the God of the Jewish religion, a being imperfect, ignorant, and, indeed, incapable of spiritual ideas. Of men some were earthly (χοϊκοί), made from the worse kind of matter, and necessitated to evil. Others were "animal" (ψυχικοί), capable of receiving the ordinary Jewish or Christian religion. They were endowed with free will, and would obtain a partial happiness hereafter if they led virtuous lives. But there was a third class, of "spiritual" men, in whom there were certain germs which had fallen from the aeon world. They were destined, whatever their actions might be, to enter the higher world, but meantime they were enslaved by the demiurge and by matter. An aeon, called Christ, clothed Himself in a body which looked like ours, and communicated to these aeons the "knowledge" of their higher destiny, teaching them to slight the god of this world and his law. The Valentinians held that it was not deeds, but the possession of a spiritual nature, which led to the higher world, and they made little account of Christ's death. Some of them held that only the body which He had formed for Himself could suffer; others, that Christ had descended on a man, Jesus, and abandoned Him at the crucifixion.[1]

Another Gnostic, Marcion as great as Valentinus, came to Rome a little later and made great changes in Gnosticism. He surrendered the fantastic aeon-systems,[2] but, on the other hand, he represented the demiurge god of this world as actually cruel and wicked.[3] He showed the bitterest hostility to the Old Testament, and in the New admitted only ten Epistles of Paul and the single Gospel of Luke, mutilating even these books and interpolating passages according to the requirements of his theory.[4] Marcion gave greater prominence than the Valentinians to moral ideas and to the death of Christ,[5] and apparently did not make salvation depend on an original difference in the natures of men.

In the preceding sketch an attempt has been made to note the principal features of Gnosticism; and though the division adopted —viz. into the Oriental Gnostics, the philosophical Gnostics of Alexandria, and the Marcionite Gnostics with their more practical and Christian religion, which presents many points of contact with modern Protestantism[6] —is not altogether satisfactory, it is perhaps as simple as any other which has been proposed. Some of the Gnostics were led by their belief in the impurity of matter to asceticism, others to unbridled licence; but we cannot classify the Gnostics on this principle, for we find the two opposite tendencies appearing in the same sect. At least we know that while Basilides respected the moral law, the Basilidians set it at naught.[1]

After Marcion the development of Gnosticism came to an end, though the heresy held its ground more or less for centuries, and the like tendencies reappear in the Manichees and in the Manichaean heretics of the Middle Ages. But Gnosticism has left an enduring mark on the history of the Church. It was in opposition to this heresy that Irenaeus wrote the earliest treatise which we possess on Catholic dogma. It was the conflict with this heresy from which the need arose of formulating with greater precision and stating with greater fulness the Catholic doctrines on the Incarnation, on the sacraments, and above all on the authority of the teaching Church. The Arian heresy itself did not produce a greater crisis in the Church's history, or contribute more to the development of Catholic doctrine.

(This account of Gnosticism has been made with some care from the sources, of which Irenaeus and the "Philosophumena" are the chief. But great use has also been made of Massuet's dissertations "De Gnosticorum Rebus"; Neander in the last edition of his "Church History"; Möhler's essays collected by Döllinger, 1839; Baur, "Christliche Gnosis," 1835, and "Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte," 3rd ed., 1863; Lipsius, "Gnosticismus," 1860; see also Arendzen in "Cath. Enc."; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," i. ch. xi. and in DAp. In the article MODERNISM the resemblance between the ancient Gnosticism and the modern heresy is pointed out.)

GOANESE SCHISM. [See MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN, p. 592.]

GOD. In the Apostles' and in the Nicene Creed we begin by professing our belief in one God, Creator of heaven and earth, and the Fourth Lateran Council explains more fully what we know by reason and revelation of His nature and attributes. The Vatican Council, although to a great extent it merely reiterates the Lateran definition, adds at least two important truths concerning God's relation to us and ours to Him. For, after stating that there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, almighty, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intellect and will and in every perfection, concerning Whom, seeing that He is one, singular, altogether simple and unchangeable spiritual substance, we must assert that He is in reality and essence distinct from the world, most blessed in Himself and of Him-

[1] See the account of Ptolemy the Valentinian, Iren. i. 8, *ad fin.*, *PG*, vii. 532. Cf. Massuet, *Diss.* i. n. 83. The differences among the Valentinians were not very serious.

[2] Massuet denies this (*Diss.* i. n. 138); but his only real authority—Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 23 and 24—is a very poor one in such a matter.

[3] *Philosophum.* vii. 30; Iren. i. 27, 2, *PG*, vii. 688.

[4] Epiphan. *Haer.* xlii. 9, PG, xli. 708.

[5] *Ib* xlii. 8; and the Armenian bishop Esnig, *apud* Baur, *hristliche Gnosis*, p. 272.

[6] N. nder (*Kirchengeschichte*, ii. p. 162) sees in Marcion "the spirit of a genuine Protestantism." He represents, says Lipsius (*Gnosticismus*, p. 165), "the Protestantism of ecclesiastical antiquity."

[1] Clem. Al. *Strom.* iii. 1, p. 509 *seq.*

self, and infinitely exalted above all that is or can be thought of besides Himself,—the council adds that God "by His most free counsel," constrained by no necessity of any kind, created the world; and then, in the next chapter, that we can, by the natural light of reason, and from the consideration of created things, attain a "sure" knowledge of God, Who is the beginning and end of all. It is the object of this article to explain the Vatican definition, and to show its perfect consistency with reason and with the previous teaching of theologians. It is obvious that we cannot attempt, in the space at our command, anything like a full and philosophical treatment of the subject, or even try to explain many of the difficulties which are often urged. The utmost which we hope to do consists in indicating the general line which Catholic philosophers and theologians have taken in proving the existence of God, and treating of His attributes.

We begin with a definition sufficient to explain the sense we give to the word "God," and which would be accepted probably both by theists and atheists, at least in civilized countries. By "God" we understand the one absolutely and infinitely perfect spirit who is the creator of all; and, taking this definition for granted, we proceed to state the following propositions:

I. It is certain from mere reason, apart from revelation, that God exists; and this may be proved, according to the council, from a consideration of created things. "His invisible things," St. Paul says (Rom. i. 20), "from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. His eternal power also and divinity: so that they" (*i.e.* the heathen, who did not believe in the true God) "are inexcusable." Everyone knows the popular form in which the argument is put, and has been put from the time of the Fathers of the Church. There are, it is said, plain marks in the mechanism of created things which show that they are the work of an intelligent being. The laws, for example, which govern the physical world must come from an intelligence of some kind, for they display a high degree of wisdom united to immense power. Plainly this intelligence does not reside in the things themselves. The world, therefore, was created and is supported and governed by an intelligent being whom we call God. Nor does there seem to be any valid answer to this argument. True, there are many things in the world which are not, so far as we can see, arranged to wise ends, and others which even seem to contradict the supposition that they come from a wise and benevolent Creator. All this may be admitted, but it cannot do away with the fact that we do on every side discern unmistakable traces of intelligent design. When these traces abound, it is not only humility but common sense which prompts us to acknowledge a wise Creator and to believe that all is created for a good end, though in many cases our ignorance prevents us from discerning it. A man who does not understand the mechanism of an engine is still within his rights when he concludes that it is due to an intelligence possessed of understanding which he himself lacks, and would most certainly transgress the plainest rules of common sense if he attributed all the parts of the machinery which he could not understand to mere chance, or, again, to a want of knowledge or power on the part of the constructor. Accordingly, we may fairly conclude that the argument from design will always keep its place among the proofs of God's existence. It has the great advantage of being easily grasped, and no valid objection can be urged against it.

While, however, St. Thomas gives this argument, he places it last among the five which he adduces at the beginning of the "Summa," 1ª, q. 2: "Cont. Gentes," I. xiii., and though it is the most popular it does not seem the most cogent. His other arguments are more metaphysical and subtle, but they have the advantage of leading the mind more directly and more conclusively to the belief in an absolutely perfect Being. His first argument is from motion, and it assumes no more than the patent fact that movement exists. Whence does it come? Not simply from the things themselves, for nothing can in the same respect be at once the cause and the subject of motion. Motion implies passivity: in other words, the thing moved must be under the influence of some thing distinct from itself which causes the movement or change. Life offers no instance to the contrary, for though, no doubt, we say, and rightly, that living things have the cause of motion in themselves, this only means that one part in living organisms communicates movements to other parts. The heart sends the blood through the frame, but the heart itself receives the first impulse from the parent to whom life is due. Nor are even intellectual beings the independent cause of their own movements. The will is influenced by the thoughts, the mind cannot think unless objects are proposed or have been originally proposed to it from without. Hence, even if we assume an infinite series of created things, still, so long as they all are subject to motion and change, this motion and change calls for explanation, and we are forced to the belief (a sublime one, truly) of a first mover, Himself immovable, of a Being who is at once the perfection of activity and life and the perfection of rest, the cause of movement and change, while He Himself changes not.

In modern scientific language St. Thomas's principle is evidently that known as Newton's First Law of Motion: "Every body continues in a state of rest or of uniform

motion in a straight line, unless it be compelled by impressed forces to change that state." In other words, any beginning, ceasing or change of motion in a material entity postulates the existence and action of a cause external to itself. To the current objection that all bodies move of themselves by gravitation one towards the other independent of the action of any external cause, it may suffice here to reply that they so move in virtue of the *external* force which placed them at a distance the one from the other.

The second proof is taken from the activity, as the former from the passivity, of things. Certain causes in the world produce certain effects, and we find these causes existing in a regular series or order. Causes are themselves the effects of other causes; the parent is the cause of his child's being, and, he himself owes his being to his own parents. Here again, if we prolong the series to infinity, we cannot escape from the conclusion that there is a God. Even in such a series, there is no cause which is not itself the effect of another cause—which does not require a cause outside of itself as the origin of its being. No explanation can be devised except that of a first cause, who is Himself uncaused.

The third argument is drawn from the contingency of things. Existence does not belong to the essence of things; they are not in their own nature determined to be, for most of them fade and die: of all of them it may be said, once they did not exist. Besides, then, the series of contingent entities (and here again we may, without prejudice to the argument, multiply the series to infinity) there is a necessary and absolute being.

We cannot do justice in the space at our command to the fourth argument of St. Thomas, taken "ex gradibus bonitatis"—*i.e.* from the degrees of perfection in things. It is perhaps the most subtle and difficult of all, and the commentators are not agreed about its meaning. The following account, however, may be given as the substance of the reasoning. We find by observation that creatures are more or less wise, noble, good, and the like. These qualities do not belong to their essence, for if so, there could be no question of more or less. Socrates and Plato were both men: humanity constituted their nature, and in the strict sense neither could be more truly and perfectly a man than the other, since the definition of man may be predicated of each. The very fact, then, that one man or angel is more wise, noble, powerful than another proves that wisdom, nobility, power, do not belong to the human or angelic natures as such or in themselves. As they are not wise, &c., in themselves, or in virtue of their mere existence, their perfection must come to them from without, and we end with the idea of a Being absolutely and perfectly wise, holy, strong, &c., because wisdom, holiness and strength are in Him more than mere attributes—are, in short, identical with His nature. Thus St. John says, not merely that God is charitable or loving, but that He is charity. Such a statement is untrue of any being except God. Summed up, the four arguments urge that finite being cannot explain its own definite limitations.

This argument involves the cogent proof drawn from the definite quantity of existing matter in the Universe, which in no conceivable manner can be either increased or diminished. Theoretically the masses of sun, moon, earth and stars could be weighed and the amount in myriads of tons expressed mathematically. The reason why the total is just what it is, not an ounce more nor an ounce less, cannot be in the mass itself but must perforce be as Scripture teaches, because an external agent has "ordered all things in measure and number and weight" (Wisd. xi. 16).

St. Thomas's fifth argument, viz. from design, has been already stated.

The reader will find another from conscience—*i.e.* from the fact attested by experience, that man has by nature a sense of right and wrong altogether distinct from the knowledge that certain actions are hurtful to others, hurtful to or unworthy of himself, drawn out with surpassing genius by Cardinal Newman, in his "Grammar of Assent." This argument has the advantage of leading us more directly than any of those given from St. Thomas to a true conception of God's character as a just, holy, and merciful God (cf. Rom. ii. 14–16).

Such are the chief arguments by which Catholic theologians prove God's existence. But are any arguments necessary? Have we not an intuitive perception of God's existence? Or again, can we not be sure of His existence the moment we understand the meaning which the word "God" is intended to convey? The great majority of theologians answer this question in the negative. St. Thomas holds that the mode of cognition corresponds to the nature of him who knows. Our soul, he says, informs a material body. By nature, therefore, it can only know directly things which are themselves, partly at least, material. It recognizes the existence of purely spiritual beings only by a process of inference. But instead of explaining and developing this Thomist (or rather Aristotelian principle), we will take the simpler course of pointing out the flaw in the reasoning of those who have advocated the theory that the knowledge of God's existence is self-evident, or, as the thesis is often formulated, can be proved *a priori*. St. Anselm, who has been followed in modern times by Descartes, began with the assumption that all men, theists and atheists alike, understand the name of God to denote the most perfect being that can be conceived, and so far we may

allow that he was right. When, however, he goes on to argue that the idea of the utmost perfection implies existence, he confuses, as St. Thomas justly objects, between the real and the imaginary. The mere fact that we can form a notion of a being the most perfect that can be conceived cannot prove that such being has existence except in our imagination. Nor have the attempts of ontologists in our own day to show that the belief in God is intuitive been more successful. We begin, they say, with the notion of being, and this notion of existence, without which we can understand nothing, is nothing else than the divinity. The obvious answer is, that although we do begin with the vague and abstract notion of existence, the existence which we predicate of the things around is wholly distinct from the self-existent and all-perfect spirit whom we call God. In 1861 the Roman Inquisition decided that ontologism as it has just been expounded could not be "safely taught" ("tuto tradi").

II. *The Nature of God.*—All human conceptions of God's nature are of course imperfect; still, since reason enables us to ascertain God's existence, it also enables us to know something of His nature.[1] We learn what God is, partly by removing from the idea we form of Him all perfections which belong to creatures, partly by attributing to Him, in a more excellent form, all the perfection we find in them. The schoolmen set out with the notion of God as "pure actuality," which notion is immediately derived from the proof given for the divine existence. Creatures have potentiality, or the power of becoming what they are not, in different modes and degrees. There was a time when they were not, and merely had the capacity of existence: once existing, they are capable of further perfections, which determine their nature; and again, they are subject to the possibility of falling away from the perfection of their nature, or of ceasing to exist altogether. All these capacities are expressed by the Aristotelian word "potentia," which is opposed to "actus," or actuality. Now because capacity can be reduced to act only by something which is already in act, God as the first cause, as the mover of all, Himself immovable and changeless, as the necessary and self-existent being, must be pure actuality. He is infinite in all perfection, for otherwise He would be subject to the capacity of change and improvement. His essence, as we have already seen, is one with His existence. His attributes also, such as goodness, justice, and the like, are identical with His nature. Goodness, justice, &c., perfect an intellectual or rational creature, but nothing can perfect the infinite and perfect nature of God. His justice is really one with His mercy and love; and although we rightly distinguish the one from the other, this is only because He, notwithstanding the absolute simplicity of His nature, produces in His government of the world a variety of effects equivalent to those which would be produced by distinct attributes in creatures. All the pure perfections of creatures are found in Him, and though certain qualities of creatures, such as bodily form, are wanting in God, who is a pure spirit, this is because these qualities involve imperfection. Lastly, all these perfections belong to the one true God. If there were more gods than one, there must be something to constitute the individuality, to distinguish the one deity from the other. Either, then, the distinguishing attribute must be a defect or else a perfection proper to the one deity and absent in the other. Each alternative is inconsistent with infinite perfection.

III. An important conclusion results from the principle that God by natural reason can be known as the author of the world. Men can be excused on the plea of invincible ignorance, if they in good faith reject certain truths of faith. But all men who have come to the use of reason are bound to know, love, and obey God. (The Catholic philosophers treat of God in natural theology; the theologians in the treatise "De Deo," *e.g.* Franzelin, Billot; the patristic teaching will be found summarized in Petavius "De Deo" and Thomassinus, "De Deo"; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." I, 154 *sqq.*; W. G. Ward, "Philosophy of Theism"; Chossat, Mangenot, Le Bachelet, Moisant in DThC, *Dieu*—a most able treatment of the subject from the philosophical, patristic, and scholastic points of view. See also the last part of Kleutgen's "Theologie der Vorzeit.")

GOD-FATHER, GOD-MOTHER. [See SPONSORS.]

GOLDEN BULL (BULLA AUREA). The ordinance of Charles IV. regulating the election of the emperors of Germany (1356). It was so called by reason of the imperial golden seal affixed to it.

GOLDEN LEGEND. [See LEGEND, GOLDEN.]

GOLDEN NUMBER. [See CYCLE.]

GOLDEN ROSE. An ornament blessed by the Pope every year on *Laetare* Sunday (fourth Sunday in Lent), and sent occasionally to Catholic sovereigns, to churches and sanctuaries, to generals, and to Catholic cities or republics. Originally, it was a single flower of wrought gold, coloured red; afterwards the golden petals were decked with rubies and other gems; finally, the form adopted was that of a thorny branch, with several flowers and leaves, and the principal flower at the top, all of pure gold. The practice appears to have arisen in the thirteenth century, but by what Pope it was instituted in its present form is uncertain.

[1] Here is the radical difference between the view of Catholic theologians and that propounded with great ability by Mansel in his famous Bampton Lectures.

That Popes used to send presents in very early times to princes who had deserved well of the Church is well known: Gregory the Great was accustomed to send with this intention golden keys containing filings of St. Peter's chains, and Boniface V. sent to Edwin, king of Northumbria, in 626, a *camisia*, or shirt with a gold ornament, and to Ethelberga his queen a gilded ivory comb and a silver mirror.[1] Urban V. sent a Golden Rose in 1366 to Joanna of Naples. Among the recipients of the Rose have been Gonzalo de Cordova, Napoleon III., Isabella II. of Spain, and Queen Marie Amélie of Portugal. Morone records a large number of instances in which this favour has been conferred: a few of the most noteworthy are the following. Henry VIII. received the Rose from three Popes, the last time from Clement VII. in 1524. It was sent to his daughter, Queen Mary, by Julius III., in 1555. The republic of Lucca was thus honoured by Pius IV., in 1564; the Lateran Basilica by Pius V. three years later; and the sanctuary of Loreto, by Gregory XIII., in 1584. The Queen of France, Maria Theresa, received it from Clement IX., in 1668; and the Queen of Poland, Mary Casimir, from Innocent XI., in 1684, in recognition of the recent deliverance of Vienna by her valiant husband, John Sobieski. Benedict XIII. (1726) granted the Golden Rose to the cathedral of Capua; and in 1833 it was sent by Gregory XVI. to the Basilica of St. Mark's, Venice. (Morone, "Dizionario Ecclesiastico.")

GOOD FRIDAY. [See HOLY WEEK.]

GOOD SHEPHERD, SISTERS OF THE. The full title of the institute is: "Sisters of our Lady of the Good Shepherd of Angers." A society called the Sisters of "Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge" was founded by B. John Eudes in 1641, for the care and reformation of fallen women. This still exists in a flourishing condition. Out of it has grown the order of the Good Shepherd, founded by Mary Euphrasia Pelletier (d. 1868; declared Venerable in 1897). The objects are the same as those of the parent institute, but instead of each community being independent, all are subject to the mother-house at Angers. Good Shepherd convents have been established in all the quarters of the globe and have been the means of rescuing countless souls.

Many of the penitents received into the homes wish to remain there for the rest of their lives. For these an institute has been founded, distinct from, but under the direction of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. These "Magdalens" form a strictly contemplative Order under the rule of the Third Order of Mt. Carmel. (See Boulay, "Vie du Père Eudes"; Paquier, "La Vénérable Mère Marie de St. Euphrasie Pelletier"; R. Eaton, "Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia.")

GOOD WORKS. [See MERIT.]

[1] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 10, 11.

GOSPEL (LITURGICAL USE OF). The practice of reading the Gospels in the Christian assemblies is mentioned by Justin Martyr, and prescribed in all the liturgies. The First Council of Orange, in 441, and that of Valentia in Spain (Hefele-Leclercq, II. 444, 1067) order the Gospel to be read after the Epistle and before the offertory, in order that the catechumens might listen to the words of Christ and hear them explained by the bishop. We give here, first of all, the ceremonies with which the Gospel is sung at High Mass according to the Latin rite, adding illustrations from history and the other liturgies. We conclude with an account of the way the Gospel is read at Low Mass.

I. *The Gospel at High Mass.*—The deacon places the book of the Gospels on the altar, kneels and prays that God may purify his lips, as He purified those of Isaiah, takes the book of the Gospels, asks the priest's blessing, and then goes to a place in the sanctuary on the right hand[1] of the altar, where the Gospel is to be sung. The deacon is accompanied by acolytes bearing lights; he announces the title of the Gospel, the choir singing "Glory to Thee, O Lord"; he makes the sign of the cross on the book, then on his forehead, lips and breast; he incenses the book, the incense having been previously blessed, and sings the Gospel, which the priest has previously read in a low voice on the right side of the altar. Finally, he incenses the priest, to whom the book is presented open, and who kisses it, saying "By the words of the Gospel may our sins be blotted out."

The singing of the Gospel was not always reserved to the deacon, as has been shown in the article under that word. In ancient times the book of the Gospels was carried in procession to the altar at the beginning of Mass, a custom noted in the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, and observed for a long time in the West. This procession fell into disuse when Missals containing all that is said or sung at Mass replaced the old Gospel book, sacramentaries, lectionaries, and antiphonaries, which contained different parts of the Mass, each in a separate form. All the ancient liturgies recognize the use of incense at the Gospel. It signifies the "good odour of Christ." The lights at the Gospel were familiar to St. Jerome, and St. Isidore, who says they were carried in sign of joy, and to signify that Christ is the light of souls. In the old churches, which were usually turned to the east, the south side was occupied by the men, and down to the middle of the ninth century the deacon turned towards them when he reached the "ambo" or place where the Gospel was sung. On the other hand, Remi of Auxerre, who wrote about 882, assumes that the Gospel is read towards the north, the region of darkness, in order to

[1] *I.e.* the right hand of the crucifix or of one who stands with his back to the altar.

signify the power Christ's words have to annul evil influences. Le Brun thinks that this mystical reason was commonly adopted; that then a similar evil signification was attributed to the left side of the priest (*i.e.* his left when he faces the altar), and that hence it became usual to move the Missal which the priest uses to his left, before he reads the Gospel. In the older Ordines, the Missal is not changed to the left till the offertory,[1] when convenience obviously requires the moving of the book. The people stand at the singing or reading of the Gospel, to indicate their alacrity in obeying Christ's words; and for a like reason members of military orders stand with drawn swords. In the earliest of the Roman Ordines, all the clergy kiss the book of the Gospels, and Jonas, bishop of Orleans in the ninth century, speaks of this rite as an ancient one even in his day. It appears from Remi of Auxerre that the people made the sign of the cross at the end as well as at the beginning of the Gospel.

II. At Low Masses the book is moved to the Gospel side at the end of the Gradual, the priest says the prayer "Munda," &c., in the middle of the altar, and begs a blessing from God, saying "Jube, Domine, benedicere," "Pray, Lord, a blessing," whereas the deacon uses the form "Jube, domne," &c., "Pray, Sir, a blessing." He then signs the book, &c., as has been described above, the server saying "Gloria tibi, Domine." At the end the server says "Praise be to thee, O Christ," and the priest kisses the book, with the prayer "By the words of the Gospel," &c. The old custom was to say "Amen" at the end of the Gospel, as is still done in the Mozarabic Mass and by the Benedictines after the reading of the Gospel at Matins. Alexander of Hales tells us that some in his time said "Amen," others "Deo gratias," but his words imply that "Laus tibi, Christe" had already become the prevalent form. (See Le Brun, and Benedict XIV. "De Miss.")

III. The reading of the Gospel of St. John (i. 1–14) at the end of the Mass is a late development made compulsory by St. Pius V. in 1570. Till lately it was still not printed in the Ordinary of the Mass. Whenever an office is commemorated whose Gospel is begun in the ninth lesson at Matins, that Gospel is read instead of Jn. i. (Duchesne, "Christian Worship," 58, 167, 196; Fortescue "The Mass," 257–261, 280; Baudot, "Les Evangéliaires.")

GOTHIC LITURGIES. [See LITURGIES.]

GOTHS. [See MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN.]

GOTTESCALCUS, or GOTTSCHALK. [See PREDESTINATION.]

GRACE. I. *Definition and Divisions of Grace.*—All that we receive from God—our existence, our natural powers, the good things of this life—are God's free gift and may therefore be rightly called graces or favours received from Him. But God has been pleased to call man to a supernatural end—*i.e.* to a destiny out of all proportion to the exigencies of his nature, and which cannot be attained by the use of his natural powers. Man has been created that he may see God face to face in His glory, and God, who calls him to eternal life, also furnishes the means by which it may be secured. Hence the Scriptural writers and the theologians of the Church distinguish grace from nature; and grace in this stricter and narrower sense may be defined as a supernatural gift freely bestowed by God on rational or intellectual creatures in order that they may attain eternal life. We say that it is freely given, apart, at least in the first instance, from all merit or claim of ours; otherwise, as the Apostle argues, it would not deserve the name of grace. We call it supernatural in order to distinguish it from gifts which come to us in the natural order, although the definition is not meant to exclude those special providences which dispose even natural events for the furtherance of our salvation. We speak of it as bestowed on intellectual and rational creatures, for angels and men are the only creatures capable of knowing and loving God, and consequently the only recipients of grace. All grace since the Fall has been given to man on account of Christ's merits. Whether the grace of the angels or of Adam in his innocence was due to the same cause is a question freely discussed in the theological schools.

Grace thus understood is divided into external and internal grace. The former term includes such external gifts as the preaching of the Gospel, the examples of Christ and the Saints, occasions of good actions, the removal of exterior temptations —in a word, all the effects of supernatural providence by which the cause of our salvation is promoted. Internal grace directly affects the understanding and the will, either inhering in the soul as a permanent quality, or merely moving and aiding the soul at the time to acts of supernatural virtue. Internal graces may be conferred for two great ends. They may be given in order that the recipient may promote the spiritual good of others among whom he labours, and in this case the schoolmen speak of graces as "gratis datae," and infer from 1 Cor. xii. 8 that they are nine in number—viz. the word of wisdom, the grace of healing, &c. Or, on the other hand, graces may be given with the direct object of bringing the subjects of the grace nearer to God, and such graces are called "gratum facientes"— graces which make man pleasing to his Creator. We have already explained that internal graces may be actual (*i.e.* passing movements of the soul by God) or habitual (*i.e.* permanent qualities residing in the soul or its faculties). Habitual grace

[1] So even an *Ordo of Monte Cassino*, written about 1100.

may inhere in the substance of the soul, which it sanctifies and renews by the very fact of its presence there. It is then called sanctifying grace, and is, says the Council of Trent (sess. vi. can. 11), shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us. This sanctifying grace makes us the friends of God and partakers of the divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4), it creates within us new hearts and spirits (Ezech. xxxvi. 26), and its existence in the soul is incompatible with mortal sin (1 John iii. 9). The infused virtues are another form of habitual grace. They inhere in the faculties of the soul; they do not directly sanctify, but they complete and perfect sanctification and make the soul capable of supernatural acts. Actual grace also is subdivided into grace of operation (*gratia operans*) and of co-operation—the former exciting the mind to action, the latter working with it and assisting it in operation already begun—into prevenient and subsequent, into sufficient and efficacious grace, &c. This last subdivision will be explained in the account which we have to give of the doctrinal systems of grace maintained in the Church.

II. *Catholic Doctrine on Grace.*—The Church teaches, in opposition to the Pelagians, not only that the grace of Christ is absolutely necessary for justification before God, but also that without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Ghost and His assistance a man "can neither believe, hope, love, or repent, as it is necessary he should do, in order that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him" (Concil. Trid. sess. vi. De Justif. can. 3). In no case can a man merit the first grace by natural good works. "No man," says our Blessed Saviour, "can come to Me except the Father who hath sent Me draw him" (Jn. vi. 44); and the Apostle, "It is God who worketh in us to will and to do" (Philipp. ii. 13). The very wish to believe or to rise from sin comes, according to the definition of the Council of Orange (can. 3, 4, 5), from the grace of God. Moreover, although we can by our own strength do good actions in the natural order, and although our nature is not wholly depraved and corrupt, even after the Fall and before it is healed by the grace of Christ, still so great is the weakness left by original sin, and by the disorder consequent on the very fact that a man destitute of grace is necessarily turned away from his last end—viz. God apprehended by supernatural means—that we need grace in order to resist grievous temptations against natural virtue, nor can we fulfil the whole natural law of God without its help. Hence Scripture constantly attributes triumph over temptation to the grace of God, who with temptation makes a way of escape that we may be able to bear it (1 Cor. x. 13).[1] Finally, even a person who is in a state of grace and friendship with God needs a new impulse of actual grace before he can think a good thought or perform a good deed;[1] while a special grace, which cannot be merited, is required in order that he may persevere to the end. "In the case of those who are regenerate and holy there is always need to implore God's help that they may come to a good end or persist in a good work" (II. Council of Orange, can. 10). In short, the world of grace is like the world of nature, which is not only created but also sustained at each instant by the hand of God.

As the Pelagians and Semipelagians erred in the estimate they formed of man's natural powers, so the Calvinists fell into another and much more pernicious error in denying the freedom of the will altogether and making grace irresistible; and the Jansenist doctrine on these points is substantially identical with that of the Calvinists. The Council of Trent (sess. vi. *De Justif.*) condemns under anathema those who maintain that the will of man is merely passive under the action of grace, and has not the power of resisting *it*. It also defines that a state of grace is not, as the Calvinists supposed, the mere external favour of God, but that it is a gift inherent in the soul, in virtue of which the sinner is not only accounted just, but really becomes so, and that the gift of sanctifying grace is forfeited by any single mortal sin. We discuss these points more fully under the articles CALVINISM, FINAL PERSEVERANCE, JUSTIFICATION, MERIT, only remarking here that the very essence, not only of Christianity, but of natural religion, is at issue in the dispute between Catholics and Calvinists. That God will accept no man as just except he really be so; that nothing else, neither ritual nor sacrifice, nor imputed merit, can be taken as a substitute for personal holiness—that is the central truth of all religion; it is the very truth which the prophets of God maintained against the priests of Baal or Moloch. We are of course well aware that there are many excellent Christians who profess Calvinism, and do not dream of holding the consequences which may fairly be deduced from their tenets. But this should not blind us to the fact that the Calvinistic theories on imputation, irresistible grace, the impossibility of falling from a state of grace, &c. are in themselves not only irreligious but immoral.

III. *Theological Systems on Grace.*—All Catholics, as we have seen, believe in the necessity of grace for all supernatural acts, and therefore also, since God desires the salvation of all, they hold that He offers to all grace, really and abundantly sufficient for their salvation. They further maintain that the will always remains free to reject grace or to correspond with it. But when we inquire

[1] On this part of the subject, see the Second Council of Orange, anno 529, confirmed by Pope Boniface II. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1085 *sqq.*)

[1] *I.e.*, of course, a thought or deed profitable to eternal salvation.

into the nature of the distinction between efficacious and sufficient grace, Catholic theologians give different answers. We begin with a general definition which may suffice for the understanding of the question in dispute. A sufficient grace is one which merely enables the soul to perform a supernatural act; an efficacious grace is one which does really effect the purposes for which it is given. Thus Judas received sufficient, Peter efficacious, grace for conversion: in other words, grace was given capable of converting Judas, but to Peter grace which actually did convert him. The question is, whence does the efficacity of grace proceed?

The Dominican theologians defend what is usually called the Thomist system of grace, because those who hold it allege that it is in substance to be found in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas.[1] This theory may be stated in the following propositions:—

(1) Second causes act only so far as they are determined to act by the first cause—*i.e.* God. Hence it is not enough to say that the power to work out our salvation comes from God. He also moves to the good action itself, and the existence of two kinds of grace must be admitted—viz. sufficient, which merely enables the recipient to act; and efficient, which is always followed by, and, indeed, produces the action ("dat non solum posse sed agere").

(2) God sincerely wishes all men to be saved, and offers to all the means of salvation. But He wishes some to be saved absolutely, and considering all the circumstances; others, only on certain conditions which are not realized. To the latter He gives sufficient, to the former efficacious, grace.

(3) In either case grace is given without any claim or merit on man's part.

(4) There is an intrinsic difference between sufficient and efficacious grace—*i.e.* between the graces in themselves—so that it is always true to say that a man consented to grace given because it was efficacious: never true that the grace was efficacious because the man consented.

(5) Man always remains free and capable of merit under efficacious grace: free and responsible for his demerit with merely sufficient grace For God as the first cause in no way interferes with the agency of second causes, but, on the contrary, moves each second cause according to its nature, so that beings with free will do not cease to be free because efficaciously moved by God. Sufficient grace gives full power to act, so that a man is perfectly responsible if he does not exert the power; while efficacious grace leaves perfect power of resistance. The reader will perceive the extreme difficulty, or, as the adversaries of Thomism would say, the impossibility of reconciling this last with the foregoing propositions; but the fact that the Thomists do honestly hold this last proposition places a wide gulf between Thomism on the one hand, and Calvinism and Jansenism on the other.

The first three of the Thomist propositions are admitted[1] by that large number of Jesuit theologians known as Congruists, but they make the efficacity of grace depend, not on anything in the grace itself, but on the fact that it is given under circumstances which, as God foresees, are suitable to the disposition of the recipient. He foreknows what all creatures would do in all possible circumstances—in what combination of circumstances they would accept or reject grace (the famous *scientia media*). If He decrees their predestination absolutely He gives them grace in circumstances under which they will certainly correspond to it; otherwise He confers grace which is in itself perfectly sufficient, but which they will certainly reject. Congruism has the advantage of admitting the full force of scriptural texts which attribute the whole difference between sinner and saint to the grace of God, while at the same time, there is no difficulty in reconciling it with belief in the freedom of the will.

The Molinists (so called from Louis Molina, a celebrated Jesuit) hold that the efficacy of grace depends simply on the will which freely accepts it. The difference is not in the graces in themselves, nor even in the circumstances under which they are given. A powerful grace given at the most favourable juncture may be rejected, and so remain merely sufficient; a much less powerful grace may be given with much less favourable circumstances, and the consent of the will may make it efficacious. God predestines those who, as He foresees, will correspond to that grace which He offers to all.

The Augustinians advocate a third system. Like the Thomists, they admit an intrinsic difference between efficacious and sufficient grace, but they maintain this position on purely theological, not on philosophical grounds: on the weakness of man's will since the Fall, not on the general principle that all second causes must be moved to action by the first cause. Hence they propound a Molinist theory for the period before, a Thomist theory for that after, the Fall.

A singular theory, adopted, however, by St. Alphonsus in his treatise on prayer, was devised by Tournely, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and author of a "Dogmatic Theology" justly held in high esteem. Tournely supposed that God gave men first of all sufficient grace, in the Molinist sense, for certain initial works, especially prayer, which grace, if rightly used, was followed by grace efficacious in the Thomist sense. The obvious

[1] An allegation, however, by no means admitted by their antagonists.

[1] So at least Billuart puts the case in his treatise *De Gratia*, but probably the Jesuit theologians would demur to the form at least of the first proposition.

objection is that prayer, if it fulfils the conditions necessary for obtaining the requests made, is one of the most excellent and difficult of all good works, so that either there is no need at all of grace efficacious in its own nature, or else such grace would be imperatively demanded for prayer.

The controversy on grace and predestination between the Dominicans and Jesuits began in Spain about the year 1580. Bañez, a Dominican professor at Salamanca, maintained the intrinsic efficacity of grace as explained above. Setting out from the notion of God as the first cause and the first mover, he represented efficacious grace as determining the free consent of the will by "physical premotion," and this premotion which was infallibly followed by the consent of the will came, as he alleged, from God's absolute decree that the person so moved by grace should correspond to it. The Jesuit college at the same university met this doctrine of intrinsic efficacity of grace and physical premotion on the part of God with vigorous opposition. As early as 1581, a Jesuit, Prudentius de Monte-Mayor, defended in public disputation a doctrine which had already been propounded by another member of his order, Fonseca, in 1566—viz. that God knew, apart from any decree except the general one of concurring with free agents in this determination, where and when the will would correspond to or reject grace, and that efficacious grace was simply that which, as God foresaw, would be accepted. This doctrine was eagerly defended in the Society of Jesus. Suarez maintained it at Coimbra, Vasquez at Alcalà, Gregory of Valentia at Ingolstadt, Lessius in the Netherlands, Toletus at Rome. But it was Molina, professor at Evora, in Portugal, and a disciple of Fonseca, who carried out the principles of his master to their utmost consequences. His famous book, "Liberi Arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia," was published at Lisbon in 1588. It made an epoch in theology, and roused the keenest controversy amongst Catholics for more than a century. The controversy turned on predestination as well as grace, for Molinists held[1] (1) that sufficient grace became efficacious simply by the free consent of the will which corresponded to it; (2) that God predestined those who He foresaw would consent to grace, so that predestination was an effect of God's prevision that His creatures would consent, not *vice versa*.[2]

[1] We say Molinists in deference to usage, though the name is really inaccurate. Lessius held proposition (2). Molina, on the contrary, "doctrinam gratiae congruae una cum praedestinatione ante praevisa merita et bonorum operum praedefinitionem adumbravit." Schneemann, *Controversiarum de divinae gratiae liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus*, p. 237.

[2] On the Congruist and Thomist theories, God, apart from all prevision of merit or demerit, determines who are to be saved, and then gives to the elect efficacious grace by which they freely merit their salvation.

In 1594 Clement VIII. intimated that he reserved the decision of the controversy to himself, and in November 1597 the famous Congregations *de Auxiliis*—*i.e.* concerning the helps or assistance of grace—were instituted for the examination of the question. The congregation consisted of eight consultors (of these eight two were absent, and were replaced by three new members), of whom all except two condemned Molina's book after considering it for little more than two months. They repeated this adverse sentence after a second consultation. Molina begged to be heard in his own defence, and accordingly the Pope ordered that conferences should be held, in which the generals of both orders and the great Cardinal Bellarmine took part. The limits of the question were seriously narrowed in these conferences, for the Jesuits refused to commit themselves to the opinions of Molina and Lessius on predestination, and the dispute was confined to the efficacity of grace. In 1600 Cardinal Madrucci, who presided at the conferences, died, and the conferences themselves ended without definite result. Once more Molina's book was submitted to a congregation on which two Jesuits and two Dominicans sat, and twenty propositions contained in it were censured by a majority of the members. From 1602 to 1606 congregations were held in the Vatican before Clement VIII. and Paul V. The Dominicans were represented by Didacus Alvarez and Thomas of Lemos, the Jesuits during the first nine sessions by Gregory of Valentia, and later by Arrubal, Bastida, and De Salas. The Spanish Court pressed for the condemnation of the Jesuits, who had offended Spanish prejudices and selfishness by espousing the cause of Henry IV. in France. It has been alleged that Clement VIII., shortly before his death in 1605, had prepared a bull condemning Molina, but this supposed fact has never been proved. In any case the bull was not promulgated, and the congregations, which met sixty-eight times under Clement, held twelve more sessions under Paul V. On August 28, 1607, the latter Pope convoked the College of Cardinals (excluding, however, those who had been consultors or secretaries of the congregation), and handed an encyclical to the generals of the Dominicans and Jesuits, which they in turn were to communicate to the provincials. The theologians of each party were allowed to hold and teach their respective opinions, provided they did not stigmatize their opponents with theological censures. Urban VIII. and Clement XII. declared themselves in the same sense.

In 1613 Aquaviva, general of the Jesuits, required the members of his order to teach the doctrine on grace known as Congruism, and defended by Bellarmine, Suarez, and others as distinct from the doctrine of Molina, Lessius, Becanus, &c., known as Molinism

(but see Schneemann, p. 302 *seq.*). It is scarcely necessary to add that the Molinist and Congruist theories are held by many theologians who are not Jesuits, just as the so-called Thomist doctrine is accepted by many besides the Dominicans.

All the large courses of dogmatic theology published during the seventeenth and earlier part of the eighteenth century enter fully into the controversies on grace. Santamour and other writers inclined to Jansenism published acts of the Congregations *de Auxiliis*, attributing them to Pegna, Coronell, and De Lemos, along with a constitution said to have been drawn up, but never promulgated, by Paul V., in condemnation of Molinism. The Pope is said to have abstained from promulgating this constitution because the Jesuits at the time were suffering for their obedience to the interdict issued by Paul V. against Venice. But in 1654 Innocent X. declared that no faith was to be given to these documents. In spite of this, the Dominican Hyacinth Serry compiled a history of the controversy, drawn in great measure from the spurious Acts. It was published at Louvain early in the eighteenth century. In reply, the Jesuit Livinus Meyer, under the pseudonym of Theodore Eleutherius, wrote his "Historia Controversiarum de div. gratiae auxilio sub SS. PP. Sixto V., Clemente VIII., et Paulo V." (Antwerp, 1705.) A Bavarian Carmelite, Alexander a Sto. Johanne, in his continuation of Fleury, repeated the charges of Serry, and was answered in the Latin treatise of the ex-Jesuit Mangold, "Reflexions on Fr. Alexander's Continuation of Fleury." See also Mannhart, "De ingenua indole gratiae efficacis," in Zaccarias "Thesaurus," tom. v., and Schneemann's treatise quoted above. (See St. Thomas, 1a 2ae, qq. 109–114, and the Commentaries thereon. Most of the dogmatic theologians have a separate treatise "De Gratia," and are well known to the student; we may mention however, a small but profound work by Scheeben, "The Glories of Divine Grace" (Eng. tr.). The present position of the controversies on Grace may be studied in Dummermuth, "S. Thomas et Doctrina Praemotionis Physicae" and "Defensio Doctrinae S. Thomae de Praemotione Physica" on the Thomist side; and on the Molinist side, Frins, "S. Thomae Doctrina de Cooperatione Dei cum omni natura creata, praesertim libera, seu S. Thomas Praedeterminationis Physicae Adversarius.")

GRACE AT MEALS. In this expression "grace" represents the Latin *gratiae*, thanks (see Mt. xv. 36; Mk. viii. 6; Jn. vi. 11); but it also covers the notion of *benedictio*, blessing (Mt. xiv. 19; Mk. vi. 41; Lk. ix. 16); hence the Italian equivalent to "saying grace" is "benedire la tavola." In the passages above cited, and also in other places, our Lord sets us the example of praying for the blessing of God on the daily bread which He gives us, and giving Him thanks for what He thus provides, both before and after partaking of it. Christians have from the first complied with this teaching. "Whether you eat or drink," says St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 31), "or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God"; and this precept is further developed in Col. iii. 17: "Whatsoever you do in word or in work, all things do ye in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, *giving thanks* to God and the Father by Him." Compare also 1 Thess. v. 18, and 1 Tim. iv. 3. Many of the Fathers—*e.g.* Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Basil—enjoin the punctual performance of this duty. St. Basil says[1] "Let prayers be said before taking food, in meet acknowledgment of the gifts of God. both of those which He is now giving and of those which He has put in store for the future. Let prayers be said after food, containing a return of thanks for the things given and request for those promised." A variety of specimens of early graces are given in the Gelasian Sacramentary, which dates from the end of the fifth century. In the Apostolical Constitutions as given in Bunsen's "Hippolytus" (§ 21), meals in the church are spoken of, of which the bishop is always to be ready to partake along with the faithful, and at which he is to distribute a portion of the bread among those present, "for a blessing," before they begin to eat. This custom still prevails in the East, and a relic of it survives in the *eulogies* or *pain bénit* of certain French churches [see EULOGIA]. The Constitutions also say "Everything which they shall eat they shall give thanks to God for."[2] (Smith and Cheetham, art. by Scudamore.)

GRADUAL (*gradus*, a step) An antiphon sung after the Epistle, and so called either because it used to be sung on the altar steps, or because it was sung while the deacon ascended the steps of the ambo to sing the Gospel. It is also called "responsory," because it answers to the Epistle, or because sung antiphonally, or because in some places it had the form of a Matins' Responsory. Such a Gradual is that still sung at the Blessing of the Psalms. The "Liber Pontificalis," in the Life of Celestine I., attributes its origin to that Pope; others refer its introduction to Gregory the Great. (Benedict XIV. "De Missa.") But Tertullian mentions the psalms between the lessons ("De Anima," ix., PL, ii. 660), and St. Augustine says "We have heard first the lesson from the Apostle . . . . *Then we sang a psalm* . . . . After that the lesson of the Gospel," &c. ("Sermo clxxvi." 1, PL, xxxviii. 950.)

[1] Ep. ii. ad Greg. Naz. (quoted in Scudamore's art. in *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*).
[2] *Apost. Constit.*, from the Coptic, Tattam, 1848; p. 74.

It is usual to speak of all the chant between the Epistle and Gospel as the Gradual. But this chant really consists of two separate parts, of which only the former is the true Gradual, the latter being the Alleluia (q.v.), replaced on fast days by the Tract (q.v.). In the earlier ages there were two lessons before the Gospel, one taken from the Old Testament and the other the Epistle proper. The Gradual followed the first, the Alleluia or Tract the second. (See Fortescue, "The Mass," 265 sqq.; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," 114; Gihr, "Das Heilige Messopfer," 408–427.)

GRADUAL PSALMS. A title given to Psalms cxx.–cxxxiv. in the Hebrew, cxix.–cxxxiii. in the Vulgate numeration.[1] All these Psalms have much in common. All except Ps. cxxxii. are short; the same tone of joyful trust in God's protection runs through them all; and although some of them (viz. Ps. cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxi., cxxxiii.) are ascribed to David, cxxvii. to Solomon, it is pretty plain that they all belong to the early period of the return from the exile.

I. The Latin "canticum graduum" is a translation of the Hebrew שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת (in cxxi. לַמַּעֲלוֹת), which occurs in the inscriptions. The LXX have ᾠδὴ ἀναβαθμῶν. But it is impossible to say for certain what the title means. The following are the chief attempts at solving the problem:—

(1) The oldest explanation given by Jewish and Christian scholars, and implied perhaps in the LXX translation, is that the psalms were so called because sung on the fifteen steps which led from the court of the men to that of the women. According to the Talmud, two priests were stationed on the evening of the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles at the top of the steps with trumpets, while the Levites sang the psalms on the steps (according to a later tradition one psalm on each step). We have no historical evidence apart from the Talmud for such a custom; the steps most likely did not exist till Herod's time; and there is strong reason to suspect that the custom was imagined to account for the title of the psalms.

(2) Others have suggested that the psalms were sung by the exiles in returning or "going up" from Babylon, so that the word translated "graduum" would answer to the Greek ἀνάβασις. This explanation was adopted, partially at least, by the Syriac translator, and seems to have been in the mind of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion when they used ἀναβάσεις to render מַעֲלוֹת. This view was advocated by Chrysostom and Theodoret among the Fathers, as well as by modern scholars of name. No doubt the words מַעֲלֵה מְסִבֶּל do occur in Esdras vii. 9, in the sense of return, or ἀνάβασις, from Babel. But the plural number in מַעֲלוֹת retained in the Vulgate "graduum" is against this interpretation; and, besides, Ps. cxxii. implies that the exile was over some considerable time, and the Temple and city rebuilt.

(3) Closely allied with the foregoing is another explanation adopted by many great scholars—*e.g.* by Eichhorn, Maurer, Hengstenberg, Keil, Hupfeld, Kuenen, &c.—and which has very much to recommend it. They suppose that these psalms were sung during the "goings up" or pilgrimages to Jerusalem for the great annual feasts. This account satisfies the laws of grammatical usage (*e.g.* it accounts for the use of the plural), and is perfectly consistent with the contents of the psalms in question. We may reasonably conjecture that some of the psalms were actually written for the pilgrims, while others were placed in this collection because they dealt with subjects or expressed feelings which had a powerful attraction for the pious Israelite in general, and so for the pilgrim in particular. "Thus Ps. cxx.–cxxii., Ps. cxxxiii., cxxxiv. (*i.e.* the first and the last songs in the collection) point directly to the pilgrimages; Ps. cxxiv., cxxvi., cxxviii., cxxix., cxxxii., treat of subjects more or less connected therewith; lastly, Ps. cxxiii., cxxv., cxxvii., cxxx., cxxxi., are more general, but at the same time contain nothing which makes their incorporation in a 'petit psautier des pèlerins du second temple' inexplicable or even strange."

(4) We add, for the sake of completeness, two other explanations. Gesenius, followed by De Wette, Winer, Delitzsch, &c., suggested that the name described the ascending rhythm of the psalms, for the sense goes on progressively, and the first or last words of a preceding are often repeated at the beginning of a subsequent sentence. It is scarcely fair to urge against this view that the same rhythm is found in the song of Deborah, and in Isa. xxvi. 5, 6. It is, however, a strong objection that this ascending rhythm is not found at all in Ps. cxxvii.–cxxxiv.; and is, to say the least, not strongly marked in Ps. cxxv. Besides, this explanation will not suit the inscription of Ps. cxxi.—viz. a song "for ascents," not "of ascents": "gradibus," not "graduum" (לַמַּעֲלוֹת).

Fürst's theory, given in his Concordance and in his Lexicon (*sub voc.* מַעֲלָה), may be dismissed in a single sentence. He translates the titles "songs of excellence," a meaning which is not justified by usage, which is unlikely on the face of it, and which leaves the plural number unexplained. (Chiefly from the essay in Hupfeld's "Commentary on the Psalms," vol. iv. p. 274 *seq.*, and from Kuenen, "Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek naar het Onstaan en de Verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds," vol. iii. p. 218 *seq.*:

[1] The Hebrew numeration is followed in the rest of this article.

the words in inverted commas are from the latter author.)

II. We may now pass on to the use of the Gradual Psalms in the Christian Church. The Fathers, as well as later Catholic writers, found various mystical meanings in the number fifteen, and regarded these Psalms as marking the steps by which the soul ascends to God. The Breviary divides the Gradual Psalms into three sets of five each, the first five ending with the common conclusion "Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine," and with a prayer for the dead, while each of the remaining psalms ends with the "Gloria Patri," and each of the remaining sets with a collect. This arrangement and the practice of reciting these psalms before matins are mentioned by Radulphus, a contemporary of Innocent III. At one time the Gradual Psalms were said before matins every day in Lent, but Pius V. limited the recitation to all Wednesdays in that season, excepting Wednesday in Holy Week, and days on which an office of nine lessons occurs. Moreover, Pius V. made the private recitation a matter of devotion, not of precept. He attached an indulgence of fifty days to the devout repetition. (From Gavantus, sect. 9, cap. 2.) The obligation of reciting the Gradual Psalms in choir was abolished by Pius X. (*Divino Afflatu*, tit. viii).

GRAFFITI (γράφω, write). Rude inscriptions or pictures scrawled or scratched with charcoal on the walls of ancient monuments. The custom of scribbling on famous buildings was as prevalent in olden days as it is now. Much as we may lament the practice at the present time, we cannot but be grateful to the pilgrims who wrote their names and dates and prayers and confidences in the catacombs. The Latin indeed is bad and full of misspelling, but the information is of highest importance and interest. The great Christian archaeologist, De Rossi, made a special study of these inscriptions, and the results are truly marvellous. (See CATACOMBS; Northcote and Brownlow, "Roma Sotteranea," i. 287–290, &c.; Leclercq, "Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne," i. 22; Barnes, "The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments," 159 *sqq.*)

GRAIL, THE HOLY. The legendary sacred vessel used by Christ at the Last Supper, either the chalice or more properly the dish for the Paschal Lamb. It was also said to have been used by Joseph of Arimathea to collect our Lord's blood while He was on the cross. The etymology of the original Latin word, *gradale*, is doubtful. The Grail legend is closely connected with the Perceval (Parsifal) legend as well as with that of King Arthur. It is a matter of controversy as to whether the legend is of purely Christian or of pagan origin, with Christian elements added. We have not space to trace it through its various modifications. We may note, however, its connection with Glastonbury through Joseph of Arimathea, the legendary founder of that abbey. The Church never looked kindly upon the legend. Everyone knows how magnificently it has been worked up in Tennyson's "Idylls of the King," and in Wagner's "Parsifal." (See Nutt, "Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail" and "The Legend of the Holy Grail"; Jessie L. Weston, "The Quest of the Holy Grail"; Wechssler, "Die Sage vom heiligen Gral in ihrer Entwicklung bis auf R. Wagners Parsifal"; Hägele in "Kirchenlex." *Gral*; Remy in "Cath. Enc.")

GRATIAE EXPECTATIVAE. [See EXPECTATIVES.]

GREAT SCHISM. [See ANTIPOPES, p. 37.]

GREATER TITHES. [See TITHES.]

GREEK [SCHISMATIC] CHURCH. THE SO-CALLED ORTHODOX CHURCH. Under this title we include all those Christians who, being separated from the communion of the Pope, acknowledge the primacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Russian Church, however, which is really Greek in the sense of the above definition, we put aside for the present, reserving our account of it for another article. At one time, as everybody knows, the Greek Churches were in full communion with the Holy See. We begin, therefore, with the history of the schism and of the origin of the Greek Church as an independent body.

Ignatius, a member of the imperial family and a monk, was made Patriarch of Constantinople in 846 or 847, during the reign of Theodora. When Theodora's son Michael III., known as Michael the Drunkard, began to reign, he fell entirely under the influence of his uncle Bardus, a profligate of the most abandoned character, who lived in sin with his own stepdaughter. On the feast of the Epiphany 857 Ignatius refused to give Bardus communion, and further offended him by declining to clothe Theodora and her daughters against their will with the religious habit. Accordingly Ignatius was banished, and in 858 Photius was consecrated Patriarch in his place. Photius was the most learned man of his time, among the most learned of any time—as his Bibliotheca (or Μυριοβίβλιον, as he entitled it, consisting of extracts from 280 books which he had read) still remains to testify. But he was ambitious and unscrupulous. His consecration was utterly uncanonical. For, first, Ignatius, a pious and virtuous man, was the lawful patriarch; next, Photius, who was a layman at the time of his election, was promoted to the episcopate within six days; and, lastly, he was consecrated by a bishop who was himself under sentence of deposition.

This violent change in the government of the Church caused discontent among the clergy and people, and in order to quiet them the Emperor Michael sent ambassadors with

costly presents to Pope Nicholas I., in order to secure his approbation. In spite of false statements made by the ambassadors, the Pope refused to decide till he had investigated the matter, and for this purpose despatched two legates to Constantinople. Those legates, yielding to bribery or to threats, confirmed the deposition of Ignatius on the ground that he had been elected through the undue influence of Theodora, and acknowledged the jurisdiction of Photius. This took place in a synod at Constantinople, held in 863, but the Pope remained inflexible. He sent word to the Eastern bishops that he condemned both the deposition of Ignatius and the usurpation of Photius, and in the same year, 863, he deposed the latter from the office into which he had intruded.

Three years later Bardus was murdered by the army, but the schism which he had originated still continued; nay, fresh causes of quarrel arose. The Bulgarians, a Slav people, had been converted in the middle of the ninth century by the Greek teachers St. Cyril and St. Methodius. Some time later, when Cyril and Methodius had gone to the Moravians and Bohemians, the Bulgarian king, Michael, sent envoys to Pope Nicholas desiring information on various points. Nicholas sent Latin missionaries to the country, and the Roman missionary bishops re-confirmed all those who had received Confirmation from Greek priests, denying that Photius, who was himself without real jurisdiction, could empower his priests to confirm. In 867 Photius, now more embittered than ever, convoked a council in the imperial city, and delivered sentence of deposition and excommunication against the Pope. Further, he accused the Latin Church of heresy for adding the words "Filioque" to the Nicene Creed, and attacked the discipline and usages of the Latins, particularly their practice of fasting on Saturday their use of milk and cheese on fasting days, and the enforced celibacy of their clergy.

Scarcely had Photius issued his pretended deposition of the Pope, when he himself was removed from office by the new emperor, Basil, who had murdered Michael; and Ignatius was reinstated. The new pope, Hadrian II., worked zealously for the restoration of peace; the Eighth General Council met at Constantinople in 869, and then the excommunication of Photius was recognized, though his followers were admitted to the communion of the Church if they consented to express their sorrow for the past. Thus Greeks and Latins were again united; but Bulgaria was still the cause of strife, and in 872 Pope John VIII. threatened Ignatius with excommunication if he insisted on regarding it as subject to his see. Peace was not actually broken till 878, when, after the death of Ignatius, Photius again ascended the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. John VIII. would not acknowledge him, except on condition that he begged pardon for his offences and renounced his claim to jurisdiction in Bulgaria. Once more Photius circumvented legates sent from Rome. At a Council of Constantinople in 879 he contrived to evade the Pope's demand for apology, and those who made any addition to the Nicene Creed were anathematized. The Pope, however, was not to be deceived. He despatched the Roman deacon Marinus (afterwards Pope) to Constantinople, and he annulled the acts of the late synod. The excommunication of Photius was reiterated by Marinus, John's successor, as well as by Pope Hadrian III. Things took a new turn under Pope Stephen V. (885–891). The Emperor Basil died in 886, and his successor, Leo VI., "the Philosopher," banished Photius, who died in 891. The schism was healed after a fashion, but the ashes of the old dissension were still smouldering, and it only needed a new Photius to kindle them into flame.

This new Photius was found in Michael Cerularius, also Patriarch of Constantinople, who in 1053, under Pope Leo IX., wrote to the bishop of Trani, in Apulia, reproaching the Latins with their use of unleavened bread in the Mass, their habit of eating flesh with the blood (πνικτόν; see Acts xv. 23), their custom of omitting Alleluia during Lent, &c. The Pope wrote a reply which made a good impression on the Emperor Constantine Monomachus, and in 1054 the Papal legates went to Constantinople. The Patriarch, however, would not hear of peace, and the legates left the document containing his excommunication on the altar of St. Sophia. Michael succeeded in withdrawing the Oriental bishops from communion with the West—a task which he did not find difficult, for the Greeks generally were averse to the addition of the "Filioque" and to the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist. Since then the Greeks have as a body been severed from Catholic communion, although the separation of the Russo-Greek Church from Rome was not effected till the twelfth century.

Many attempts were made to repair the breach, but without lasting results. In 1098 Urban II. convoked a synod at Bari, in which St. Anselm of Canterbury defended the doctrine of the Holy Ghost's procession from the Son. Negotiations were carried on between Alexander III. and the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, and the latter assembled a council at Constantinople in 1168 to promote the reunion of the Greeks, but the resistance of the Greek Patriarch defeated the Emperor's intentions. The presence of the Crusaders in the East only served to aggravate the schism. Latin patriarchates were established in Antioch and Jerusalem. On the capture of Constantinople by the Latins, a Latin empire and patriarchate were set up there

(in 1204); the Greek Patriarch of Alexandria returned to Catholic communion; and learned Greeks, such as Nicholas, archbishop of Thessalonica, the monk Nicephorus Blemmidas, and John Beccus, archivist of the church at Constantinople, were courageous advocates of the union; but the cause which they had at heart was ruined by the selfishness of the Emperor, the fanaticism of the Greek monks, and the cruelty and avarice of the Crusaders. The Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople settled at Nicaea, where Theodore Lascaris had founded a kingdom on the ruins of the Byzantine empire. In 1262 the Latin empire fell, the Greeks recovered possession of Constantinople, and the schism continued in full force. The union effected at Lyons (1274), when the Greeks acknowledged the primacy of the Pope and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, did not last six years, and the Decree of union at Florence (1439) was repudiated in 1443 by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In Constantinople it was only the Patriarch and the prelates of the Court who adhered to the union; and when (in 1453) this city fell before the Turks, its Patriarch fled to Italy, and Gregory Scholarius, a schismatic, was chosen in his place by command of the Sultan Mahomet II. Peace was at an end between Rome and Constantinople. In the Russian empire proper, the decree of Florence had never been accepted. The Greek exarchs, however, subject to the Metropolitan of Kiew among the Lithuanians and Poles, and the Greek Churches in Italy, Illyria, Hungary, Slavonia, &c., were faithful to the union effected at Florence. They are known as "United Greeks," or Catholics of the Greek rite.

II. *The Present State of the Greek Schismatic Church.*—The Patriarch of Constantinople is superior in rank to the three other Patriarchs —viz. of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. His direct spiritual jurisdiction extends over all the Greeks of Turkey in Europe, and over all the Greeks of Turkey in Asia who are not subject to the other Patriarchs. His power has been greatly lessened within the last three centuries. The Russian Church was emancipated in a considerable degree by the erection of a patriarchate at Moscow in 1589, and completely by the institution of the Holy Governing Synod in 1721. The bishops in the kingdom of Greece asserted their independence in 1833, and it was acknowledged in 1868 by the Patriarchs themselves. In 1870 the Bulgarian Church placed itself under an exarch or primate who is independent of Constantinople. Still the Patriarch retains under his rule a large population. He inflicts spiritual penalties, including excommunication, on any of the clergy or people in his patriarchate. He nominates and deposes archbishops and bishops. He has also ample civil jurisdiction, for he can summon criminals before his court and inflict punishment; he has his own police and his prison, and he is the supreme arbiter in all civil disputes between Greeks and Greeks. The council of the Patriarch is the Holy Synod—a body which consists of twelve metropolitans, though the Patriarch may reduce the number to ten. The metropolitans of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, and Chalcedon are *ex officio* members; the rest are nominated by the Patriarch, but all bishops who happen to be in Constantinople at the time are entitled to take part in the deliberations and decisions of the synod, if matters of great import are at issue. The Patriarch needs the synod's consent for matters which concern the general good of the Church, whether these affairs are spiritual or temporal, and for the nomination of bishops. When the patriarchate is vacant, the synod chooses three candidates, who, according to the present rule, must all be metropolitans. The names are announced to the "community," composed of dignitaries, lay and cleric, belonging to the patriarchal palace, of notables from the merchants, and of heads of corporations. The "community" then elect one of them by acclamation, and the Porte grants the Berat, or diploma of investiture. The day after, the Grand Vizier presents the new Patriarch with a pastoral staff, a white horse, and rich ornaments. The Patriarch may be tried by the synod, and if he is found guilty the Porte is requested to depose him. The Patriarch is assisted by the officials of his household. Of these the principal are—the Oeconome (*μέγας οἰκονόμος*), who manages the revenues and presents candidates for ordination; "Visitors" (*σακελλάριοι*), who inspect the monasteries and convents; the Chartophylax, who superintends ecclesiastical causes; the Protonotary, who has charge of wills, contracts, and the patriarchal correspondence; the Great Logothete (*μέγας λογοθέτης*), a layman who represents the Patriarch at the Porte; and the Protecdicos (*πρωτέκδικος*), who, with twelve assistant judges, forms a court of minor instance.

The other patriarchates are mere shadows of former greatness. That of Alexandria comprises Egypt, Libya, Nubia, and Arabia. Next comes the Patriarch of Antioch, ruling over the schismatic Greeks in Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Isauria, &c. There are some 15,000 Greeks with thirteen metropolitans in Palestine subject to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. These Patriarchs have their synods, officials, &c. The Berat of their investiture is obtained from the Porte by the mediation of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

There are few ecclesiastical provinces in Turkey, and the title of archbishop is merely honorary. As bishops are necessarily celibate, they are selected by the Patriarch and Holy Synod from the monks, a Berat being required to confirm the appointment. The bishops

appoint the parish priests, and no monastery can be erected in their dioceses without their leave. Collections are made for them in the parishes; they receive dues from their priests, besides honoraria for dispensations, marriages, burials, Masses, &c., so that their revenues are sometimes large. They also wield considerable political influence. They, like the Patriarchs, have their officials, such as the Protosyncellus, answering to the Latin Vicar-General; the Proto-Presbyter, who visits the churches, instals the new parish priests, and executes episcopal sentences; the Chartophylax or chancellor. There is, moreover, in every diocese a commission consisting of three members: one of them examines candidates for orders; another watches over the administration of the sacraments and the publication of books, to which he gives his *imprimatur* in case of approval; a third superintends the schools.

In large parishes, there is a Proestos, who baptizes, marries, and buries; a Pneumaticos, who is approved by the bishop to hear confessions; and an Ephemerios, who says Mass and recites the canonical hours; but poor parishes have only one priest, with a deacon or lector to assist him. The clergy are usually ill paid. As a rule they are married.

The religious men and women generally follow the rule of St. Basil, for houses of St. Antony's order are only found on Sinai and Lebanon, and by the shores of the Red Sea. Most of the monks are laymen; if priests, they are called ἱερομόναχοι. The monks never taste flesh, and are bound to the recitation of the hours. The superior of a monastery is called Hegoumenos, or, in the case of the great monasteries, Archimandrite. The name for the superioress of nuns is Hegoumenissa. The monks wear a long robe of coarse cloth, a belt, cloak, scapular, and a hood with five crosses. Some of the religious houses are subject to the bishop, others are placed immediately under the Patriarchs. On Mount Athos there are still anchorites, or solitaries, and the Greeks have preserved the old custom according to which pious virgins and widows lead an ascetic and quasi-religious life in the bosom of their families.

The Greeks reject the words "Filioque" in the Creed, and they do not use the word "Purgatory," but they teach that there are two hells, from one of which there is no redemption; and they pray for the dead. "In all other points of doctrine," says Hefele, "they are in full agreement with the Latin Church," though we ought to add that they consider the marriage tie to be dissolved by adultery. In 1576 the Patriarch Jeremias of Constantinople sent a document to the Protestant theologians of Tübingen, in which he asserted the belief of his Church in the saving efficacy of good works, the seven sacraments, the change of the bread and wine into Christ's Body and Blood, the necessity of detailed confession to a priest, the veneration due to the saints, the utility of prayers for the dead, and the sanctity of the monastic life. The Greeks offered a stubborn resistance to Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Alexandria, and afterwards of Constantinople, who endeavoured to introduce among his own people the doctrines which he had learnt in Geneva. He was driven repeatedly from his see, and finally murdered by the Janissaries in 1638. During the controversy of Arnauld and Nicole with the Calvinist Claude on transubstantiation, the most distinguished Greek theologians were asked for their opinion, and gave it in the most decided way for the Catholic doctrine.

There are, however, great differences on points of ritual and discipline between Latins and Greeks, whether united or schismatic. The Greek Church retains its ancient and beautiful rites. Mass is celebrated throughout Turkey in Greek, except where the "orthodox" community is Slav or Roumanian. The liturgy of St. Chrysostom is used all the year round, that of St. Basil only on certain fixed days. Leavened bread is consecrated at Mass. During Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, there is no Mas in the proper sense, but only a "Mass of the Presanctified," corresponding to our office of Good Friday. The liturgies for Mass, and the forms for the administration of the sacraments, are contained in the "Euchologion," of which an excellent edition by the Dominican Goar was published at Paris in 1647. The canonical hours are given in the "Horologion," the office for Lent in the "Triodion," that from Easter Sunday to the octave of Pentecost in the "Pentecostarion." The Heortologion is a calendar of the feasts, fasts, and ferias; the "Typicon," an Ordo which marks the order of prayers in the office, while the "Menaea" contains lives of the saints honoured in the East. The greater feasts of our Lord and the Blessed Virgin are nearly the same as with us, except that their Epiphany or Theophany on January 6 merely commemorates the baptism of Christ, and that the greater solemnities are preceded by a Proeortia or Ante-feast. Sunday is sanctified by hearing Mass and resting from servile work, and holidays of obligation are observed in the same manner, the number of these holidays being different in different nations.

Every Wednesday and Friday, and the vigils of the great feasts, are fasting-days. In addition to Lent, the Greeks keep the fast of "the Mother of God," from August 1 to August 15; the fast of Christmas, from November 15 to December 24; the fast of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, from the first Sunday after Pentecost to June 28. On Wednesdays and Fridays, and during Lent, the use, not only of meat, but of fish, eggs, milk, cheese, wine, beer and oil is strictly forbidden.

The Greek canon law is based on the

Apostolic canons and constitutions, the canons of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, in Trullo; on the canons of the particular councils held at Gangra, Laodicea, and Antioch; on the canonical letters of the bishops; on the council of Photius, and the synodal decrees of the schismatic Patriarchs. Mgr. Pap-Szilagyi has made a methodical compendium of these documents in his "Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiae Orientalis."

(The substance of this article is chiefly taken from an elaborate essay on the Greek Church by Hefele in his "Beiträge." Lamy in "Dublin Review" July 1880; Silbernagel, "Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämmtlicher Kirchen des Orientes"; and see especially Fortescue, "The Orthodox Greek Church"; Vailhé in "Cath. Enc."

GREEK CHURCH, UNITED. [See UNITED GREEK CHURCH.]

GREGORIAN ALTAR. An altar in the church of St. Gregory in Rome specially privileged; historically the first to be enriched with a plenary indulgence for the relief of the souls in Purgatory gained without other conditions by a celebration at it of a Mass. Altars in other places have from time to time been privileged *ad instar*—that is, in the same degree as that of St. Gregory in Rome. All indulgences for the dead are imparted *ad modum suffragii*: that is, they are no longer the direct application by the Church to a soul of the merits of Christ, of our Lady and the Saints, in satisfaction for the debt of temporal punishment due for sin, but are a supplication to that effect made to God by His Spouse the Church. In the case of the Gregorian Altar indulgence, holy Church, as it were, is more instant in this prayer, and in particular has recourse to the intercession of St. Gregory, regarded as a special patron of the souls in Purgatory. So great has become the reliance of the faithful on the certainty that God will hear the prayer of the Church on behalf of souls for whom Mass is said at a Gregorian altar that the delivering by every one of these Masses of at least one soul from Purgatory has become a popular belief. By a decree of December 12, 1912, no further concession of Gregorian altars, or of altars *ad instar*, will be granted. (Moccheggiani, "De Indulgentiis"; "Acta Ap. Sedis," vol. v. p. 32.)

GREGORIAN MUSIC. [See CHANT.]

GREGORIAN SACRAMENTARY. [See LITURGIES.]

GREMIALE. A piece of cloth, often adorned with gold or silver lace, which is placed on the bishop's lap when he sits in celebrating Mass or conferring orders. Probably its original purpose was to keep his vestments from being soiled. It must be distinguished from a similar vestment, the "subcinctorium," which is used by the Pope only. (Meratus on Gavantus, tom. i. p. ii. tit. 1.) The use of the Gremiale was not confined to bishops in mediaeval times: the celebrant, deacon, and subdeacon had each their "Lap-cloth" at High Mass. (Rock, i. 334 *sqq.*; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 123.)

GREY FRIARS. Franciscan Friars were so called on account of the original colour of their habit, which was slate-coloured. They now wear a brown habit [see FRANCISCANS], except the Conventuals, whose habit is black. The latter are not to be confounded with the Black Friars, *i.e.* the Dominicans, so called from the black mantle which they wear over their white habit. The General of the Conventuals wears grey, and his Friars are returning to the use of that colour. Franciscan Cardinals have their robes of this hue.

GUARDIAN. I. A person responsible in the eye of the law for the proper bringing up of children whose father is dead or incapable. Under the ancient discipline, a cleric might not act as guardian, lest he should be too much entangled in worldly business; and *e converso*, a Council of Carthage decreed that a guardian should not be ordained to any ecclesiastical function till the period of his responsibility had come to an end. (Smith and Cheetham.)

II. The superior of a Franciscan convent (in mediaeval English, called "Warden"). He is elected for three years, and cannot hold the guardianship of the same convent twice, though he may be chosen head of another convent. [ABBOT, FRANCISCANS.]

GUARDIAN ANGEL. [See ANGEL, p. 24.]

GUILDS. [See GILDS.]

GUNPOWDER PLOT. [See ENGLISH CHURCH, *persecution period.*]

GYROVAGI (lit. "circuit-wanderers"). There was a class of spurious monks in the early Christian centuries—nor were they unknown even to the Middle Ages—who were without real piety, and, like the tramps of modern times, preferred a lazy rambling life to one of steady regular activity. St. Benedict mentions them by this name in his Rule, and describes them as the fourth, last, and worst kind of monks—men who "spend their life in travelling up and down the different provinces, lodging in each cell [= monastery] some three or four days; always wandering, never stable; enslaved to their own pleasures and to gluttony; and worse in all respects than the Sarabaitae" (the third class of monks, those who lived in twos and threes). More than a hundred years later, the Synod in Trullo (691) (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. p. 568), when regulating monastic discipline, orders that a man who wishes to be recognized as a true monk shall pass three years at least in the same monastery, and that "the vagabonds calling themselves hermits, clad in black, and with long hair," be driven away from the cities into the desert. This is evidently the same class of persons as those whom St. Benedict calls "Gyrovagi."

H

HAIL, MARY. [See AVE MARIA.]

HALO. [See AUREOLE.]

HEARSE. The word is now understood to mean the car in which a coffin is carried at a funeral. Formerly, however, it meant a framework for holding candles, and was used at funerals and at Tenebrae [HOLY WEEK, p. 418]. "Hearse" (*hericia, herice*) is a corruption from *herpex*, a harrow. "It would seem that the idea of a harrow was suggested by the spiky points of the prickets upon which the candles were fixed. It is the same word as that still used in connection with arrangements for funerals. The body as it lay in state was wont to be canopied in former times with some sort of an erection in wood or iron provided with prickets for a multitude of tapers. This also suggested the idea of a harrow, and the word was gradually transferred from the construction above the coffin to any receptacle, fixed or movable, in which the coffin was placed" (Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," 258).[1] It is still used at the funeral service of the Pope, and sometimes of other distinguished personages. (See Rock, ii. 399, where evidence of its favour in England in Catholic days is given. It was in use in London as late as fifty years ago.)

HEART OF JESUS (SACRED HEART). The special and formal devotion to the Heart of Jesus owes its origin to a French Visitation nun, the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, who lived in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Her biographers relate that our Lord Himself appeared to her and declared that this worship was most acceptable to Him; and her director, the famous Jesuit, Father de la Colombière, preached the devotion at the Court of St. James's, and zealously propagated it elsewhere. The most popular book in defence of the new devotion was that of Father Gallifet, S.J., "De Cultu SS. Cordis Jesu in variis Christiani orbis partibus jam propagato." It was published with a dedication to Benedict XIII. and with the approval of Lambertini (afterwards Benedict XIV.); the French translation appeared in 1745, at Lyons. On February 6, 1765,[2] Clement XIII. permitted several churches to celebrate the feast of the Sacred Heart, which was extended in 1856 to the whole Church. It is generally kept on the Friday (or on the Sunday) after the Octave of Corpus Christi. In England, Ireland, Italy, France, Netherlands, Germany, Spain, and Portugal, indeed throughout the Catholic world, the devotion and the feast found a ready and enthusiastic acceptance. However, the worship of the Sacred Heart encountered keen opposition, particularly from the Jansenists. They who practised it were nicknamed "Cardiolatrae" or "Cordicolae," and charged with Nestorianism, as if they worshipped a divided Christ, and gave to the created humanity of Christ worship which belonged to God alone. The Jansenist objections were censured as injurious to the Apostolic See—which had approved the devotion, and bestowed numerous indulgences in its favour—by Pius VI. in his condemnation of the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia. This condemnation was issued in the bull "Auctorem fidei," bearing date August 28, 1794. A further approval of the devotion was implied in the beatification of Margaret Mary Alacoque in 1864.

The bull "Auctorem fidei" contains the following explanation of the principle on which the devotion rests—an explanation which is at once authoritative and clear. The faithful worship with supreme adoration the physical Heart of Christ considered "not as mere flesh but as united to the Divinity." They adore it as "the Heart of the Person of the Word to which it is inseparably united." It is of course absurd to speak of this principle as novel; it is as old as the belief in the hypostatic union, and it was solemnly defined in 431 at the Council of Ephesus. All the members of Christ united to the rest of His sacred humanity and to the Eternal Word are the object of divine worship. If it be asked further why the heart is selected as the object of special adoration, the answer is that the real and physical heart is a natural symbol of Christ's exceeding charity, and of His interior life. Just as the Church in the Middle Ages turned with singular devotion to the Five Wounds as the symbol of Christ's Passion, so in these later days she bids us have recourse to His Sacred Heart, mindful of the love wherewith He loved us "even to the end." Nothing could be made of the fact, if it were a fact, that the devotion actually began with Blessed Margaret Mary, for though the doctrine of the Church cannot change, she may, and does from time to time, introduce new forms of devotion. But the special devotion to the Heart of our Saviour is as old at least at the twelfth century, while early in the sixteenth the Carthusian Lansperg recommended pious Christians to assist their devotion by using a figure of the Sacred Heart.[1]

[1] "The French *herse* also acquired the meaning 'portcullis,' the pointed bars of which were naturally likened to the blades of a harrow; and it seems probable that it is to this latter sense that we owe the older English meaning of *hearse*." (*The Romance of Words*, by E. Weekley, p. 75.)

[2] The Congregation of Rites had refused to sanction the feast in 1697 and 1729.

[1] See F. Ryder's quotations (*Catholic Controversy*, pp. 148-9) from the *Vitis Mystica*, a series of meditations printed among the works of St. Bernard, c. iii. 8, and from Lanspergius, *Divini Amoris Pharetra*, ed. 1572, p. 78.

(An account of the theology of the devotion will be found in Card. Franzelin, "De Incarnatione," and of the propagation of the devotion in the admirable Life of Blessed Margaret Mary by F. Tickell, S.J.; Bainvel, *Cœur Sacré de Jésus*, in DThC; Dalgairns, "Devotion to the S. Heart of Jesus." Both the doctrine and the history are exhaustively treated by Nilles, "De Rationibus Festorum Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu et Purissimi Cordis Mariae," 1873.)

HEART OF MARY IMMACULATE. The principles on which the devotion rests are the same (*mutatis mutandis*) as those which are the foundation of the Catholic devotion to the Sacred Heart. Just as Catholics worship the Sacred Heart because it is united to the Person of the Word, so they venerate (with hyperdulia, see CULTUS) the heart of Mary because united to the person of the Blessed Virgin. In each case the physical heart is taken as a natural symbol of charity and of the inner life, though of course the charity and virtues of Mary are infinitely inferior to those of her Divine Son.

The devotion to the Immaculate Heart was first propagated by Blessed John Eudes, founder of a congregation of priests called after him Eudists. [See that art.] Eudes died in 1680. The Congregation of Rites in 1669, and again in 1726, declined to sanction the devotion. However, a local celebration of the feast was permitted (but without proper Mass and office) by Pius VI. in 1799; and in 1855 Pius IX. extended the permission to the whole Church. The Arch-confraternity of the Immaculate Heart established some twenty years earlier at the church of Notre Dame des Victoires, in Paris, did much to spread the devotion and make it popular.

(Nilles, "De Rationibus Festorum SS. Cordis Jesu et Purissimi Cordis Mariae"; Dublanchy, in DThC, *Cœur de Marie*.)

HEAVEN. An account of the joy which constitutes the essential happiness of heaven has been given in the articles on the BEATIFIC VISION and on BEATITUDE. In these articles, particularly in the former, it has been shown that all the blessed see God face to face, some, however, more perfectly than others, according to the degree of their merit, and that the soul's entrance into perfect bliss is not deferred till sentence has been passed at the day of judgment. Here, however, it is as well to point out that heaven is not only a state but a place of beatitude. It is the place where God manifests His glory to the blessed, and clearly shows Himself to them. This appears from the fact that Christ has ascended to heaven in that body which He took from Mary, and that the body of Mary herself is, according to the belief of the Church, already reunited to her soul, so that she is, body and soul, with her Divine Son. Since, then, the sacred humanity is not omnipresent, heaven is a definite place in which Christ and the Blessed Virgin exist, and in which the angels and blessed souls are gathered together. After the general resurrection heaven will also be the home in which the bodies of the just will live for ever. Where the place is we do not know, but Scripture clearly indicates that it is beyond this earth. (See Jungmann, "De Novissimis," a. viii.)

We may here add a few words on "the third heaven" of which St. Paul speaks, 2 Cor. xii. 2–4. Catholic commentators are not agreed about the meaning of the words "caught up," and it is of course lawful to hold, as St. Thomas appears to do (1ª, q. 68, a. 4), that St. Paul was simply raised to the highest kind of supernatural vision. But in any case the metaphor implies belief in a corresponding reality, and hence St. Thomas maintains (*loc. cit.*) that there are three heavens, viz. the sidereal, the crystalline, and the empyrean, the last of which is heaven in the proper sense. Further, it is generally taken for granted that St. Paul identifies this third heaven with paradise. There is a difficulty, however, in supposing that the Apostle alludes to this triple division, for the statement of Grotius, that the Rabbins recognised three heavens, is unsupported by good evidence. There is some Rabbinical authority for the belief in two heavens, but the Jewish doctors almost unanimously taught that there were seven, and we find this belief recognized in a Christian document of the second century—viz. the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," iii. § 3. The probability, therefore, is that St. Paul alludes to this belief without necessarily asserting its truth. We may, then, reasonably distinguish "the third heaven" from paradise. The former was a resting-point on the journey upwards, whether that journey was local or merely spiritual: the latter marks the end of the journey, the "Paradise of God," or heaven in the usual acceptation of the word. This distinction between "the third heaven" and paradise is in keeping with St. Paul's own language. "I know a man . . . . caught up . . . . even to the third heaven . . . . and I know of such a man . . . . that he was caught up into paradise." This distinction is made by several Fathers as well as by Estius and others among modern commentators.

HEBDOMADARIUS. A name used in churches and monasteries for the cleric or monk who takes his turn for presiding in choir during the week (ἑβδομάς, a week). The word is found in the Roman Breviary in the rubrics at Prime and Compline. (Ducange.)

HELL may be defined as the place and state in which the devils and such human beings as die in enmity with God suffer eternal torment. In this article we have to consider the proofs for the existence of hell, the nature of the punishment there inflicted,

and the eternity of these torments. This triple division of the subject arranges the difficulties attached to it in an ascending scale. No one who accepts the Christian revelation at all, no one perhaps who believes in a God at all, is likely to find much difficulty in believing that obstinate and unrepented sin will be punished in the next world. It is much harder to ascertain the nature of the torments which God reserves for those who die in rebellion against Him; while the dogma of eternal punishment is undoubtedly one of the most awful and mysterious truths taught by Scripture and the Church.

1. *The Existence of Hell.*—The Hebrew Bible contains few direct and clear announcements of a life beyond the grave, so that it is not the place to which we should naturally turn for the proofs that hell exists. Three passages are most commonly quoted as decisive on the point—viz. Isa. xxxiii. 14; Isa. lxvi. 24; Dan. xii. 2. The first of these must, we think, be put aside, for it has no real connection with the matter before us. Isaiah, writing probably at the close of his life, foretells the judgments of God which are to fall both on the Assyrians and on the immoral and irreligious part of the Jewish nation. This judgment, by a metaphor familiar in the Hebrew Scriptures, he describes as fire which is, like God Himself, eternal. "Sinners shudder in Sion: trembling seizes unholy men. O who will dwell in devouring fire? O who will dwell in eternal burnings? A man who walketh in justice, and speaketh upright things, who rejecteth the gain of oppression, who shaketh his hands, so that they lay not hold of a bribe, who stoppeth his ears so that they hear no deeds of blood, and closeth his eyes so as not to look on evil—he shall dwell on heights; fastnesses of rocks are his fortress; his bread has been given to him, his waters are sure. The king in his beauty shall thine eyes behold; they shall see a land that stretches far." In other words, the fire which consumes the wicked will leave the just man unharmed: he will be secure from the sword and the famine. Then, when the Assyrian is destroyed, he will see the King of Judah in the fulness of his royal splendour, the city no longer beleaguered, the land no longer held by the foe, but peacefully inhabited by its rightful owners and stretching to its ancient limits.

The second passage (Isa. lxvi. 24) comes near the point, if it does not actually touch it. It clearly refers to the Messianic age. "All flesh" is to come and worship at Jerusalem, "from new moon to new moon, from sabbath to sabbath." "And they shall go out and look on the corpses of the men who rebelled against me, for their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched, and they shall be an abomination to all flesh." Immediately, of course, the prophet only mentions the dead bodies of the wicked, but we may reasonably suppose that the prophet is depicting punishment in the future world in imagery borrowed from that in which he lived. For it is impossible to take his words literally. "All flesh" could not gather in Jerusalem; worms cannot live in fire, or dead bodies continue to burn for ever. The heavenly Jerusalem and the eternal sufferings of the lost are the real object of his prophecy. Such is the interpretation found in the Targum, and so, as we shall presently see, the words of Isaiah are applied in the deuterocanonical books, and by our Lord Himself. We say applied, for neither the deuterocanonical books nor our Lord give an authoritative explanation of the prophet's actual meaning.

The words of Daniel xii. 1, 2, are more definite. A time of trouble such as has never been known is to come. Michael, however, is to stand up for the people of God, and everyone whose name is written in the book is to be delivered. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth" (literally, "earth of the dust," *i.e.* grave) shall awake, some to eternal life, and some to shame and to everlasting contempt." Here we have an explicit statement that some will meet with eternal punishment. We must beware, however, of pressing the words further. Even if the word רַבִּים which in all other places means "many," could be regarded here (cf. Romans v. 15, *οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον*, with Romans v. 12, *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν*) as equivalent to "all," this sense is absolutely excluded in the passage before us by the construction (*i.e.* by the partitive מִן which follows). To say that "many from or out of those who sleep in the dust" means "all who sleep," &c., is not to interpret language, but to abuse it.

There are two passages in the deuterocanonical books, in which the language of Isa. lxvi. 24 is evidently borrowed, but at the same time applied more definitely to the future sufferings of the wicked. "Humble thy soul exceedingly," says the book of Ecclesiasticus vii. 17; "remember that wrath will not tarry, and that fire and worm take vengeance on the impious." And in Judith xvi. 17 we read "Woe to the nations that rise up against my people: the Almighty Lord will take vengeance on them in the day of judgment, appointing fire and worms for their flesh, and feeling it they will weep for ever." The last passage is very important from an historical point of view. It is well known that the Talmudical doctors disputed whether immortality and resurrection were common to the bad and the good, or reserved for the latter; and, again, whether any but Israelites partook in the future life. The book of Judith speaks clearly on this question.

No one doubts that the New Testament teaches the existence of hell; and here it

is enough to refer to such passages as Mt. xviii. 8, xxv. 41 *sqq.*; Mk. ix. 48, &c. The New Testament has a special name for hell, viz. Gehenna (γέεννα), which occurs repeatedly in St. Matthew (v. 22, 29, 30, x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33); three times in St. Mark (ix. 43, 45, 47); once in St. Luke (xii. 5); and once in St. James (iii. 6). The name, which is taken from the Hebrew Bible (גֵּי הִנֹּם Jos. xv. 8, or more fully גֵּי בֶן הִנֹּם), simply means "the valley of [a man called] Hinnom." It was a deep and narrow glen to the south of Jerusalem, in which from the time of Ahaz Jews offered their children to Moloch. Josiah in consequence of these abominations polluted the valley (4 Kgs. xxiii. 10), and into it the dead bodies of criminals and every kind of filth were cast, and, if we follow late and somewhat questionable authorities, were burned. Thus it became the image of, and gave a name to, the place of punishment for the wicked after death—a usage which is common to the Targums and to Rabbinical literature generally.[1] It would be useless in this place to produce evidence from Christian traditions and from the definitions of the Church, since we shall have to discuss them in considering the eternity of punishment.

2. *The Nature of the Punishment.*—Theologians divide the punishments of the damned into that of loss and that of sense. The former of these ("poena damni") is indicated in our Lord's words "Depart *from me*, ye cursed," and consists in the deprivation of the vision of God, which each human soul was intended to enjoy. It is from the knowledge of the bliss which they have forfeited that the chief suffering of the lost arises. It is the loss of the kingdom of heaven, as St. Chrysostom explains at length ("Ad Theodor. laps." i. n. 10, 12; PG, xlvii. 289, 290), which is the most bitter torment of all. "So great a punishment," says St. Augustine ("Enchir." c. 112, PL, xl. 285), "that no torments known to us can be compared to it."

The "punishment of the sense" ("poena sensus") comprehends all the suffering and torment inflicted in hell, except that which springs from the loss of the sovereign good. The origin of this term is uncertain. Suarez ("De Angel." lib. viii. c. 12, quoted by Jungmann) supposes that this class of torture is so called because it arises chiefly from a sensible substance, viz. fire. This explanation is not accepted by all, but of course the term cannot mean punishment inflicted on the senses, for separated souls who have no senses are still undoubtedly subjected to the "poena sensus."

However this may be, it is certain that the devils and disembodied spirits of the damned suffer from material fire. True, Origen ("De Princip." ii. 10 *seq.*, PG, xi. 236) distinctly teaches that the fire of hell is merely figurative, while St. Ambrose (in Luc. xiv.) and Theophylact (in Marc. ix.) express the same opinion. Petavius, however ("De Angel." iii. 5), has shown that the preponderating weight of tradition is on the other side, and sums up this part of the question in the following words: "At present all theologians—nay, all Christians—are agreed that the fire of hell is corporeal and material, though, as Vasquez rightly observes, the matter has not been settled as yet by any decree of the Church." To those who ask how material fire can affect spirits no certain answer can be given. St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 70, a. 3) thinks that God gives to the fire as the instrument of His justice a preternatural power of constraining the spirit and impeding its action, so as to cause intense suffering. Other theories have been propounded—*e.g.* by Suarez, who argues that just as God elevates and ennobles the soul by grace, so He may use the fire of hell to deform and disfigure it. But it is really impossible to understand much about a question which is above our reason and on which revelation is silent.

Though the fire of hell is the chief it is by no means the only cause of the positive punishment. The lost are afflicted by "the worm which never dies"—*i.e.* by the anguish of remorse. They are doomed to endure the society of others reprobate like themselves and they know that all hope is over. Their will is entirely depraved because entirely averted from God, the end to which each thought and action should be directed. After the resurrection the body also is subjected to torment.

Further, it is certain from Scripture and tradition that the torments of hell are inflicted in a definite place. But it is uncertain where the place is. According to the common opinion of Fathers and theologians, it is in the centre of the earth, but many other theories have been propounded, and St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 97, a. 7), quoting St. Augustine ("De Civ. Dei," xv. cap. 16) and St. Gregory the Great ("Dial." iv. cap. 42, PL, lxxvii. 400), admits that no one can know where hell is unless he has had a special revelation on the point. St. Thomas himself thinks it "more probable" that hell is under the earth.

3. *The Eternity of Punishment in Hell.*—Here, as we have already said, we reach the most awful and mysterious part of the subject, and one which, at a time when the Catholic doctrine of eternal punishment is rejected and attacked by so many and with such vehemence, it is necessary to treat carefully and in detail. We begin with the teaching of Scripture.

(*a*) Our Lord's words are plain enough to make reasonable doubt impossible. He speaks of "the eternal fire," Mt. xviii. 8; of "hell," where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched," Mk. ix. 48. He tells us that

[1] It becomes one word גֵּיהִנֹּם; see Buxtorf, *sub voc.*

He will say to the wicked at the last day "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Daniel, long before Christ, had held similar language (see xii. 2, quoted above), and so do the Apostles after Christ (2 Thess. i. 9; Jude 13; Apoc. xiv. 11).

Now, it may be admitted that the word translated "eternal" (*αἰώνιος*) is not in itself decisive. Thus in Titus i. 2 St. Paul mentions the hope which God, who cannot lie, promised "before eternal times," where the Greek *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* is very happily rendered by the Vulgate "ante tempora saecularia." The promise of salvation had not, of course, been made from all eternity; it had been made long ages before by the prophets who are said in Lk. i. 70 to have been *ἀπ' αἰῶνος* (Vul. "a saeculo")—*i.e.* from of old or since the age of the prophets first began. Again, the word *αἰώνιος* in the LXX and the Hebrew noun to which it corresponds (עוֹלָם) are still more loosely used: *e.g.* (to quote the strongest instance which occurs to us), Isa. lviii. 12 predicts that the children of Israel "will build up the eternal ruins" (חָרְבוֹת עוֹלָם, *αἱ ἔρημοι αἰώνιοι*), though the ruins present to his mind had only been ruins for some fifty years. So much may be freely granted. But the fact that Christ sets eternal fire in sharp antithesis to eternal life assures us that He did mean to warn men that there was no hope in hell and no escape from it. Moreover, He speaks of fire which will never be quenched; of an undying worm; He declares it would have been better for Judas not to have been born; and He does not breathe a syllable which can be urged on the other side or applied to qualify His language about eternal fire. The celebrated Protestant commentator Meyer fully admits that the words "eternal fire" must be taken in their strict and absolute sense. Nobody will accuse Meyer of ignorance on the one hand, or on the other of prejudice in favour of the dogma. Nobody, we may be sure, would doubt Christ's meaning who considered it with a really unbiassed mind. The fact is, men persuade themselves that the doctrine is untrue and inhuman, and therefore that Christ, being the eternal truth, could not have taught it. Their exegesis will scarcely find acceptance either with Christians prepared to accept the doctrine or with non-Christians who come with purely historical interest to the study of the Gospels.

Here we turn for a moment to two passages alleged against the doctrine which we are maintaining from the dicta of the Apostles. One is from 1 Cor. xv. 24 *seq.* "Then is the end when He [Christ] shall give up the kingdom to the God and Father, when He shall bring to nought every princedom and authority and power; for He must needs reign, until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be brought to nought is death . . . . and when all things have been subjected to Him, then even the Son Himself will be subjected to Him [God] who subjected all things to Him [Christ], that God may be all in all." There are dogmatic and exegetical difficulties in this text which do not concern us here, but the last clause, "that God may be all in all," presents no difficulty to believers in eternal punishment. All are to be subject to Christ. Christ as man is and will be recognized as subject to God, and "God will be all in all"—*i.e.* will be seen to be the one source of every blessing in all the subjects of the kingdom of heaven. The context clearly limits the meaning of the word "all." God is not to be "all in all" to Christ's enemies. On the contrary, Christ is to put them under His feet.

The second passage is Acts iii. 20, 21, when St. Peter tells the Jews that the heavens must receive Christ "until the times of restoration of all things." The Apostle seems to mean that Christ will remain in heaven till the people of God are converted and renewed and their due and original relation to God restored; and this is the motive for penance which St. Peter urges. Our Lord's words, Mt. xvii. 11, "Elias indeed cometh and will restore all things," and the prophecy of Malachi iv. 6 (Heb. iii. 23), "Behold I send to you Elijah the prophet before the day of the Lord comes, the great and terrible [day]. And he will turn the heart of fathers to sons, and the heart of sons to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse," probably supply the key to the sense. Anyhow, St. Peter has in mind a renewal and restoration which is to take place on earth and not in hell: before the judgment, not after it.

(*β*) *Tradition.*—The historical objections to the doctrine of eternal punishment may really be reduced to one head—viz. the views of Origen. In his "De Principiis," i. 6 (PG, xi. 169) this great man gives it as his opinion that even the devils will undergo a long course of purification and be saved at last; and in his commentary on Joshua (Hom. viii.) he asserts the same thing of men who have been condemned at the day of judgment. In "Princip." iii. 6 (PG, xi. 334) he puts forward the interpretation of St. Paul's words, "God will be all in all," which we combated a little back. Origen's piety, genius, and learning, and his reputation as a commentator on the Bible, gained for him a wide and an enduring influence in the Church, so that we cannot be surprised to find that other Fathers followed him in his hopes of a universal restoration. Petavius ("De Angelis," iii. 7) shows that St. Gregory Nyssen did so, that St. Gregory Nazianzen entertained the hope that the punishment of sinners in the next world would not last for ever—a hope which St. Jerome limits to such sinners as had died in the Catholic faith. St. Ambrose, as quoted by Petavius, says that men may, though

angels will not, be purified and restored, even after an adverse sentence has been passed upon them at the judgment. Carefully to be distinguished from this error is the opinion of Augustine and other Fathers, viz. that the sufferings of lost souls may be mitigated by the prayers and good works of the faithful. "Concerning this amelioration of the condition of lost men at least" (so Petavius writes in words which Cardinal Newman has made familiar to all) "the Church as yet has laid down nothing as certain, so that for this reason this opinion held by Fathers of high sanctity is not to be dismissed offhand as absurd, though it differs from the common feeling of modern Catholics."[1]

We have tried to give as fairly as possible the patristic evidence for the view that the torments of hell will come to an end. But the whole stream of tradition runs in the contrary direction. There is no real trace of such a view within the Church before Origen's time. Theophilus of Antioch ("Apol." 1, *ad fin.*) contrasts the eternal joys of heaven with the eternal woes of hell. St. Irenaeus (iv. 28, 2, PG, vii. 1062) and St. Cyprian, ("Ad Demetrianum," cc. 24, 25; ed. Hartel, p. 368) express themselves in a way which puts their meaning beyond all possibility of misapprehension. "Those," says the former, "to whom Christ addresses the words 'Depart into everlasting fire' (*perpetuum*, not *aeternum*) will be always condemned, and those to whom He says 'Come, ye blessed,' &c., always obtain the kingdom." "Hell ever burning," says St. Cyprian, "will consume those who are given over to it, nor will there be any means by which their torments can ever rest or cease."

Petavius has collected a catena of passages from later Fathers, some of them expressly reprobating the error of Origen. It is doubtful whether or not his error was condemned at the Fifth General Council. Certainly his name stands in the present text of the eleventh anathema, which is levelled at "Arius, Eunomius, Apollinarius [*sic*], Nestorius, Eutyches, and Origen, together with their impious writings," and Hefele-Leclercq (iii. 121) defend the authenticity of the text as we have it against Garnier and many other critics. But no particular doctrine of Origen is mentioned in the anathema. Cardinal Noris and the Ballerini in their edition of his works tried to show that part of the Acts of the Council have perished, and that a special investigation and specific condemnation of Origen's errors took place. There are plausible grounds for this opinion, which is, however, rejected by Hefele (*loc. cit.* p. 71) after an elaborate discussion. He thinks that the Church historian Evagrius, one of the chief witnesses cited by Cardinal Noris, confused the general council of 553 with another held ten years earlier at the same place. But whether or no Origen was expressly condemned by a general council, it is a plain matter of fact that a council has defined that the punishment of hell lasts for ever. The Fourth Council of Lateran (anno 1215) speaks of the "everlasting punishment" (*poenam perpetuam*) which awaits the reprobate, and the force of the word "perpetuam" cannot be evaded even by those who explain away the word "eternal." And, apart even from this definition, the question is closed by the constant teaching of the Church through her pastors.

(γ) If we turn from the history of the doctrine to the doctrine itself, and ask "Is it reasonable or credible?" the difficulties are unquestionably great and terrible enough, and never have they been felt more keenly than in the present age. We must of course put aside erroneous or even unwarranted presentation of the Church's belief. God condemns no single soul unless He has first bestowed upon it full opportunity of securing a life of eternal happiness with Himself. Moreover, He desires the salvation of all, whether Catholics or Protestants, Christians or heathen, and will judge all according to the advantages or disadvantages they have had. "Thou sparest all, because they are Thine, O Lord, Thou lover of souls." Again, He remembers the frailty of our nature and condemns to eternal banishment from His presence those only who die separated utterly from Him by mortal—*i.e.* by deliberate and grievous—sin. Nor can we say who these persons are, or guess with any degree of probability what proportion they bear to the whole race of man. Sins which seem grievous to us may be excused by ignorance or want of deliberation, and even men who appear to end evil lives with evil deaths may nevertheless be enlightened by God's mercy at the last—perhaps just as their souls are passing out of their bodies—and so die in peace with Him. Even after these and other abatements have been made, the awful and mysterious character of the doctrine remains. Why does not God, who holds all hearts in His hand, turn the hearts of sinners to Himself? It is no answer to say that He chooses to confer the gift of free will on men with its attendant responsibilities, for it is the common doctrine of theologians that God could soften the heart of each and every sinner, and yet leave the freedom of the will in its integrity; and one who seriously reflects on the meaning of omnipotence as a divine attribute will scarcely venture to contradict the proposition. The only safe reply is that God so acts for reasons inscrutable to us, and that if reason cannot penetrate God's designs, it is at the same time unable to show

[1] Zaccaria, in his notes on Petavius, has shown that both in the East and West prayers were said in Mass for the damned. He cites, *e.g.*, an ancient Latin Missal which contains a touching prayer for a person taken away without time for penance, beseeching God, if the dead man's crimes make it impossible for him to "rise to glory," at least to make his torments endurable.

that the conduct which the Scripture attributes to God is unjust. "Retributive justice," Cardinal Newman writes ("Grammar of Assent," p. 420), "is the very attribute under which God is primarily brought before us in the teachings of our natural conscience." If, then, God will by no means clear the guilty, it is not at any rate inconceivable that He should punish a man who ends the period of trial in utter rebellion against Him who is at once his sovereign and his loving benefactor, by the most extreme punishment which can be conceived. "The great mystery," to continue our quotation from Cardinal Newman—"the great mystery is, not that evil should have no end, but that it had a beginning." From this latter mystery there is no escape to those who believe in a God at all.

Some other arguments have been adduced for the Catholic doctrine, but we have preferred to rest our belief on the words of merciful warning spoken by Christ Himself. For it is not surely without significance that it is from Christ Himself rather than from the Apostles that we have the plainest statements of the doctrine.

> Christ on Himself, considerate Master, took
> The utterance of that doctrine's fearful sound;
> The fount of love His servants sends to tell
> Love's deeds; Himself proclaims the sinner's hell.

(The subject is treated by the dogmatic theologians in their commentaries on Peter Lombard, Sent. iv., dist. 44–50 and St. Thomas, 1^a, q. 64, and Suppl. qq. 97–99; also in their treatises "De Deo Creatore," and in special treatises "De Novissimis" or "Eschatologia," *e.g.* Palmieri, Billot, Atzberger; Oxenham, "Eschatology"; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 546; for the teaching of the Fathers, Petavius, "Dogmata Theol." *De Angelis*, lib. iii. cc. 4–8; Richard in DThC, *Enfer*.)

HENOTICON (ἑνωτικόν, instrument of union). The Emperor Zeno, wishing to put an end to the controversies between Catholics and Monophysites, published his famous *Henoticon*, which both parties were to sign. In it both Nestorius and Eutyches were condemned, and St. Cyril's anathemas were approved; but a creed other than that of Nicaea-Constantinople was inserted, and both of the expressions "one nature," "two natures," were studiously avoided. Instead of bringing about re-union it satisfied neither party, but rather produced further dissension. (See MONOPHYSITES, p. 600; PL, lviii. 963–1096; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 865 *sqq.*; Duchesne, "Hist. Anc. de l'Église," iii. 503 *sqq.* Gibbon (c. xlvii.) and his editor, J. B. Bury, applaud the statesmanlike character of the edict.)

HEORTOLOGY (ἑορτή, a feast). The study of the origin, meaning, and development of the Church's feasts. (See FEASTS OF THE CHURCH; Kellner, "Heortology," Eng. tr.; Guyet, "Héortologie.")

HERESY (αἵρεσις, from αἱρεῖσθαι, to choose) is used in a later Greek (*e.g.* by Sextus Empiricus) to denote a philosophical sect or party. In the Acts of the Apostles (*e.g.* v. 17, xv. 5) it is applied to the parties of Sadducees and Pharisees, who were divided from each other in religious and political views. But in the New Testament we also find the word employed in a distinctly bad sense. In 1 Cor. xi. 18, it indicates an aggravated form of division (διχοστασία) among Christians—*i.e.* of division grown into distinct and organized party. We find St. Paul (Gal. v. 19) placing "heresies" on the same level with the most heinous sins, and St. Peter (2 Ep. ii. 1) speaks of false teachers among Christians, who will bring in "heresies [or sects] of perdition." St. Ignatius in his epistles also uses the word as a term of bitter reproach, and Tertullian ("Praescript." 5 and 6, PL, ii. 17, 18) accurately draws out the meaning of the term. The name, he says, is given to those who of their own will choose false doctrine, either instituting sects themselves, or receiving the false doctrine of sects already founded. He adds that a heretic is condemned by the very fact of his choosing for himself, since a Christian has no such liberty of choice, but is bound to receive the doctrine which the Apostles received from Christ.

The nature of heresy is further explained by St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 11. Heresy implies a profession of Christian belief, so that persons who have never been Christians, or who have utterly renounced Christianity, are infidels and apostates, but not heretics. The heretic, he says, is right in the end which he proposes or professes to propose to himself—viz. the profession of Christian truth—but he errs in his choice of the means he takes to secure this end, for he refuses to believe one or more of the articles of faith, "determined by the authority of the universal Church." St. Thomas adds that this rejection of Catholic dogma must be deliberate and pertinacious, so that his teaching, which is that of all theologians, may be summed up in the following definition. Heresy is error pertinaciously held and manifestly repugnant to the faith, on the part of one who professes the faith of Christ. It is clear from this that such Protestants as are in good faith and sincerely desirous of knowing the truth are not heretics in the formal sense, inasmuch as they do not pertinaciously reject the Church's teaching. Their heresy is material only—*i.e.* their tenets are in themselves heretical, but they are not formal heretics: *i.e.* they do not incur the guilt of heresy, and may belong to the soul of the Church.

Formal heresy is a most grievous sin, for it involves rebellion against God, who requires us to submit our understandings to

the doctrine of His Church. This guilt, if externally manifested, is visited by the Church with the greater excommunication, absolution from which, except in the article of death, can only be given by the Pope, although the power of imparting it is communicated to bishops, under certain restrictions, in their quinquennial faculties, and to priests, in missionary countries, such as England. Ecclesiastics who fall into heresy are liable to irregularity, perpetual deprivation of their offices and benefices, and to deposition and degradation. The sons of an heretical mother, the sons and grandsons of an heretical father, need a dispensation from the Holy See for entering the clerical state.[1] (Ferraris, *Haeresis*; Taunton; for the different heresies see ARIANS, DONATISTS, &c., Choupin in DAp.)

HERMAS. The author of a book entitled "The Shepherd," one of the collection known as the "Apostolic Fathers" (*q.v.*).

HERMENEUTICS (ἑρμηνεύω, interpret). The principles of the right interpretation of the Bible. These are generally dealt with in General Introductions to Holy Scripture and also in special treatises under the titles of "Hermeneutica Sacra, Biblica," &c., *e.g.* Szekely, "Hermeneutica Biblica Generalis"; Gigot, "General Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," part iii. [See BIBLE (3).]

HERMESIANISM. The name is given to principles on the relation of reason to faith which were propounded by George Hermes, a German priest and professor (1775–1831). These principles were accepted with enthusiasm by many German Catholics, were vehemently attacked by others, and were finally condemned by the Holy See.

Although his writings and lectures excited great opposition, particularly during the last six years of his life, no authoritative condemnation of them appeared till 1835, when Gregory XVI. censured his "Introduction to Theology," parts 1 and 2 (Münster, 1819 and 1829), and the first part of his Dogmatic Theology (published after the death of Hermes, Münster, 1834). The same Pope, by a decree of the Congregation of the Index, declared that the second and third parts of the Dogmatic Theology were included in the previous condemnation. The chief error of Hermes lay in his theory that Christians ought to begin by doubting everything which was not self-evident, and hold themselves loose in theory from the faith they had been taught till it had been demonstrated to their satisfaction by reason. Some of his disciples held obstinately to their master's doctrine, and the former condemnations were repeated by Pius IX. in 1847. Finally the Vatican Council (sess. iii. ch. iv.) defined the freedom of the act of faith and its supernatural character. (Franzelin, "De Divina Traditione et Scriptura," p. 686; Kleutgen, "La Philosophie Scolastique" (French tr.), i. 432; Vacant, "Études Théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican," i. 124 *sqq.*, ii. 67 *sqq.*; Schulte in "Cath. Enc."; Kessel in "Kirchenlex."; Fortescue in "Enc. of Religion and Ethics.")

HERMITS. *Eremita* (from the Gr. ἐρῆμος, desert), a dweller in the desert. Anchorite (ἀναχωρητής, one who has retired from the world) has the same meaning. On the life of St. Paul the first hermit, who was born in the Thebaid about 230, and died in 342, after ninety years spent in solitude, see Alban Butler for Jan. 15, and the "Acta Sanctorum." Though the lives of the hermits are not proposed by the Church for the imitation of ordinary Christians, she holds them up for our admiration, as men who, committing themselves to the might of divine love, buoyed up by continual prayer, and chastened by life-long penance, have vanquished the weakness and the yearning of nature, and found it possible to live for God alone. "They appear to some," says St. Augustine,[1] "to have abandoned human things more than is right, but such do not understand how greatly their souls profit us in the way of prayer, and their lives in the way of example, though we are not allowed to see their faces in the flesh." St. Paul fled to the desert during the persecution of Decius, when he was twenty-two years old, and never afterwards left it. He was visited in his cell by St. Anthony shortly before he died (see his Life by St. Jerome). Experience soon proved that it was seldom safe for a man to essay the life of a solitary at the beginning of his religious career. The prudent plan was found to be, to spend some years in a monastery, in rigorous conformity to all the ascetical rules of the coenobitic life, and then, the spiritual strength being tested and the passions subdued, to pass on to the hermit's cell. Thus we read in Surius ("Vita Euthymii Abbatis") of an abbot Gerasimus, who presided over a great monastery near the Jordan, round which there was a Laura consisting of seventy separate cells. Gerasimus kept everyone who came to him for some years in the monastery; then, if he thought him fit for solitary life, and the disciple himself aspired to it, he allowed him to occupy one of the cells, where he lived during five days in the week on bread and water, in perfect solitude, but on Saturday and Sunday rejoined his brethren in the monastery and fared as they did.

On the Hermits of St. Austin, and those instituted by St. Romuald, see AUGUSTINIAN HERMITS and CAMALDOLI. Among the more famous English hermits were Bartholomew of Farne, St. Godric of Finchale, and St. Wulfric of Haslebury; all these flourished

[1] Provided the heresy was notorious, and that the parents died in it. St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.* lib. ii. § 363.

[1] *De Mor. Eccl. Cath.* i. 31, quoted by Thomassin.

in the twelfth century. St. Cuthbert lived an eremitical life on Farne Island for nine years, from 676 to 685. Hélyot, in his history of the monastic orders, mentions a Spanish order of Hermits of St. John of Penance and two Italian orders, one called *Coloriti*, the other, of Monte Senario. (Rosweyde, "Vitae Patrum," PL lxxiii. lxxiv.; Hélyot, iii., iv., viii.)

HEROIC ACT. It will be best to explain what is meant by this expression by quoting the words of the S.C. of Indulgences (Dec. 18, 1885). "The Heroic Act of Charity in favour of the souls detained in purgatory consists in this, that a member of the Church militant, either using a set formula or simply by an act of his will, offers to God for the souls in purgatory all the satisfactory works which he performs in his lifetime, and also all the suffrages which may accrue to him after his death. Many Christians devoted to the B.V. Mary . . . . make it a practice to deposit the said merits and suffrages as it were into her hands that she may distribute these favours to the souls in purgatory according to her own merciful pleasure." Of this latter devotion the great apostle is the Venerable Grignon de Montfort. The Act is not properly a vow, as it is revocable at will. It is called "heroic" because it involves the readiness to undergo the pains of purgatory oneself in order that others may escape them. The Heroic Act has been enriched with many indulgences and privileges. (J. Wilhelm in "Cath. Enc."; Thalhofer in "Kirchenlex." *Liebesact, heroischer.*)

HEROIC VIRTUE. [See CANONIZATION.]

HESYCHASTS (Gr. ἡσυχος, quiet). So called because they held the opinion, shared by the Quietists of later times [QUIETISM], that the absolute repose of all the faculties both of mind and body was the best preparation by which the soul was made fit to receive divine communications. The monks of Athos in the fourteenth century endeavoured to reduce this quietism to a system, adopting the principles of a certain abbot Simeon, who, in a work written about three centuries before, had taught that if the body was kept motionless day and night, the mind raised above transitory things, the eyes steadily fixed on the contemplative's own navel, and the thought searching for the place of the heart within the frame, the result would be, if the monk persevered long enough, that he would find himself enveloped in a wonderful light and full of discernment. Barlaam, a Calabrian abbot, returning from Italy about 1340, where he had been negotiating for the termination of the Greek schism, met some of these monks at Thessalonica and fell into controversy with them. He called them "omphalopsychi" on account of the singular tenet above mentioned. They maintained that the light which Simeon spoke of was none other than the uncreated light which the disciples saw on Mount Tabor, during the Transfiguration of Christ. Barlaam took up the expression "uncreated light," and charged them with believing in two Gods, one visible, the other invisible. A synod held at Constantinople in 1340 condemned Barlaam, who was supported, however, in his dispute with the Hesychasts by the monk Gregory Akindynos, and Nicephorus Gregoras the Byzantine historian. (Fleury, xcv. 9; Möhler, "Kirchengeschichte.")

HEXAHEMERON (six days). The history of the six days of creation as described in the first chapter of Genesis. [See CREATION.]

HIERARCHY (ἱεράρχης, a president of sacred rites, a hierarch: whence ἱεραρχία, the power or office of a hierarch). The word first occurs in the work of the pseudo-Dionysius (a Greek writer of the fifth century) on the Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchies. This author appears to mean by it "administration of sacred things," nearly in accordance with its etymology. The signification was gradually modified until it came to be what it is at present: a hierarchy now signifies a body of officials disposed organically in ranks and orders, each subordinate to the one above it. Thus we speak of the "judicial hierarchy"[2] and the "administrative hierarchy." However, when *the* hierarchy is spoken of, what is meant is the organization of ranks and orders in the Christian Church. In a wide and loose sense, when the whole Catholic Church is considered as existing in the midst of heretics, schismatics, and the heathen, even the laity may be considered as forming a portion of the hierarchy. With this agrees the expression of St. Peter, calling the general body of Christians in the countries to which he is sending his epistle "a kingly priesthood" and "a holy nation" (1 Pet. ii. 9). St. Ignatius, writing to the Smyrnaeans,[1] salutes "the bishop worthy of God, and the most religious presbytery, my fellow-servants the deacons, and all of you individually and in common." So at the Mass, the priest, turning to the people, bids them pray that "his and their sacrifice" may be acceptable to God; and at the incensing before the *Sanctus*, the acolyte, after the rite has been performed to all the orders of the clergy within the sanctuary, turns towards and bows to the laity, and incenses them also. But, according to its ordinary signification, the word "hierarchy" only applies to the clergy—with varieties of meaning which must be clearly distinguished.

I. There is a hierarchy of divine right, consisting, under the primacy of St. Peter and his successors, of bishops, priests, and at least deacons or, in the language of the Tridentine canon, "ministers." "If any one shall say," defines the council,[2] "that there is not in the Catholic Church a hierarchy established by the divine ordination, consisting of bishops,

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* xii., *PG*, v. 857.
[2] Sess. xxiii. can. 6.

presbyters, and ministers, let him be anathema." The term "ministers" comprehends those inferior orders of ecclesiastical institution which, as occasion arose, were, so to speak, carved out of the diaconate.

II. There is also a hierarchy by ecclesiastical right, or a hierarchy of order. This consists—besides the Roman Pontiff and the three original orders of bishops, priests, and deacons—of the five minor orders (two in the East) of subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, and porters (*ostiarii*), which, as was said above, were in the course of time severed from the diaconate.

III. There is also the hierarchy of jurisdiction. This is of ecclesiastical institution, and consists of the administrative and judicial authorities, ordinary and delegated, which, under the supreme pastorate of the Holy See, are charged with the maintenance of the purity of the faith and of union among Christians, with the conservation of discipline, &c. These authorities exercise powers conferred on them by delegation, expressed or implied, from the order above them: thus the powers of cardinals, patriarchs, exarchs, metropolitans, and archbishops proceed from the Pope, either expressly or by implication; again, the powers of archpriests, archdeacons, rural deans, vicars-general, vicars-forane, &c., are derived to them from bishops. (Thomassin,[1] I. iii. 23; Phillips in "Kirchenlex." with the note appended; Petavius, "De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia"; and the theologians and canonists in the treatises "De Ecclesia" and "De Ordine.") On the restoration of the Hierarchy in England in 1850 see ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 299.

HIERONYMITES. [See JERONYMITES.]

HISTORY, CHURCH. [See CHURCH HISTORY.]

HOLIDAYS or HOLY DAYS. [See FEASTS.]

HOLINESS, as a title of the Pope. [See POPE.]

HOLOCAUST (ὅλος, καυστός, "whole," "burnt"). A sacrifice in which the victim was wholly consumed by fire. The subject does not come within the scope of the present volume, but properly belongs to a Bible Dictionary, *e.g.* Vigouroux, "Dictionnaire de la Bible." [See EUCHARIST; SACRIFICE.]

HOLY CHILD, SOCIETY OF THE. Founded in England (Derby) in 1846 by Mrs. Connelly (formerly Peacock), who was a native of Philadelphia, U.S.A. The primary object of the society is the education of girls of all classes; and subsidiary to this, the instruction of converts and visiting the sick and poor. The constitutions are based on those of St. Ignatius Loyola so far as they are applicable to women. The society has been very successful in England and in the United States. (M. Mary of St. Peter in "Cath. Enc.")

HOLY COAT. [See COAT, HOLY.]

HOLY FAMILY. Our Lord, His Mother, and His foster-father St. Joseph, together formed one family which should be the model and veneration of all Christian households. An archconfraternity under the invocation of the Holy Family has this devotion for its special object. It was founded at Liège in 1844 by Henry Belletable, a non-commissioned officer of engineers. He used to assemble a number of workmen on one night in each week for the sake of joining in prayer and pious reading, and encouraging each other in the practice of Christian virtues. The good work was taken up by the Redemptorists and approved by the Bishop. In 1847 Pius IX. enriched it with many indulgences and raised it to the dignity of an archconfraternity, with the power of affiliating to itself other confraternities with the same name and object. Women now benefited by this approval. Their numbers soon began to rival those of the men. At present the confraternity has branches in almost every country in the world. We cannot here give a full account of the constitution and rules. They were considerably modified by Leo XIII. (For further information see the "Directory of the Archconfraternity of the Holy Family.")

HOLY GHOST. [See TRINITY, p. 821.]

HOLY GHOST, CONGREGATION OF THE, AND OF THE IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY. This congregation, as its name might suggest, arose out of the fusion into one, in 1848, of two pre-existing institutes—the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and the Missioners of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The former was founded at Paris in 1703 by a poor Breton student, Claude Desplaces; the latter by Francis M. P. Libermann about 1841. In 1848, it having been long observed that the aims of the two societies were to a great extent similar, a fusion was effected between the congregation of Libermann and that of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, whose superior, Father Monet, had seen the missioners of the other society at work in Bourbon. The rule of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost (which had been lately approved at Rome) was to be retained, and the constitutions of the missionaries were for the most part incorporated in it.

Père Libermann, the first superior of the united congregation, died in 1852. A process has been commenced for his canonization, and he was declared "Venerable" in 1875, no other Jewish convert having ever been so distinguished.

The constitutions, as finally settled at a general chapter held in 1875, have been approved at Rome without change or addition. "The society . . . is governed by a superior-general elected for life. Its missions

[1] Thomassin's *Vetus et Nova Eccl. Disciplina* is quoted by the part, book, chapter, and paragraph.

are directed by bishops or vicars-apostolic chosen from its own body. All the members—fathers and brothers—consecrate themselves to God by the three simple vows of religion, at first temporary, afterwards perpetual; and they bind themselves to the congregation by their act of profession, which contains an engagement of perseverance. Besides the professed members there are the oblates, who, from the age of fourteen, after a trial of at least six months, are received into the congregation as its children, are clothed with its habit, and take the engagement to persevere till their profession." The novitiate is ordinarily for two years. The congregation always pursues as its main and direct object, after the perfection of its members, the evangelization of the blacks, especially of the blacks in Africa itself.

Indirectly the congregation pursues the same end by founding institutions primarily devoted to different objects. A house at Rome being found to be necessary, they established there a French seminary, canonically erected in 1853, which was treated with remarkable favour both by Pius IX. and by Leo XIII. Again, it was thought desirable to encourage vocations in Ireland, and as a means to this end two colleges for secondary education have been established by the congregation, at Blackrock and Rockwell (near Cashel), and have achieved in a few years, owing to the skill and ability with which they have been conducted, an extraordinary success. At the present time about half of the professed members are engaged in the African missions. They are steadily forming a native clergy and sisterhood there. Already a dozen negro priests and about one hundred negro sisters are at work (Gopfert, "Life of Ven. Father Libermann"; J. T. Murphy in "Cath. Enc.")

HOLY HOUSE. [See LORETO.]

HOLY NAME OF JESUS. [See JESUS.]

HOLY OFFICE. [See INQUISITION.]

HOLY OILS. [See OILS, HOLY.]

HOLY PLACES, THE. The spots rendered sacred to Christians by the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, as well as by events in the life of the Blessed Virgin, have been visited by pilgrims and travellers at least since the third century, when we hear of Alexander, the friend of Origen, and Origen himself as going to Palestine to explore them. Constantine, early in the fourth century, after the removal of the earth and rubbish which had long encumbered the site of the Holy Sepulchre, caused a magnificent church to be built over it. His mother, St. Helena, erected and richly adorned a basilica over the grotto of Christ's nativity at Bethlehem,[1] and a portion of her work is believed to be still preserved in the existing structure. She also built a church on the top of Mount Olivet, over the cave which was traditionally believed to mark the scene of the Ascension. Towards the end of the fourth (?) century the noble pilgrim Etheria (Sylvia) refers to the three sacred buildings at Jerusalem: (1) the *Anastasis*, or Sanctuary of the Resurrection, where was the Holy Sepulchre; (2) the Sanctuary of the Cross, where the true cross and other relics were preserved; (3) the *Martyrium*, or great basilica of Constantine, situated "behind the Sanctuary of the Cross." Arculfus, a French bishop, visiting the Holy Land about the end of the seventh century A.D., saw a church built over the rock of Golgotha, the place of the Crucifixion.

To the consideration of the sites here named the present article will be confined. The Abbé Michon, in his work on the Holy Places, gives a list of twelve localities more or less identified by tradition with religious events: among these are Cana, Tiberias, Nablous, &c. To examine the value of the tradition in each of these cases would be a task much exceeding our limits. Narrowing the problem to the necessary degree, we ask this question, Is the traditional belief which has connected for many centuries, and does still connect, certain sites in Palestine with the conception, nativity, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord reasonably trustworthy, or is it not?

Holy places, considered as supports and encouragements to faith and virtue, are in the same category with miracles and relics. "Movemur nescio quo pacto locis ipsis, in quibus eorum quos diligimus et admiramur adsunt vestigia." As Dr. Johnson says: "That man is little to be envied, whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona." As miracles reassure and quicken faith, so the touch of relics, and visits to holy places, seeming to bring us palpably nearer to those to whom God was very near, or even to the very Author and Founder of our religion, tend to the consolation and softening of the hearts of men, and to the revival of their courage under the trials of life. Not sharing the faith, and regarding the consolation as illusory, Protestants and agnostics are disposed by a natural instinct to reject miracles, scoff at relics, and deny the authenticity of holy places. All such supports to a faith and a morality which they accept only in part find with them no easy credence. In the case of holy places, the multiplication of traditions—some spurious, others doubtful, many ridiculous—affords a plausible ground for incredulity. The objector urges that tradition supplies no valid evidence. But there are traditions and traditions. A perfect or adequate tradition as to a holy place is one which identifies by the unvarying testimony of

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* iii. 43.

many generations of Christians living on the spot—who therefore could not have been deceived—a place which, as connected with some event of high religious importance, must have been interesting to them from the very time of its occurrence. Imperfect or inadequate traditions are those in which these conditions are not fulfilled; and they are imperfect in the ratio of their non-fulfilment. The tradition as to the site of the Resurrection is one of the first kind; that as to the "prison of Christ" of the second. To stand at the spot where death, the common enemy, was effectually vanquished, could not but be profoundly interesting to everyone bearing the name of Christian. The Apostles and the women from Galilee "saw where he was laid,"[1] and certainly made true report of what they saw. But no such eager memory or universal interest attached itself to the place where Christ was confined while waiting for His trial; and the identification of the spot, since it may have arisen out of the desire to carry out with a dramatic completeness the localization of the entire story of the Passion, may well be classed among imperfect traditions.

1. We may now proceed to the consideration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, under the roof of which, it is alleged, may be seen the two most holy places in the world—Golgotha, or the scene of the Crucifixion, and the garden-tomb from which Christ rose to die no more. Under the pressure of motives such as have been described above, many non-Catholic writers have formed conclusions adverse to the authenticity of the entire site. Prominent among these are the American Dr. Edward Robinson,[1] the German Tobler, and our own countrymen Clarke, Fergusson, G. A. Smith, and Conder. A much larger number of names may be appealed to in support of the authenticity of the site. Among these the most prominent are—Chateaubriand, Schulz (the Prussian consul at Jerusalem, 1845), Williams,[2] Tischendorf, Finlay, De Vogüé, and Clermont Ganneau, the discoverer of the Moabite Stone.

The slight diagram given below will help to explain, so far as that can be done in a brief popular essay, the main difficulties of the question.

The theory of Fergusson [3] may be at once disposed of. He identifies the sepulchre of Christ with the "dome of the rock," commonly called the Mosque of Omar, in the middle of the Temple area. This extravagant notion has found few supporters, and the latest researches have entirely exploded it. Lieut. Warren (now Sir Charles Warren), who laboured three years in Jerusalem (1867–1870) for the Palestine Exploration Fund, after passing under review all the known facts, came to the conclusion that the Jewish temple stood in the middle of the Temple area; "where, in fact, Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan tradition all unite in placing it." [4] Col. Conder, a well-known worker in the same field ("The City of Jerusalem," p. 53 *sqq.*), and G. A. Smith ("Jerusalem from the Earliest Times," i. 230 *sqq.*) come to the same conclusion. But



1. First wall. 2. Second wall (Warren). 3. Second wall (Conder). 4. Church of the Holy Sepulchre. 5. Pool of Hezekiah. 6. The tower of Hippicus. 7 Dome of the rock. 8. Temple area. 9. The tower of Antonia. 10. Pool of Bethesda. 11. Jaffa Gate. 12. Via Dolorosa.

[1] *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (1841); *Later Researches* (1856).
[2] See his *Holy City* (1849), a work of immense research.
[3] *Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem*, 1847.
[4] *Twenty-one Years' Work in the Holy Land* (Pal. Exploration Fund), 1886.

if the site of the Temple be identified with that of the Mosque of Omar, it is obvious that the sites of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre—which Scripture tells us (Jn. xix. 41) were close together—must be looked for elsewhere.

Conder himself in 1878 proposed another site—not indeed for the Sepulchre, which he declares to be unknown—but for Calvary. It is at a knoll, north of the Damascus Gate, or the cliff on the south side of this knoll, called the Grotto of Jeremiah. This view was adopted by Gen. Gordon in 1882; and he further, quite in opposition to Conder, thought that a tomb in this cliff—now known as the "Garden Tomb"—must be the true site of the Holy Sepulchre. "This identification," says Sir C. Wilson ("Enc. Brit." *Jerusalem*, 1902), "rests on no evidence and no tradition, and is simply a guess." Nevertheless it has been much believed by English-speaking Protestants, especially Americans, mainly on Gordon's authority.

Coming now to the traditional site (see diagram), we may confidently affirm that it is that which Constantine and Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem in his day, believed to be the true one. They had far better opportunities than we have of finding the site, and they were of course familiar with the fact that the Scripture plainly stated (Mt. xxvii. 32, Mk. xv. 20, Jn. xix. 17, 20, Hebr. xiii. 12) that the place where Jesus was crucified was outside the gate of the city. In fixing upon the present site they must have been assured that it was outside the wall, *as the wall existed in our Lord's time.* No intelligent traveller supposes that the present distribution of the buildings of the city is not very different from what it was. The city has naturally been attracted to the north-west, round the principal object of interest. The modern wall was of course erected many centuries after our Lord's death. But Robinson argues that the language of Josephus is almost incompatible with the assumption that the traditional site was outside the wall as it stood at the date of the Crucifixion. At the time of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus three walls protected the city on the north side. About the course of the first there is little difference of opinion; it ran from the tower of Hippicus on the west nearly in a straight line across to the Temple enclosure on the east. It is about the course of the second wall that the main controversy is waged. Josephus says that it left the first wall at the gate called Gennath, and, "encircling the northern quarter" of the city, reached as far as the tower of Antonia.[1] The position of Gennath is uncertain, but it is generally believed to have been near Hippicus, and not far from the Jaffa gate. If it ran nearly straight thence to the tower of Antonia, at the north-west corner of the Temple area, the second wall would have *excluded* the received site of the Holy Sepulchre. Robinson and Conder maintain that it must have been considerably curved, so as to include the large suburb which had gradually sprung up to the north of the first wall. It would in that case have included within its sweep the ground on which stands the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. But Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Williams maintain that the second wall (see diagram) ran in such a manner as clearly to leave the traditional site outside of it. Anyhow, the traditional site still holds the field; no conclusive argument has been brought against it. "My own conclusion," says G. A. Smith in his elaborate work quoted above (i. 249), "after a study of the remains, so far as they are still visible, and of the literature of the subject, is that we do not know how the Second Wall ran from the First to the Tyropoeon; we do not know whether it ran inside or outside the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre." And Sir Charles Wilson (*l.c.*) says: "In the absence of any precise indication of direction in the Bible there can be no certainty; but if excavations ever show that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is outside the second wall, it will be difficult to dispute the authenticity of the sites it covers."[1]

The third wall of Josephus[2] was built about eleven years after the Crucifixion, by Herod Agrippa; no one doubts that it included the traditional site within it.

Assuming now that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre *may* correspond with the true sites of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, we have still to trace its history, so as to ascertain the degree of firmness with which one may hold the belief that it *is* the true site, and then to give a brief description of what the church contains.

That from the very first the places where Jesus was crucified and rose again were visited and reverenced by many, if not the majority, of the Christians of Jerusalem it is impossible to doubt. There may have been some among them who, like the Puritans and Quakers of later times, found or fancied their faith so firm as to be independent of external aids. But to the majority the tomb, the pillar, the inscription, the fixed feast, the annual rite, were powerful helps to that devotion which aimed at bringing the facts of the Passion and the lives of the martyrs more vividly before the mind, and arousing for these last an imitative enthusiasm. "His sepulchre is with us to this present day."[3] This meant much to the Jews, whom

[1] *Wars of the Jews*, v. 4.

[1] The testimony of a scholar so eminent as Tischendorf is worth citing. He wrote to Mr. Williams (*Holy City*, i. p. x.): "I think it will be in future difficult to dispute that authenticity [viz. of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre] upon reasonable grounds."

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Acts ii. 29.

St. Peter reminded of it, and considerations of the like order, in spite of Puritanism, mean much to us to-day. Some forty years after the Crucifixion occurred the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. During the siege the Christians in the city withdrew to Pella, on the other side of the Jordan; but the time was not long enough to cause a break in their recollections. Moreover, in spite of the hideous devastation and destruction which followed the collapse of the Jewish resistance, we must remember that no rapine or violence could injure the rock of Golgotha, nor the tombs in the neighbouring garden. The Jewish revolt under Barcochebas, in the time of the Emperor Hadrian, was the occasion, when suppressed, of an order prohibiting all Jews from entering the city; but this did not extend to the Christians, whom, up to a certain point, Hadrian was disposed to favour. He was resolved, however, to make Jerusalem a completely Roman city; he renamed it Aelia Capitolina, after himself and the Capitoline Jupiter; and we may reasonably accept the testimony of Sulpicius Severus—writing towards the end of the fourth century—to the effect that Hadrian profaned by pagan statues both the site of the Temple and the sacred localities of Christ's Passion.[1] It is therefore to the reign of Hadrian that the origin may probably be referred of the state of things described by Eusebius. The Bishop of Caesarea, in his "Life of Constantine," tells us that when the first Christian emperor resolved to build a church at Jerusalem on or near the site of the Passion, that site was found to be covered over by a huge mound of earth, which "impious and godless men," desiring to efface the memory of all that is most precious to Christians, had heaped up over it, crowning this mound with a statue of Venus. Constantine caused the earth to be removed; the rock tomb from which Jesus had risen was found uninjured beneath it; architects were engaged; and by the year A.D. 335 "the entire site"—including the place where Helena found the cross, the Golgotha, and the cave of the Sepulchre, with the intervening ground—"was occupied by a symmetrical mass of building."[2] But the place of the Resurrection, surrounded on three sides by porticoes, and having the Basilica of the Saviour on the east side, was left open to the air. In 614 Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Persians, who set the basilica on fire, and committed every sort of devastation. When they had retired, Bishop Modestus at once undertook the task of rebuilding; but now, instead of the vast pile of Constantine, three edifices arose, which the description of Arculfus, a French bishop who was at Jerusalem towards the end of the seventh century, and was questioned on the subject by the Irish Adamnan, brings very clearly before us.



1. The Church of Constantine, or Martyrium.
2. The Church of Golgotha.
3. The Church of the Resurrection.

Nearly in this condition the three churches remained till the era of the Crusades. After Jerusalem was taken by Godfrey de Bouillon, great building works were undertaken, and the result, speaking generally, is the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as we now see it; the three churches mentioned by Arculfus being now, so to speak, fused into one spacious basilica, containing both Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre beneath its roof.

A fire in 1808 destroyed the rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre. The Greek architect, who rebuilt it in a debased style, also completely transformed the fine mediaeval choir into a modern Greek church. The new cupola lasted only fifty years. In 1869 it was renewed at the joint expense of France and Russia.

Aided by the diagram here given, the reader may easily understand the mutual topographical relations of the chief sites. The general slope of the ground is from west to east; twenty-nine steps lead down from the Greek church into the Chapel of Helena, at the south-eastern end of which twelve more steps descend to the place where Helena found the cross. The rock or "monticulus" of Golgotha, now encased in masonry, rises considerably above the floor of the Greek church; it therefore has to be separately shown on the diagram. Eighteen steps, beginning at the point marked (7), lead up from the floor of the basilica to the chapels of Golgotha. In one of these chapels is shown a hole in the rock, in which the cross which bore our Saviour is said to have been fixed.

In the portion of the church which is called the Rotunda, from the semicircular row of columns round it—placed in the middle of the pavement—is the small Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre. It is about twenty-six feet long by eighteen broad, and contains two small chambers, to which the only approach is by a door on the east side. The outer chamber is called the "Chapel of the Angel," the inner one is the Sepulchre. The "Chapel of the Angel" is regarded as the place where the angel appeared to the women who were coming to the sepulchre on the morning of Easter-day. All that it contains is a portion of a marble slab, said to be the very stone which closed the sepulchre, and on which, after he had rolled it away (Mt. xxviii. 2), the angel sat. A narrow

[1] Sulp. Sev., quoted in Merivale's *History of the Roman Empire*, viii. 178.
[2] Willis, in Williams' *Holy City*, ii. 257.

low door leads out of the chapel into a sort of grotto, only seven feet by six, and eight or nine feet high. More than half of this confined space is occupied by "a kind of altar or pedestal," not quite three feet high, "which covers and protects the real sepulchral couch where the body of our Lord was laid." [1] The whole of this inmost chamber, this *penetrale* of the Christian religion, is now cased with marble; but there can be no reasonable doubt that the marble slabs veil and screen the actual natural rock of the "new tomb" in which Jesus, after the deposition from the Cross, was laid.

2. Nazareth lies in a basin of gently rounded hills, near the northern edge of the great plain of Esdraelon, about half-way between the lake of Gennesareth and the sea.



1 Holy Sepulchre. 2. Pillar of Flagellation. 3. Chapel of Helena. 4. Place where the Cross was found. 5. Altar of the Franks. 6. Place of the Cross. 7. Stairs to Golgotha. 8. Place where Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene.

"It is a rich and beautiful field in the midst of these green hills—abounding in gay flowers, in fig trees, small gardens, hedges of the prickly pear; and the dense rich grass affords an abundant pasture" (Stanley's "Palestine," 357).

It was at Nazareth that the annunciation of the future birth of her Divine Son was made to our Lady by the angel Gabriel (Lk. i. 28–38). But the exact place is disputed between the Greeks and Latins. The former maintain that it was near the well at the eastern end of the village, whence the women of Nazareth draw water to this day. They support their opinion by reference to the apocryphal gospel of St. James ("Protevang. Jacobi," cap. ii.), where it is said that the angel saluted Mary as she was drawing water from the spring near the town. But the belief of the Latins in the genuineness of their site rests upon a stronger and fuller tradition. Whether the statement of Nicephorus (a Byzantine writer of the fourteenth century [1]) be correct or not, that Helena built a stately church at Nazareth over the house of Mary, it is certain that pilgrimage was made to the spot from an early period. The same Arculfus whose report of the Holy Sepulchre given to Adamnan we have quoted above says that he found two churches at Nazareth, and that one of them was "at the place where the house had been built in which the archangel Gabriel, finding her alone," had addressed the Blessed Virgin. After the first crusade, the brave Tancred, to whom the government of Galilee had been committed, is said to have enriched the church at Nazareth with many donations (Kenrick, p. 20). What Phocas saw here in 1185 is related in the article LORETO; where also is given the later history of the church, down to the removal of the Santa Casa in 1291.

A grotto within the church of the Franciscan convent at Nazareth is believed by the Latins to have been the scene of the Annunciation. This convent, "the most prominent building" in Nazareth, "stands on a spur of the hill which projects some little distance into the green plain" (Murray). Through the great gate the stranger is admitted into a square court, on the opposite side of which is the church. The interior of the church forms nearly a square of seventy feet. From the pavement a broad marble staircase of fifteen steps leads down to the grotto. First there is a vestibule, twenty-five feet by ten, where, it is believed, the house of Mary formerly stood, and whence it was removed in 1291 [LORETO]. From the vestibule "a low arched opening, opposite the stairs, admits

[1] Williams' *Holy City*, ii. 160.

[1] Quoted in Archbishop Kenrick's work on Loreto; see that article.

to the *sanctum*, about the same dimensions as the vestibule" (Murray). Here is an altar of white marble with a fine picture of the Annunciation over it; below it is a marble slab on which are carved a large cross, and the words "Verbum caro hic factum est." Not far off is a large pillar, said to mark the spot where the angel stood during the Annunciation; and another pillar, broken in the middle, where Mary is said to have stood at the same time. Many other interesting localities are pointed out by the Franciscan fathers, respecting which we must refer to the works of Fathers Geramb[1] and Meisterman[2]; the chief facts are also given in Murray's "Handbook for Syria and Palestine."

3. The place of the Nativity of Jesus Christ was already reported by Justin Martyr,[3] in the middle of the second century, to have been "a cave near Bethlehem." The apocryphal gospels uniformly adhere to the tradition of a cave; and it is further confirmed by the reference of Eusebius ("Vit. Const." iii. 43) to the "places renowned by two mystical caves," the sites of the Nativity and the Ascension, which Constantine and his mother took especial care to adorn with all the splendour that the resources of architecture could supply. Bethlehem is on high ground about seven miles south of Jerusalem. "The Convent of the Nativity is an enormous pile of buildings, extending along the ridge of the hill from west to east, and consisting of the Church of the Nativity, with the three convents (Latin, Greek, and Armenian) abutting respectively on its north-east, south-east, and south-western extremities."[4] The nave of the church, which is the common property of Catholics, Greeks, and Armenians, still remains to a great extent as Helena's architect left it. But the impression of the noble building, with its marble columns and mosaics, is marred, says Schulz,[5] by a whitewashed wall by which the Greeks in 1842 cut off the transept and apse (which belong to them exclusively) from the rest of the church. There are five aisles, of which the chief and central one leads up to the apse; the others end at the wall above mentioned. "Under the high altar before the apse belonging to the Greeks . . . is the sanctuary proper, the place of the Nativity, to which two marble staircases, north and south, lead down from the choir. It is a cave under the transept, about three metres high, twelve long, and three-and-a-half broad, lighted with thirty-two lamps; its pavement and walls are covered with white, black, and red-veined marble slabs. At the eastern end is a recess, and under the altar thereof there sparkles in the light of fifteen lamps a star, set close to the ground, with fourteen rays, and several inlaid glittering stones. It bears the inscription 'Hic de Virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est.'" Near the foot of the southern staircase "one descends by three steps into the Chapel of the Manger (*praesepe*). The manger is now of marble; the earlier [or original] wooden one was taken by Sixtus IV. to Rome in 1486," and may now be seen in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore. "In the same chapel is also the altar of the 'Adoration of the Magi,' and from the west end of the principal cave a narrow passage leads" to the place where St. Joseph is said to have received the command to flee into Egypt, to the Chapel of the Innocents, the tombs of Paula and Eustochium, and the cell where St. Jerome laboured at the translation of the Bible. Some way off is the "Grotto of the Shepherds," said to mark the place where the shepherds on Christmas night saw the great light and the angelic company.

4. Mount Olivet, the scene of our Lord's Agony and Ascension, formerly possessed three primitive churches: one in the garden of Gethsemane, and two on the high ground above, Eleona and the Church of the Ascension. The exact sites of the Agony and the Ascension have not been fixed in the Gospels or in the Acts; hence in early times the piety of the faithful was satisfied by venerating the memory of the one at the foot of the mount and the other at the summit. The first of the three churches in the order of time was Eleona (Mt. of Olives), built by the Empress Helena, and described by Etheria as "very beautiful," *satis pulchra*. It was situated at the cave where our Lord discoursed with His disciples on the destruction of Jerusalem and His final coming. While the memory of the churches within the city has been carefully retained, the very site of Eleona was lost until it was discovered by the White Fathers quite recently (1911). The church of the Ascension (Imbomon), the work of Poemenia (before 378), marked the spot from which our Lord ascended into heaven. It was a rotunda, like the church of the Resurrection, and stood in the same relation to Eleona as the Anastasis to the *Martyrium*. The present chapel is the work of the Crusaders, with some of the earlier portions preserved, and the whole modified by Mahometan additions. It is a small octagonal structure within a paved court. In the chapel is shown the rock said to be imprinted with the footsteps of Christ—His last on earth. There is now no resemblance to a foot. This rock was venerated by St. Jerome (*In Zach.* xiv. 4) and St. Paula.

Robinson ("Bibl. Researches," ii. 77) thinks that the Christian tradition which places the scene of the Ascension on the top of the Mount of Olives is certainly wrong, because inconsistent with Lk. xxiv. 50, "He

[1] *Pèlerinage à Jérusalem*, 1853.
[2] *Nouveau Guide de la Terre Sainte*, 1907.
[3] *Trypho*, 58, *PG*, vi. 657.
[4] Stanley's *Palestine*, 432.
[5] Quoted in Herzog, art. "Bethlehem."

led them out as far as Bethania." The village of Bethany is about one mile farther from Jerusalem than the top of the Mount of Olives, to the eastward; and in its immediate neighbourhood Robinson, Stanley, and others would look for the scene of the Ascension. But there is another important passage, viz. Acts i. 12, which tells us that, immediately after witnessing the Ascension, the disciples "returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is nigh Jerusalem, within a Sabbath day's journey." What other conclusion can be drawn from these words but that the Ascension took place on Mount Olivet? What would have been the sense of specifying the distance of Olivet from Jerusalem if in fact the Ascension had not happened on the Mount of Olives at all, but somewhere "among the retired uplands immediately overhanging the village"[1] of Bethany? Everything being taken into consideration, the probability in favour of the traditional site being the true and Scriptural one, as well as the one accepted by Helena, appears to be overwhelming. In the passage from Luke xxiv. "Bethany," as Lightfoot long ago suggested, must be understood to mean "the district of Bethany," which might very well have commenced on the summit of Mount Olivet.

5. Etheria relates that on Maundy Thursday night the pilgrims came down from the Imbomon to the place where the Lord prayed. "There is in that place a graceful church (*elegans*)." St. Jerome also speaks of it as built "in the place where the Lord prayed before His passion." After being destroyed thrice and rebuilt twice, the very site of it was lost. Recently the Franciscans have re-discovered it at the southern extremity of the present "Garden." (There is an immense mass of literature, ancient and modern, on the Holy Places. Some works have already been mentioned in the course of this article. But all have been superseded by the magnificent volumes now in course of publication by the Dominican Fathers Vincent and Abel: "Jérusalem, Recherches de Topographie, d'Archéologie, et d'Histoire" (two vols.), and "Bethléem, le Sanctuaire de la Nativité" (one vol.).

HOLY SEPULCHRE, CANONESSES OF THE. This order derives its name from a tradition connecting it with the Empress Helena, the foundress of the church of the Holy Sepulchre. The earliest authentic foundation dates from 1276 at Saragossa. A great revival and reform took place at Charleville in Belgium, and was approved by Urban VIII. in 1631. Susan Hawley, an English exile, founded a community of these Canonesses at Liége in 1652. This house flourished until the Revolution, when the nuns returned to England, and, after sojourning in various country houses, finally settled at New Hall, Essex, in 1799. Communities of Canonesses still exist in Bavaria, Belgium, and Spain. (See CANONESS; Hélyot; "History of the New Hall Community"; Steele, "Convents of Great Britain"; Guilday, "English Catholic Refugees," ch. xii.; B. Ward, "Dawn of the Catholic Revival," ii. ch. xxv.)

HOLY WATER (*aqua benedicta*). Washing with water is a natural symbol of spiritual purification. "I will pour out upon you," says God by the prophet Ezechiel (xxvi. 25), "clean water, and you shall be clean." In the tabernacle a laver was placed in the court between the altar and the door of the tabernacle for the priests to wash their hands and feet before offering sacrifice; and the later Jews, as may be inferred from Mk. vii. 3, developed the frequent washing of the hands into a matter of ritual observance. If we look into a modern Jewish prayer-book, we find the same importance attached to ritual ablutions, and in particular washing of the hands is prescribed before prayer. The use of the "aqua lustralis" with which the Romans sprinkled themselves or were sprinkled by the priest shows that the same symbolism existed among the heathen.

A like custom, beautiful and natural in itself, though of course it may degenerate and often has degenerated into superstition, has been adopted by the Church. Water and salt are exorcised by the priest and so withdrawn from the power of Satan, who, since the Fall, has corrupted and abused even inanimate things; prayers are said that the water and salt may promote the spiritual and temporal health of those to whom they are applied, and may drive away the devil with his rebel angels; and finally the water and salt are mingled in the name of the Trinity. The water thus blessed becomes a means of grace. Even common water, if devoutly used as a memento of the purity of heart which God requires, might well prove useful for the health of the soul. But as the Church has blessed holy water with solemn prayers, we may be sure that God, who answers the petitions of His Church, will not fail to increase the charity, contrition, &c., of those who use it, and to assist them in their contests with the powers of evil. The reader will observe that we do not attribute to holy water any virtue of its own. It is efficacious simply because the Church's prayers take effect at the time it is used.

Holy water is placed at the door of the church in order that the faithful may sprinkle themselves with it as they enter, accompanying the outward rite with internal acts of sorrow and love. Before the High Mass on Sundays the celebrant sprinkles the people with holy water; and holy water is employed in nearly every blessing which the Church gives. And at all times, on rising and going to bed, leaving the house or returning home, in temptation and in sickness, pious Catholics use holy water.

[1] Murray's *Palestine*, 187.

The use of holy water among Christians must be very ancient, for the Apostolical Constitutions (viii. 28, ed. Lagarde) contain a formula for blessing water that it may have power "to give health, drive away diseases, put the demons to flight," &c. But there does not seem to be any evidence that it was customary for the priest to sprinkle the people with holy water before the ninth century. [See ASPERGES.]

HOLY WEEK. The week in which the Church commemorates Christ's death and burial, and which is spoken of by ancient writers as the Great, the Holy Week, the Week of the Holy Passion (*τῶν ἁγίων παθῶν, τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους, πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*), the Penal Week, the Week of Forgiveness (*hebdomas indulgentiae*). The observance of Holy Week is mentioned by Irenaeus (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." v. 24) towards the end of the second century; while Eusebius (ii. 17) evidently believed that the custom of keeping Holy Week dated from Apostolic times. In the East, Holy Week was distinguished from the rest of Lent by the extreme strictness of the fast. Thus Dionysius of Alexandria, in his Epistle to Basilides, tells us that some Christians kept an absolute fast the whole week, others did so for one, two, three, or four days.[1] Etheria, in her "Peregrinatio," says the same. Epiphanius, in his exposition of the orthodox faith, says much the same. In the Latin Church (according to Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," p. 50) it is difficult to discern any proof that the fast of Holy Week exceeded the strictness of the ordinary Lenten fast.

We have said that in Holy Week the Church commemorates Christ's Passion, and it may be objected that the definition is incomplete, since on Palm Sunday, the first day of Holy Week, it is Christ's triumphant entry into Jerusalem which is chiefly contemplated. But, in fact, Holy Week begins with the Monday, not with the Sunday. At least this is the reckoning of St. Cyril, Theophilus, and St. Epiphanius, quoted by Routh in his "Reliquiae Sacrae" (tom. ii. p. 52). We therefore reserve our account of Palm Sunday for a special article, and confine ourselves here to the ceremonies of Holy Week.

The Tenebrae.—This is the name given to the matins and lauds of the following day, which are usually sung on the afternoon or evening of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in Holy Week. The "Gloria Patri" at the end of the Psalms and in the responsories, the hymns, antiphons of the Blessed Virgin, &c., are omitted in sign of sorrow. The lessons of the first nocturn are taken from the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the Hebrew letter which begins each verse in these acrostic[2] poems being retained in Latin. At the beginning of the office fifteen lighted candles are placed on a triangular candelabrum, and at the end of each psalm one is put out, till only a single candle is left lighted at the top of the triangle. During the singing of the "Benedictus" the candles on the high altar are extinguished, while at the antiphon after the "Benedictus" the single candle left alight is hidden at the Epistle corner of the altar, to be brought out again at the end of the office. The number of the candles and the order of their extinction has much varied during the centuries the custom has existed. (See Thurston, "Tenebrae.") This extinction of lights (whence probably the name *tenebrae* or darkness) is best explained by Amalarius Fortunatus, who wrote in 820. It figures, he says, the growing darkness of the time when Christ the Light of the world was taken. The last candle, according to Benedict XIV., is hidden, not extinguished, to signify that death could not really obtain dominion over Christ, though it appeared to do so. The clapping made at the end of the office is said to symbolize the confusion consequent on Christ's death. But see Thurston, "Tenebrae," p. 22, where a more prosaic explanation is suggested.

Holy Thursday.—On this day one Mass only can be said in the same church, and that Mass must be a public one. The Mass is celebrated in white vestments because the institution of the Eucharist is joyfully commemorated, but at the same time there are certain signs of the mourning proper to Holy Week. The bells, which ring at the "Gloria," do not sound again till the "Gloria" in the Mass of Holy Saturday, and the Church returns to her ancient use of summoning the faithful or arousing their attention by a wooden clapper. Nor is the embrace of peace given. The celebrant consecrates an additional Host, which is placed in a chalice and borne in procession after the Mass to a place prepared for it. In ancient times this procession occurred daily, for there was no tabernacle over the altar for reserving the particles which remained over after the communion of the faithful. Mediaeval writers connect the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Holy Thursday with our Lord's journey to the Mount of Olives after the Last Supper. The "Pangé lingua" is sung during the procession, and the place to which the Blessed Sacrament is removed—often called the Sepulchre, but properly the altar of repose—is decked with flowers and lights. Afterwards the altars are stripped. This used to be done, according to Vert in his explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass, every day after the celebration of the sacrifice, and is retained on Holy Thursday to remind the Christians of the way in which their Master was stripped of His garments. In St. Peter's the chief altar is washed with wine, and a similar custom prevails among

[1] This strictest form of fasting, which implied a total abstinence from food till the dawn of the next day, and even till after the Sacred Mysteries had been celebrated on that second day, was called *ὑπέρθεσις* or *superpositio*.

[2] *I.e.* acrostic in the original Hebrew. No attempt is made to preserve the acrostic in the Vulgate.

the Dominicans and Carmelites, and in some churches of France and Germany.[1] It may be witnessed in our day at Westminster Cathedral.

The stripping of the altars is followed by the washing of the feet, called "Mandatum" from the words of the first antiphon sung during the ceremony—"Mandatum novum," &c., "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another" (Jn. xiii. 34); whence our English word Maundy Thursday. The principal priest or prelate of the church, assisted by deacon and sub-deacon, washes the feet of twelve poor men. The Pope washes the feet of thirteen priests, and some churches follow the Papal custom. The observance of the "Mandatum" is mentioned as a recognized custom, and is enforced under penalties, by the Twenty-second Council of Toledo in 694.

Since the seventh century the holy oils, formerly consecrated at any time, have been blessed by the bishop in the Mass of this day. Twelve priests and seven deacons assist as witnesses of the ceremony. The bishop and priests breathe three times upon the oil of the catechumens and the chrism, meaning by this action that the power of the Holy Spirit is about to descend on the oils; and after the consecration is complete they salute the oils with the words "Hail, holy oil; hail, holy chrism." Another rite proper to Holy Thursday, now passed into disuse, was the reconciliation of penitents. This reconciliation on Holy Thursday is mentioned by Pope Innocent I. and St. Jerome. The Mass now celebrated is one out of three which used to be said, the other two being for the consecration of the chrism and the reconciliation of penitents.

Good Friday (*πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, parasceve*, or *παρασκεύη—i.e.* the day of preparation for the Jewish Sabbath—*coena pura, dies absolutionis, dies salutaris*). On this day the Church commemorates the Passion of Christ, so that it is the most sad and solemn of all the days in Holy Week. The officiating clergy appear in black vestments,[2] and prostrate themselves before the altar, which still remains stripped. Nor are the candles lighted. After a short pause, the altar is covered with a white cloth, and passages of the Old Testament, followed by the history of the Passion from St. John, are read. Next the Church prays solemnly for all conditions of men, for all the members of the hierarchy, for the prosperity of Christian people, for catechumens, heretics, Jews, and Pagans. Before each prayer the sacred ministers genuflect, except before that for the Jews, when the genuflection is omitted in detestation of the feigned obeisance with which the Jews mocked Christ. When the prayers are ended, the cross, which has been up to this time covered with black, is exposed to view, "adored" [see CROSS] and kissed by clergy and people. During the adoration the "Improperia" are sung, each improperium being followed by the Trisagion in Greek and Latin. *Improperium* is a barbarous word used by Latin writers of a late age, meaning "reproach," and these "reproaches" are addressed in dramatic form by Christ to the Jewish people. They begin with the touching words, "My people, what have I done to thee, wherein have I vexed thee? Answer me." The Trisagion is so called because the word "holy" occurs three times in it: "Holy God, holy [and] strong, holy [and] immortal, have pity on us." It was first introduced at Constantinople, and it is probably because of its Greek origin that it is recited in the Good Friday office in Greek as well as in Latin, though the old Latin Sacramentaries show that the intermingling of Greek with Latin forms was very frequent as late as the eighth and ninth centuries.

We have now to speak of the most striking and singular feature in the Good Friday ritual. From very ancient times, as appears from the Council of Laodicea, canon 49, and the Synod in Trullo, canon 52, the Greek Church abstained from the celebration of Mass in the proper sense of the word during Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, and substituted for it the Mass of the Presanctified, in which the priest received as communion a Host previously consecrated. The Greeks still observe this ancient use, but the Latin Church contents herself with abstaining from the celebration of Mass on Good Friday, the day on which Christ was offered as a bleeding victim for our sins. This Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday is mentioned by Pope Innocent I. in his letter to Decentius. The Blessed Sacrament is borne in procession from the chapel where it was placed the day before while the choir sing the hymn "Vexilla Regis." The priest places the Host on the altar, the candles of which are now lighted. The Blessed Sacrament is elevated and adored while the wooden clapper is sounded; it is divided into three parts, one of which is put into a chalice containing wine and water. Finally the priest receives the portions of the Host which remain on the paten, and then takes the wine with the third portion of the Host. According to a Roman Ordo written about the year 800 and quoted by Thomassin ("Traité des Festes"), the ceremony ended with the silent communion of the faithful; but the present discipline of the Church forbids communion to be given on Good Friday except in the case of sickness.

Holy Saturday.—Before entering on the history of the ceremonies for this, the last

[1] So says Benedict XIV., speaking of his own time.

[2] In the Ambrosian rite at Milan and in many mediaeval uses the colour of the Good Friday vestments is *red*, appropriate to our Lord as King of Martyrs, and still retained in the Roman rite for other commemorations of the Passion.

day of Holy Week, it is necessary to say something about the time at which they are performed. We learn from the epistle of Pope Innocent already quoted that in his time no Mass was said during the day hours of Holy Saturday. The office began at the ninth hour, *i.e.* at three o'clock P.M.; the faithful kept vigil in the church, and the Mass celebrated at midnight belonged rather to the morning of Easter Sunday than to Holy Saturday. This state of things lasted till late in the Middle Ages. Hugh of St. Victor (died 1140) mentions the custom, then creeping in, of anticipating the vigil office; but the old mode of observance is spoken of as still subsisting in some churches by Durandus (lived about 1280) and Thomas Waldensis (after 1400). Though the time is changed, the words of the office remain as they were. This explains the joyous character of the Mass, the fact that the history of the resurrection is sung in the Gospel and the allusion to the night time in the Preface, the "Communicantes," and the majestic language of the Collect, "O God, who didst illumine this most holy night with the glory of the Lord's resurrection."

At present the ceremonies begin early in the morning with the blessing of the new fire struck from the flint. This blessing was unknown at Rome in the time of Pope Zacharias (*anno* 751), though it is recognized about a century later by Leo IV. Apparently it was the custom in some churches daily to bless the fire struck for the kindling of the lamps, and about the year 1100 this benediction was reserved exclusively for Holy Saturday, when the fire is an appropriate image of the Light of light rising again like "the sun in his strength." From this fire a candle with three stems, and placed on a reed, is lighted and carried up the church by a deacon, who three times chants the words "Lumen Christi." The same symbolism reappears in the paschal candle, which is blessed by the deacon, who fixes in it five grains of blessed incense in memory of the wounds of Christ and the precious spices with which He was anointed in the tomb, and afterwards lights it from the candle on the reed. The use of the paschal candle goes back very far—as far at least as the time of Zosimus, who was made Pope in 417—and the sublime words of the "Exultet," a triumphant hymn of praise which the deacon sings in the act of blessing the candle, can scarcely be less ancient. Martène attributes it to St. Augustine, but the modern critics deny that he is the author, though some place it as early as the fifth century.

The blessing of the candle is followed by the twelve prophecies, and after they have been read the priest goes in procession to bless the font. This last blessing carries us back to the days of the ancient Church in which the catechumens were presented to the bishop for baptism on Holy Saturday and the vigil of Pentecost. The water in the font is scattered towards the four quarters of the world, to indicate the catholicity of the Church and the world-wide efficacy of her sacraments; the priest breathes on the water in the form of a cross and plunges the paschal candle three times into the water, for the Spirit of God is to hallow it, and the power of Christ is to descend upon it; and lastly a few drops of the oil of catechumens and of the chrism are poured, in order, says Gavantus, to signify the union of Christ our anointed king with His people. At this point the baptism of the catechumens took place. On the way back from the font the Litanies of the Saints are begun, they are continued while the sacred ministers lie prostrate before the altar, and, as they end, the altar is decked with flowers and the Mass is begun in white vestments. At the "Gloria" the organ sounds and bells are rung, and the joyful strains of the "Alleluia" peal forth after the Epistle. The vespers of the day are inserted in the Mass, after the Communion.

The reason for the jubilant character of the Mass has been given above, but there are some other peculiarities which need explanation. The kiss of peace is omitted, because in the ancient rite the faithful kissed each other in the church as day was breaking, with the words "The Lord is risen"; there was therefore a natural objection to anticipating the ceremony in the Mass at midnight. The "Agnus Dei," which was introduced by Pope Sergius towards the end of the seventh century, was never added to this Mass. The Communion and Postcommunion are simply replaced by vespers. But why is there no Offertory? Liturgical writers give many different answers, none of which is satisfactory. Gavantus alleges that the celebrant alone communicated, and that hence there was no oblation of bread and wine on the part of the faithful. The faithful deferred their Communion until the later or Easter Mass properly so called. By a recent decree, it is permissible to give Communion either in the Mass itself or after the Mass (Chiefly from Gavantus, Meratus, Thomassin, "Sur les Festes"; Benedict XIV. "De Festis"; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week.")

HOMICIDE. The violent slaying of one human being by another. The modes are various—*e.g.* shooting, stabbing, strangling, causing abortion, drowning, throwing from a height, the denial of food, &c. Homicide may be either intentional or accidental. If intentional, it may be so either directly or indirectly: directly, as when one man kills another with the full intention of killing him; indirectly, as when a man, without actual intention to kill, does that which he knows is dangerous to life—*e.g.* kicks a fallen man violently about the head. Intentional homicide may be either just or unjust. The

cases when it may be justly done are these four: the command of God; the execution of public justice; a just war; and necessary defence either of oneself or others. For the first case the canonists cite the command of God to Abraham to slay his son, and the putting to death by the Israelites of the women and children whom they found in Jericho. The second case is that of judges, civil or military, who justly condemn men to death,[1] and of executioners or soldiers putting their mandates in force. For the third case, see the article on WAR. The case of life justly taken in necessary defence is one that requires a careful examination of the surrounding circumstances. Homicide is only lawful in this case if it be done "cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae," "under the limitation of an unblamable defensiveness." A defence of oneself which exceeds the measure of the assault made upon one (as, if a man were to kill an unarmed footpad, or an assailant whom it was in his power to disarm or get rid of in some other way) does not comply with the condition just mentioned. Nor is that defence of oneself "unblamable," and therefore justifiable, which would make a criminal who was being led to execution rise up against the officers of the law and kill them in order to effect his own escape: for in such a case there would be no *justa causa* for defending his life, and so it would be blamable. Nor, thirdly, is that a lawful self-defending homicide which takes away the life of the aggressor, not at the moment of the assault, but after some time has elapsed, and by way of revenge. But if the condition "cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae" be duly observed, a man may lawfully kill an unjust aggressor, not only in defence of his own life, but in defence of the life of a parent or a wife or any of his kindred, or even of an innocent stranger. It is lawful also to kill an unjust aggressor in defence of temporal possessions, if they are of great value to their possessor, and cannot otherwise be protected or recovered. But it is not lawful, even in defence of honour and reputation, to kill a man in a combat offered or accepted on private authority. [See DUEL.] Several other forms of unlawful homicide are enumerated among the Condemned Propositions.

In unjust intentional homicide a man may be either a principal, an accomplice, or an accessory. If a principal, it is by one of the various ways of killing specified at the beginning of the article. If an accomplice, he is so either by *counsel* (inflaming the wrath of another, exaggerating his wrongs, &c.), or by *co-operation* (supplying the principal with weapons, hindering the person assailed from defending himself, &c.). If an accessory, it is in one of three ways—by precept, by protection, by permission. An unjust judge knowingly condemning innocent persons to death is an accessorial homicide by precept; the executioner in such a case would incur no blame. A master ordering his servants to kill his private enemy falls under the same category; the servants are also guilty, because they should not have obeyed an unlawful command: Bothwell's ordering some of his retainers to murder Lord Darnley is a case in point. Persons who shelter, maintain, and favour homicides are accessory to homicide by protection. Lastly, magistrates who neglect to enforce the law against murderers and highwaymen, and so allow them to practise upon other men's lives with impunity, are accessory to homicide by permission. (Ferraris, *Homicida, Homicidium*, and the moral theologians when dealing with the fifth commandment.)

[1] Rom. xiii. 4.

HOMILY (from ὁμιλία, intercourse) is used by ecclesiastical writers to signify a familiar discourse on Holy Scripture. The word ὁμιλήσας occurs in Acts xx. 11, where it is applied to St. Paul's lengthy discourse, which is called λόγος a few verses earlier. The homily differs from the λόγος, or discourse, because the homily does not, like the oration or discourse, set forth and illustrate a single theme. It sacrifices artistic unity and simply follows the order of subjects in the passage of Scripture to be explained. On the other hand, a homily is distinct from a mere exegesis or exposition, because the latter is addressed to the understanding, while the homily is meant to affect the heart also and to persuade those who hear to apply the lessons of Scripture for the reformation of their lives. The word "homily" in the sense of discourse first occurs in the Epistle of St. Ignatius to Polycarp, c. 5. The earliest homilies on Scripture which we possess are those of Origen, though for the most part they only survive in a Latin version. Jerome calls the homilies of Origen "tractatus," so that this word may be fairly regarded as the equivalent of the Greek ὁμιλία. Homilies were written in abundance by later Fathers, and early in the Middle Ages Homiliaria or collections of homilies were compiled. The famous Homiliarium of Paul Warnefried was made at the command of Charlemagne, and contains homilies for the Sundays and festivals of the year. Wherever the lesson in the matin office of the Breviary is taken from the Gospels, a homily by one of the Fathers is appended to explain and apply the words of the sacred text. (See Probst, "Lehre und Gebet in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten," p. 203; Beecher in "Cath. Enc." *Homiletics.*)

HOMOEANS (ὅμοιος, like). A sect known also as Semiarians, who held that the Son was only "like" the Father. [See ARIUS AND ARIANISM, p. 50; ACACIANS.]

HOMOOUSION (of one essence, or, as it is usually translated, of one substance), a word used by the Fathers of Nicaea to express the

truth that the Son is one God with the Father. The heretical party, starting with the notion common to their heresy in all its varying shapes, that the Father and Son were of distinct essence, confessed at most that the Son was of like essence with (the ὁμοιούσιον) or even only "like" (ὅμοιος) the Father. "Here, then," says Cardinal Newman, "the word 'one in substance' did just enable the Catholics to join issue with them, as exactly expressing what the Catholics wished to express, viz. that there was no such distinction between them as made the term 'like' necessary, but that their relation to each other was *analogous* to that of a material offspring to a material parent, or that as material parent and offspring are individuals under one common *species*, so the Father and Son are persons under one common *individual substance*."[1] The history of the words "homoousion" and "homoeousion" will be found in the article ARIUS AND ARIANISM.

HONORARY CANONS. Besides the residentiary Canons there are, in connection with all the cathedral chapters of France, Austria, and Prussia, a certain number of honorary canons, who are not bound to residence. These are nominated by the bishops, and selected from among the higher clergy—deans, *curés cantonaux*, and priests who have rendered eminent services to the Church—and many of them become in time titular canons, with all the privileges attaching to that position; but they cannot claim this succession as a matter of right. They usually receive a small emolument. In England a canon is allowed to retire with the rank of "Honorary Canon"; but the number of such honorary canons in each diocese must not exceed three. (Taunton.)

HONORIUS. The condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth General Council (III. Constantinople) is a fact so remarkable in itself, and possesses so much additional interest from the discussion which it has occasioned in modern times, that it seems best to give some account of the facts and the inferences to be drawn from them in a separate article. There is a vast literature on the question, for it was for a long time a matter of contention between Gallicans and Ultramontanes, while the definition of Papal infallibility in our own day has served to bring Honorius once more before the bar of history, and to re-open the controversy on the sense of his famous letters and the precise meaning of the anathema which the council hurled at his head.

We will first of all remind the reader of the points at issue in the Monothelite controversy to which the letters of Honorius relate. The Monothelites (*q.v.*), who were really Eutychians or Monophysites in disguise, held that there was in Christ only one will (viz. the Divine Will) and one operation. The Catholic doctrine, on the other hand, is that, as Christ had two natures, there were in Him two operations, or modes of acting, viz. the Divine and human; for each nature, from the very fact that it is a living nature, must needs act, must needs have an energy proper to itself; and again, since Christ is man, He must have a human will, for human nature without a human will is not human nature at all.

Honorius became Pope in 625, and in 633 or 634 Sergius wrote asking his help in the following difficulty. Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, had succeeded in bringing certain Monophysites (viz. the Theodosians) to the Church by admitting that, as in Christ there was but one person, so there was but one operation proper to the God-man Christ (μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνεργεία). Sophronius, monk in Palestine, and about 634 Patriarch of Constantinople, justly objected to this term of union as a betrayal of the faith defined at Chalcedon. The doctrine of St. Leo and the Church is, two natures, therefore two operations. The doctrine of Cyrus was one person of the Word, therefore one operation; so that in reality he was joining the Monophysites, not the Monophysites the Church. The compromise, however, was warmly espoused by Sergius, and he was naturally anxious to prevent the Pope from interfering on the side of Sophronius, and so undoing the work of reunion already effected. But let the reader observe that Sergius did not put his doctrine honestly and fairly before the Pope.[1] He did not ask him to accept the doctrine of a single operation, but he expressed his desire that peace should be secured and scandal saved by avoiding either expression, one operation or two operations. The former, he said, though found in the Fathers, might cause surprise to the simple; the latter had no support in tradition, and might lead to the false doctrine that in Christ there were two contrary wills (δύο θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἄλληλα ἔχοντα). Accordingly Honorius addressed two letters to Sergius; the earlier of the two exists entire in a Greek translation, but this version may be accepted as an accurate one, for it was compared with the Latin original in the archives of Constantinople by John de Prato, Papal deputy at the Sixth Council. Of the second letter we have fragments only, which are preserved in the Acts of the Sixth Council, Session xiii.

In his former letter the Pope praises Sergius for his moderation and prudence. He teaches that Christ wrought both as man and God, which is equivalent to a confession of the two operations, but he expresses his strong wish that neither formula, "one operation" or "two operations," should be used, and adds contemptuously that such

[1] Newman, *Treatises of St. Athanasius*. Edition of 1842, 144.

[1] He had, however, already modified his language before he wrote to Honorius.

formulae should be left to the vain disputes of cavilling grammarians. Moreover, after speaking about the union of the natures in a single person, he proceeds to say "*Whence also we confess one will of the Lord Jesus Christ*" (ὅθεν καὶ ἓν θέλημα ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), "since plainly our nature was taken by the Godhead, and that nature sinless, as it was before the fall."

In his second letter, so far as we can judge from the fragments of it which remain, Honorius does not reassert his belief that Christ had but one will, and on the other hand he puts forward still more strongly the *doctrine* of two operations. For he confesses two natures in Christ, "unmixed, undivided, unchanged," operating what is characteristic [of each] (ἐνεργούσας τὰ ἴδια), though he again repudiates, as inexpedient, the formula "two operations."

It is certain that Honorius found orthodox advocates, who maintained that he had written with good intentions, and that his words had been misconstrued. Thus Pope John IV. in a letter to the Emperor Constantine, dated 641, defended Honorius on the ground that when he said "we confess one will of the Lord Jesus Christ," he meant one human will, and the Roman abbot, John Symponus, whose services Honorius had used in writing to Sergius, takes the same line of defence. But in the Sixth Council (III. Constantinople) Honorius met with harder measure. In Session xiii., held March 28, 681, the fathers declare that after reading the letter of Honorius to Sergius they found that it was "altogether alien from the Apostolic dogmas, and followed the false doctrine of the heretics." They anathematized the Monothelite leaders, and with them Honorius, who "in all things followed his mind [*i.e.* the mind of Sergius] and confirmed his impious doctrines" (κατὰ πάντα τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ ἐξακολουθήσαντα καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ κυρώσαντα δόγματα).

In the acclamations of Session xvi., the bishops shouted "Anathema to Honorius the heretic!" and in the decree of faith, Session xviii., Honorius is spoken of as a tool in the hands of the devil. This decree was signed by the whole council, including the Papal legates, and by the Emperor. In a letter to the Emperor confirming the conciliar definition, Pope Leo II., after anathematizing Cyrus, Sergius, &c., "the discoverers of new error," continues thus: "Also Honorius, who did not endeavour to sanctify this Apostolic church by teaching of Apostolic tradition, but permitted the spotless one to be defiled by unholy betrayal."[1] The anathema of the Sixth was repeated in the Eighth General Council (IV. Constantinople), its justice was recognized by Pope Hadrian II., and for a time each Pope at his election swore that he acknowledged the Sixth Council, which pronounced eternal anathema against Sergius, Pyrrhus, &c., and also against Honorius, "because he fostered the perverse statements of the heretics" ("quia pravis haereticorum assertionibus fomentum impendit").

The reader is now in possession of the chief facts, and the following questions naturally rise out of them—viz. (1) What is the independent judgment which would be fairly passed on the letters of Honorius, apart altogether from the fact of their condemnation by Pope and council? (2) What is the judgment of the Church on the matter? (3) Were the letters of Honorius *ex cathedra*? Catholic writers of great name have given very different answers to each of these questions. Pighius, Baronius, and in modern times Damberger, have maintained that the documents and particularly the Acts of the Sixth Council have been falsified. This view is not likely to find a respectable defender in the future, and may be here summarily dismissed. But admitting that the documents alleged are genuine, some writers, like Dupin and Bossuet in his defence of the Gallican declaration, have asserted that the letters of Honorius were heretical, and as such condemned. Others—*e.g.* Garnier, Peter Ballerini, and a multitude besides—strenuously maintain the orthodoxy of Honorius. Finally, though most Ultramontane authors deny that his letters were *ex cathedra*, some (and notably a recent Italian author, Pennachi) admit it. In developing our own view, we shall briefly note how far we are supported by the judgment of Catholic critics.

(1) *The Orthodoxy or Heresy of Honorius.*—At first sight, no doubt it seems difficult to excuse from heresy letters which repudiate the Catholic formula, "two operations," and infer the unity of Christ's will from the unity of His person. But, we think, only at first sight. We have seen that the Pope distinctly admits that each nature in Christ was operative, which implies two operations. Further, the Pope evidently did not understand the precise sense in which Sergius used the word "operation," for he (the Pope) asserts that Christ's operation was manifold (πολυτρόπως ἐνεργεῖ).[1] As for the "unity of will," we must remember that Sergius drew the false consequence, "if two wills in Christ, then there are two contrary wills," so that the words of Honorius on the unity of the will admit of an interpretation which makes them perfectly orthodox. He argues thus. Because Christ's humanity was united to, and perfectly controlled by, the Word, and because He assumed a sinless humanity, therefore "we confess one will"—*i.e.* his will, though not physically, is still morally

[1] And so in Leo's letter to the Spanish bishops, "flammam haeretici dogmatis, non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit."

[1] *I.e.* the Pope takes "energy" for a single act, not for the whole class of operations proper to one nature.

one; there can be no opposition of human and divine will in Him. But while Honorius was free from heretical error, and did not teach heresy, he neglected the only means by which the new heresy could be met. He prohibited and contemptuously dismissed the formula "two operations," which exactly summed up the orthodox faith,[1] and though he meant only to assert a moral unity in the two wills of Christ, he did so in language which lent itself easily to abuse on the part of the Monothelites, and he abstained from stating the existence of two wills in Christ, just when the occasion imperatively demanded this statement. Thus he fomented the heresy which it was his duty to check, and his exalted position made his conduct doubly mischievous, and therefore doubly reprehensible. For all that, his position is separated by a very wide gulf from that of the heresiarchs Sergius and Cyrus. This first part of our thesis may claim the support of many Catholic critics, and among them of the learned Jesuits, Garnier and (in recent times) Schneemann, of Ballerini, and of Hefele.

(2) *The Judgment of the Church.*—Peter Ballerini, in his famous treatise "De Primatu," and many others, hold that it was only in the sense given above that the council condemned Honorius. It was, they say, for negligence, not for heresy, that the Pope was anathematized. We confess that we cannot see how the words of the council, taken by themselves, are capable of this sense;[2] and here again we have great authorities on our side, and these far from Gallican. Pennachi allows that Honorius was condemned as a formal heretic, and Hefele's view in his second edition is substantially the same. But, how, it may be asked, can we defend the orthodoxy of letters which the Church has branded as heretical? We answer that it was the council, not the Church, which did so, for the Church consists of head as well as members. The decisions of the council, on Catholic principles, are binding only so far as confirmed by the Pope, and Leo II. approved the Pope's anathema on Honorius as far as it implied the assistance which his neglect had given to heresy, not so far as it implied the formal heresy of Honorius himself. Whether we say with Schneemann that the Pope confirmed the decrees of the council under this reserve, or, with Hefele, that he determined the precise sense which the words of the council were to bear ("Il est certain que le pape Léon a précisé très nettement la faute d'Honorius et indiqué dans quel sens il fallait entreprendre la sentence prononcée contre lui par le concile") does not appear to make any essential difference. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. p. 523.)

(3) *Were the Letters of Honorius ex Cathedra?*—Hefele, even in his second edition, answers this question in the affirmative, and we follow him in believing that Honorius exercised his apostolic authority, and did implicitly address the whole Church. He addresses Sergius, but he lays down rules to be observed everywhere. Nor is there, so far as we can see, any reasonable doubt that Honorius issued a doctrinal pronouncement. True, he will not define that the words "one operation" or "two operations" express the truth, and it is plausibly argued that his refusal to define was the very head and front of his offending. But though he does not define the Monothelite doctrine, he most distinctly teaches that it is vain and foolish to talk of "one operation" or of "two operations," and that such subtleties of language should be left to the grammarians. If Honorius had imposed his own belief with regard to this point on the Church, and threatened to sever from his communion all who did not believe that the phrase "two operations" was frivolous, we do not see how such a fact could be easily reconciled with the Vatican definition. Such a proposition would be so closely connected with faith as to amount to nothing less than an error in dogmatic fact. But this imposition of his own belief on others is just what Honorius abstained from. He wished to impose the disciplinary law, that the form "two operations" was to be avoided, but he stops short of *requiring* anyone to believe that the expression is idle and unmeaning. For this reason, as we think, Honorius did not teach *ex cathedra*, and there is nothing in his letters or in his condemnation, fairly considered, which can be justly urged against the doctrine of Papal infallibility as defined in 1870.

(The different opinions on this question are given with tolerable fulness by Schneemann, "Studien über die Honoriusfrage," 1869, and by Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 343 *sqq.*, 501 *sqq.* Pennachi's treatise "De Honorii I. Romani Pontificis Causa" appeared at Rome in 1870, and was sent to all the bishops of the Vatican Council. Cabrol in DThC; Chapman, "The Condemnation of Pope Honorius," and "Cath. Enc." *Honorius*; Willis, "Pope Honorius and the Roman Dogma," the principal Protestant attack in English.)

HOOD. [See ALMUCE; COWL.]

HOPE. One of the theological virtues [see that article]. It may be defined as a supernatural gift of God whereby we trust that God will give us eternal life and all the means necessary thereto if we do our part. Hope is made up of two elements, desire and expectation, involving, however, the consciousness of difficulty of attainment.

[1] Observe, however, that, as has been already said, Honorius did not clearly apprehend the meaning of the word "energy" as the heretics employed it.

[2] No doubt the council made an emphatic distinction between Honorius and the heresiarchs, Cyrus, Sergius, &c., but only, if we understand it rightly, because it looked on Cyrus, Sergius, &c., as the inventors of the heresy, on Honorius as their dupe.

Salvation and the means of obtaining it are the objects of our desire. Our expectation of obtaining these is based upon the fact that God is both able and willing to grant them, and that He has promised to do so. "With God all things are possible" (Mt. xix. 26). God "will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). "Let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering, for He is faithful that hath promised" (Heb. x. 23). At the same time, we must co-operate with God's work in us. "He who made us without our help will not save us without it"; yet "to him that does what in him lies God denies not grace." Hence our expectation is not absolutely certain. "With fear and trembling work out your salvation" (Phil. ii. 12); "Man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred" (Eccl. ix. 1). There is no room for hope in heaven: the blessed already enjoy eternal life. The damned in hell cannot hope, for they can have no expectation of salvation. It is on earth that this virtue finds place. In consequence of the twofold element of hope there are a number of vices opposed to it. The defect of desire for salvation belongs to the vice of worldliness (sloth, *acedia*). We can hardly sin by excessive desire. Want of confidence is called despair. The heinousness of this sin arises from the fact that it is a virtual denial of God's power, or goodness, or truth. Too great confidence is called presumption. This may be due to excessive self-reliance or to a distorted idea of God's goodness. The sins of Judas and St. Peter are familiar instances of these opposite vices. (See St. Thomas, 1^a 2^{ae}, q. 40; 2^a 2^{ae}, qq. 17–21.)

HOSANNA (ὡσαννά). A Hebrew word taken from Ps. cxviii. (Vulg. cxvii.) 25: "O Lord, we beseech thee, save now: O Lord, we beseech thee, send now prosperity." The words of the Psalm, הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא, "save, we pray," were shouted by the Jews at the most joyful of their feasts, that of Tabernacles, while they waved their branches of palm and willow. So closely was the feast associated with this shout of joyful prayer that it came to be called the "Hosanna" (הוֹשַׁעְנָא or הוֹשַׁעְנָה), the last or great day of the feast being known as "the great Hosanna" (הוֹשַׁעְנָה רַבָּה).[1] It was with this joyful shout that the crowds met our Lord as He entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. "Hosanna in the highest" is possibly only an intensification of the jubilant supplication, and is parallel to the Roman "Io triumphe, ter quaterque!" on occasion of triumphal processions.

The word is retained in the "Sanctus" at Mass, and in the hymn in the service of Palm Sunday.

[1] Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. et Rabbin.* sub voc.

HOSPITAL. The term is at present restricted to institutions for the treatment of the sick, and in this sense only we shall use it in the present article. For a general account of early hospitals (Nosocomia, from νοσοκομεῖον, the term first occurs in the fourth century) see the article on CHARITY, WORKS OF. Hospital attendants are called in the language of the canon law *parabolani*. The infirmary (*infirmaria*) with which every large monastery was provided (see the Rule of St. Benedict, c. 35, 36) appears to have furnished the model for the hospitals of later times. The synod of Aix in 816 ordered that every ecclesiastical foundation, whether of canons or monks, should provide accommodation for the poor, the sick, widows, and strangers. As a rule, hospitals were in early times under the jurisdiction of the bishop. Even at the Council of Trent[1] large powers of visitation and supervision of the accounts of hospitals were assigned to the bishops; but in practice these powers were greatly limited from the first by the existence of contrary customs and privileges, and at present they are hardly exercised at all. The special endowments which in course of time were founded for the support of hospitals came to be much diverted from their original destination; in consequence of which the Council of Vienne (1312) forbade that the charge of a hospital, unless it was expressly so ordered in the original foundation, should be conferred *titulo beneficii* on any secular clerk, but ordered that their government could be committed to prudent and capable men of good character, who should make periodical reports to the ordinaries or their delegates.[2] From this decree the lay administration of hospitals may be said to date.

The earliest distinct record of the establishment of a hospital in England connects it with the name of Archbishop Lanfranc, who built wooden tenements outside the west gate of Canterbury (about 1080) for the reception of persons afflicted with the king's evil.[3] The priory and hospital of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, were founded by one Rahere, a minstrel, in 1102. The hospital of St. Thomas, in the Borough, was founded by the prior of Bermondsey in 1213; it was removed to its present site in Lambeth in 1871. The priory and hospital of Bedlam (a corruption of "Bethlehem") were founded in 1247. These three institutions were given up or sold to the citizens of London by Henry VIII. after the dissolution of monasteries, and have continued to be flourishing hospitals down to the present time. A great movement in the building of hospitals took place in the eighteenth century; the writer in the "Enc. Brit." gives a list of forty-nine erected in England and Ireland between 1719

[1] Sess. xxii. De Ref. 8, 9.
[2] Fleury, xci. 60.
[3] Malmesbury, *Gest. Pont.* i. 44.

and 1797. Of late years the Catholics of Ireland have shown a most laudable and fruitful energy in this direction, especially in the dioceses of Dublin and Cork. The Mater Misericordiae hospital in the first-named city is a splendid monument of their zeal and humanity.

(Ferraris, *Hospitale*; J. J. Walsh in "Cath. Enc."; "Enc. Brit." art. *Hospital*, by Prof. de Chaumont; Smith and Cheetham.)

HOSPITALLERS. (*Hospitales*; Knights of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem; Knights of Rhodes; Knights of Malta.) This celebrated order, which in its palmy days had vast possessions in every country in Europe, and enjoyed immunities which almost rendered them independent of the *lex loci*, grew up out of humble beginnings. Some merchants of Amalfi founded at Jerusalem about the middle of the eleventh century a convent, church, and hospital, for the benefit of poor pilgrims visiting the Holy Places. At the date of the siege of Jerusalem by the Crusaders (1099), the hospital was in charge of Abbot Gerard, a Provençal. The intrepid devotion with which Gerard, before and after the city fell, sought to relieve human suffering, without distinction of creed or class, drew forth the admiration of Duke Godfrey, who authorized the separation of the hospital from the convent, and gave to it one of his own manors. Others among the princely and noble Crusaders followed his example, and the "Brothers of the Hospital of St. John the Baptist" soon became a wealthy fraternity, and founded dependent hospitals in various places. Gerard died in 1118; his successor, Raymond du Puy, took the title of Master, and drew up a rule for the order, which Calixtus II. confirmed in 1120. The rule was exceedingly austere; all the brothers, laymen as well as clerks, were required to take the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience; abstinence was to be kept on all Wednesdays and Fridays, and from Septuagesima to Easter; all faults were sternly punished; gross sins visited by expulsion. Knights began to join the brotherhood; Raymond himself was one; and the members were divided into three classes—knights, who were all of noble birth; priests or chaplains; and brothers servants, who were not noble. The revenues of the order being by this time very considerable, and Jerusalem being in a settled condition, new views presented themselves to the more aspiring among the members. Of the religious fervour of the first knights who joined the order it is impossible to doubt when one considers the rigour of the life which they voluntarily embraced; still they did not cease to be knights; and the critical condition of the little Christian kingdom, planted as an outpost in the midst of a swarming population of infidels, might naturally suggest to them that they would bear the sword in vain if they did not wield it as occasion arose in support of the Christian cause. They therefore joined, then initiated, expeditions against the Moslems; returning from which, they laid aside their arms and resumed the care of the sick in the hospital. By degrees their military duties assumed the first place in their own minds, and in the thoughts of other men; and they became, with the Templars, one of the chief bulwarks of the Christian power in the East. Dissensions arose, and were of long continuance, between them and the Templars; on one occasion (1259), the forces of the two orders fought a pitched battle on the soil of Palestine. When, in 1187, Jerusalem fell before the arms of Saladin, the tenth Master of the order transferred the convent and hospital to Markab, in Phoenicia, whence, on the retaking of Acre by the Christians in 1193, they were removed to that city. Acre, the last stronghold of Christian power, fell in 1291, and the Hospitallers withdrew to Cyprus, whence they carried on a naval war for some years against the Saracenic nations of the Levant. After the suppression of the Templars (1310), their lands were made over to the Hospitallers; but the latter "had to purchase the surrender from the King [of France] and other princes at such vast cost of money, raised at such exorbitant interest, that the Order of St. John was poorer rather than richer from what seemed so splendid a grant."[1] The sojourn in Cyprus is said to have witnessed a great moral declension among the Knights, and a departure from the spirit and letter of their rule. In 1310 they seized the island of Rhodes, and maintained themselves there for more than two centuries, in spite of all the efforts of the Turks. But in 1522, the Grand Master (this title had been used since 1268) being then Villiers de l'Isle Adam, Solyman the Magnificent sent an immense fleet and army against Rhodes, and though the defence was valiant, and great numbers of the besiegers were killed, yet, being assisted by treachery within the walls, the Sultan at length compelled l'Isle Adam to capitulate. Some years later, in 1530, the Emperor Charles V. granted to the dispossessed order the island of Malta. Here, after repelling a vigorous attack made by Solyman in 1565, they remained undisturbed till, in 1798, under the Grand Master Ferdinand d'Hompesch, a German, some of the French knights having previously been won over by the bribes and promises of the French Government, the island was tamely surrendered to Napoleon Bonaparte, then on his way to Egypt. It was soon after blockaded by an English fleet, and the garrison was compelled by hunger to capitulate in 1800, since which time Malta has been held by England. The Grand-Master Hompesch, in 1799, resigned his office in favour of the Czar of Russia, Paul I. In that and following

[1] Villani, quoted by Milman, *Lat. Christ.* vii. 276.

years the order was suppressed in several European States where it still had possessions. Paul was assassinated in 1801; Hompesch died in 1803; the headquarters of the order were then, with Papal sanction, fixed at Catana, and afterwards at Ferrara. An order of knighthood, designed apparently for the purpose of decorating members of the nobility with crosses and ribands, was founded in Prussia in 1812, under the same name—Johanniter-Orden—by which the Hospitallers had always been known in Germany.

After the order had attained its full development, it was divided into eight "languages," Provence, Auvergne, France, Aragon, Castile, England, Germany and Italy. The Grand Commander was always a Provençal, because that was the nationality of Raymond du Puy; the chief of the language of Auvergne was Grand Marshal; that of France, Grand Hospitaller; of Italy, High Admiral; of Aragon, Grand Guardian; of Germany, High Bailiff; of Castile, Grand Chancellor; and of England (before that "language" was suppressed on account of the national adoption of Protestantism), General of Infantry. Each language was divided into grand priories and bailiwicks, which again were subdivided into commanderies. The ordinary knights, "chevaliers de justice," were required to prove noble birth; but a certain number of knights by favour, "chevaliers de grâce," were also admitted, though not noble, in consideration of distinguished valour or other merit. The dress of a Knight in time of peace was a long black mantle, with a white cross of eight points (the "Maltese" cross) upon it; in the field he wore a red coat with similar crosses in front and on the back. The banner displayed a similar cross on a field gules. (Hélyot, "Ordre de Malte"; "Conversations-Lexicon," *Johanniter-Orden*; Vertot, "Hist. des Chevaliers Hospitaliers de S. Jean"; Jurien de la Gravière, "Les Chevaliers de Malte.")

HOST (from *hostia*, a victim). It is used in the Vulgate both of Christ the victim of expiation for our sins, Eph. v. 2, and also of spiritual sacrifices, such as almsgiving, Phil. iv. 18. In the liturgies and ecclesiastical writers, the word is used (1) of Christ present on the altar under the appearances both of bread and wine: thus, the Mozarabic Missal mentions the "Host of bread and wine"; (2) of Christ present under the form of bread: this use is recognised by the three earliest Roman Ordines, which were drawn up between the seventh and nine centuries; (3) of the bread before its consecration: so the word is employed in the ordinary language of Catholics at the present day, and the word in this sense occurs in the Offertory of the Roman Missal, when the priest prays "Receive, O Holy Father, this unspotted Host," &c., taking the bread, not for what it is, but for what it is to become after consecration. Le Brun ("Explic. de la Messe," p. iii. a. 6) says that this prayer was borrowed from the Spanish liturgy, and inserted in the Roman Missal towards the end of the eleventh century. The writer of the article *Host* in Smith and Cheetham maintains that in the Spanish liturgy the words were used of the *consecrated* Host, the unconsecrated elements being known in early times as "oblata." Hence the old liturgical name for the pre-anaphoral prayer, now known as the "Secret." In the Roman Sacramentaries it is always entitled "Oratio super Oblata," which last word is still of frequent occurrence in the course of the prayer itself.

The form and material of the altar-breads, the offertory, the consecration and elevation of the Host, are explained in separate articles, but this is perhaps the most convenient place to speak of the breaking of the Host.

All liturgies, following the example of our Lord at the Last Supper, require the Host to be broken. The Greeks break the Host into four parts, of which one is received by the celebrating priest, another by the other communicants, while a third is reserved for the sick, and a fourth put into the chalice. In the Mozarabic rite the Host is divided into nine parts. In the Roman Mass the Host used to be divided into three parts, one for the celebrant, another for the communicants present and for the sick, while a third was placed in the chalice. Traces of this ancient usage still remain in the Papal Mass, when the deacon and subdeacon communicate from the same Host as the Pope, and in the Mass of episcopal consecration, in which the consecrator and the new bishop receive portions of the Host consecrated jointly by both. Moreover, in the ancient Roman Mass the celebrating bishop put into the chalice the consecrated Host sent from another church in sign of peace and unity, saying, as he placed this Host in the Precious Blood, "The peace of the Lord be always with you." The Pope, according to the two oldest Ordines, performed the same rite of mixture with the Host which had been reserved from a previous Mass, and which was placed on the altar and adored by him before his own Mass began. At present it is only from the Host consecrated at the Mass that a part is taken and dropped into the chalice. Just before the celebrant puts this portion in the chalice, he says "Pax Domini," &c., words originally intended for the portion consecrated at another Mass and reserved to symbolize the unity of the Church and of the sacrifice. The words "Haec commixtio," "May this mixture of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ keep my soul into everlasting life," are said after the portion of the Host is placed in the chalice, and have kept their original reference.

This custom of mixing the Host and the Precious Blood is very ancient. It occurs

in the Liturgy of St. James, and is mentioned by a Council of Orange in 441. Liturgical writers tell us that it figures the reunion of Christ's Body and Blood after His resurrection. But if we ask what was the historical origin of the rite, the question is not easily answered. Le Brun suggests that the Host sent from another church would become hard and dry (for altar-breads were thicker in those days), and that this led to the practice of moistening them with the consecrated wine. He supports this explanation by analogies from the discipline of the early Church, and it seems at least very probable. As to the portion of the Host consecrated in the same Mass and dipped in the chalice, Pouget and Vert suppose it sprang from an old custom connected with Communion. If the consecrated wine did not suffice for the number of communicants, ordinary wine was poured into a chalice, and the liquid was sanctified by contact with a portion of the Host. Benedict XIV. justly rejects this theory as destitute of any solid foundation, so far at least as it involves the strange view that a consecrated Host dropped into unconsecrated wine (*cum intentione consecrandi*) consecrates the latter. There is no proof that the custom alleged is older than the practice which still continues of placing part of the Host in the chalice; and the theory is open to other objections. We are not aware, however, that any better explanation has been devised. (Le Brun and Benedict XIV. on the Mass; Lucas, "The Holy Mass," p. 76; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 366.)

HOURS, CANONICAL. The portions of the Divine office appointed to be recited at different hours of the day. [See BREVIARY.]

HOUSEL. For many centuries this was the English name for the Blessed Eucharist: it had not become obsolete even in the time of Shakespeare, who makes the Ghost in Hamlet lament that he had been hurried "unhouselled" out of the world. The Anglo-Saxon form was *husel*; compare the Gothic *hunsl*, which in the version of Ulfilas is the translation of προσφορά, "offering," in Eph. v. 2, and is seen in the rendering *hunsljada* of σπένδομαι, "I am being offered up," in 2 Tim. iv. 6. It is found in Mt. ix. 13, and Mk. ix. 4, 48, as the translation of θυσία, and in Jn. xvi. 2 for λατρεία. Skeat, "Etym. Dict." *sub voce*, says "The original sense is sacrifice." Grein[1] connects the word with the Gr. καίνω and Sanskr. *khan*, "to kill." *Husel* to our forefathers expressed the highest good and absolute enjoyment; thus Cynewulf (about 700 A.D.), writing of the happiness of the blessed in heaven, says, "him bið lenge husel," "*housel* shall be their portion." Robert of Gloucester (1270) says that the Normans made their shrift before the battle of Hastings, "and amorwe hom let hoseli"—in the morning caused themselves to be houselled.[1] The word does not occur in either of the Wycliffite versions of the Bible. (See ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH, p. 27; Lingard, "Hist. and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," ed. 2, i. 298; Rock, i. 134–5.)

[1] *Glossar der Angelsächsischen Dichter*, 1864.

HUGUENOTS. [See REFORMATION, p. 717.]

HUMERAL VEIL. An oblong scarf of the same material as the vestments, worn by the subdeacon at High Mass, when he holds the paten, between the Offertory and Paternoster; by the priest when he raises the monstrance to give benediction with the Blessed Sacrament; and by priests and deacons when they remove the Blessed Sacrament from one place to another, or carry it in procession. It is worn round the shoulders, and the paten, pyx, or monstrance is wrapped in it. According to Le Brun ("Explication de la Messe," i. p. 319), this veil was introduced because in many churches it was the ancient custom for an acolyte to hold the paten at High Mass, and he, not being in holy orders, could not lawfully touch the sacred vessels with bare hands. But the true explanation would seem to be the following: The earliest use of the veil in connection with the Blessed Sacrament was that of covering the pyx when carried to the sick, to preserve it from dust and rain. So, too, in solemn processions of the Blessed Sacrament the veil would be used, and would be retained when the ceremony closed with a Benediction. In recent times, when Benediction was instituted as a separate ceremony without a previous procession, the use of the veil was retained because it was found already existing. (Braun in "Cath. Enc."; Rock, i. 329–334; iv. 218, 225.)

HUMILIATI. A penitential order founded in the twelfth century. It adopted the rule of St. Benedict and was approved by Innocent III. After flourishing through the Middle Ages it became relaxed. St. Charles Borromeo, acting under the orders of St. Pius V, attempted to reform its abuses. As is well known, one of the monks made a murderous assault upon him, and in punishment for this crime the whole order was suppressed in 1571.

A female branch was founded about the same time as the other, and from their care of lepers became known as Hospitallers of the Observance. There are still in Italy five independent houses of the nuns. (See Hélyot; Rudge in "Cath. Enc.")

HUSSITES. The followers of the Bohemian John Huss or Hus, rector of the university of Prague, who was burnt for heresy at the Council of Constance. His countrymen, or a large proportion of them, rose in arms in 1418 against the imperial government, and during a war which lasted thirteen years inflicted many defeats on the German armies and laid many churches in ashes and many cities waste. Their principal leaders were John Ziska, who died in

[1] Quoted by Morris and Skeat's *Specimens*, Part 2.

1424, and the blind Procopius, an ex-priest. Terrible excesses were committed on both sides, the war being to a great extent one between two hostile nationalities, the Slavonian and the German. Bohemia was at that time celebrated for the grandeur and beauty of the churches and other religious edifices which met the eye in every part; but the Hussites destroyed most of these; in Prague alone may still be seen evidence of the ancient architectural glory of the land. Several crusades were preached against them, but with little result. After the victory of Taus (1431), which dissipated the forces of the fifth Crusade, the war ceased; and the bishops of the Council of Basle, which met in that year, laboured earnestly to bring about a peaceful arrangement. The council conceded to that section of the Hussites called Utraquists the Communion under both kinds, besides certain reforms on points of discipline; the sect was thus divided; and when war broke out again in 1434, the insurgents sustained a crushing defeat at Lepan from the imperial forces. The legate, Philibert, bishop of Coutances, succeeded at last in negotiating a peace; and by the treaty of Iglau (July 1436) the Bohemian and Moravian nations returned to the unity of the Church. Nevertheless, heretical opinions continued to be rife, until the preaching of St. John Capistran, the glory of the Church in the fifteenth century—between 1451 and 1453—wrought a great and sudden change. Eleven thousand Hussites are said to have renounced their errors before him. (See BASLE, COUNCIL OF; CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF; Salembier, "Le Grand Schisme," p. 323 *sqq.*; Wilhelm in "Cath. Enc."; Kroess in DAp.)

HYMN. I. *In the wider and ancient sense, including Psalms and Canticles*: ὕμνος meant originally a song of praise in honour of gods or heroes. It had a religious character, and was distinct for this reason from the ἐγκώμιον (*sc.* ἔπος), or laudatory ode in honour of a mere man. In the LXX the word is adopted as a translation of several Hebrew terms,[1] and here the word hymn keeps its old classical meaning, except, of course, that it is used of songs in honour of the true God. The use of the New Testament is the same as that of the LXX. Thus we read in Mt. xxvi. 30, Mk. xiv. 26, that Christ and His disciples sang a hymn (ὑμνήσαντες) at the close of the Last Supper. This hymn, no doubt, was the latter part of the Hallel (הַלֵּל), or ascription of praise, consisting of Ps. cxiii.–cxviii., which was sung on the feast of the new moon, the dedication, and the three great solemnities of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. The former part of the Hallel (Ps. cxiii. cxiv.) was sung before beginning the Paschal meal; the latter (Ps. cxv., cxvi., cxvii., cxviii.), after the assembled company had drunk of the fourth and last cup,[1] over which the "blessing of the song" was said, beginning with the words "Let all thy works praise thee, O Lord," and including the beautiful and solemn ascription "Blessed is he who createth the fruit of the vine." In the gospels, then, the word hymn is not distinct from psalm. St. Paul, however, does make a distinction. He tells the Ephesians (v. 19, cf. Coloss. iii. 16) that they are not to imitate the drunken revelry of the heathen, but to express their joy in a different way. They are to "speak to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual odes." Probably by psalms the Apostle meant poems in the style of the Hebrew psalter; by hymns, songs in *praise* of God and Christ (see v. 19); while spiritual odes (ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαὶ) is perhaps a generic term including both psalms and hymns. In the first part, then, of this article we shall continue to use the word in the wide sense with which we set out, including under it any composition in praise of God which is adapted to be chanted or sung.

We do not believe (though the authority of Probst, "Lehre und Gebet in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten," p. 256 *seq.*, may be quoted against us) that St. Paul in the passage just quoted refers to the use of psalms and hymns in public worship. The context appears to show that he has in view the private intercourse and social meetings of Christians, and desires to point out the kind of joy and mirth which should accompany them. But it is certain that from the earliest times psalms and hymns were sung in Christian assemblies. Pliny, in his famous letter to Trajan, written about 104, mentions the Christian custom of singing a hymn (*carmen*) to Christ as God in their assemblies. Christian hymns are spoken of by Justin Martyr ('Apol.' i. 13, PG, vi. 345), and it would be useless to multiply citations on the use of the psalms in the primitive Church. In them the Church of the first three centuries found the most natural expression of her own sorrow and hope when persecution weighed hard upon her; of her joy in the midst of tribulation. There, too, she found the most natural expression of her faith, for "nearly all the psalms," Tertullian says ("Adv. Prax." 11, PL, ii.167), "are spoken in the person of Christ" ("Christi personam sustinent").[2]

The psalms still form the bulk of the Breviary office, and portions of them constantly occur in the Mass. They are sung

[1] Often the Hebrew word does not answer at all closely to the Greek ὕμνος—*e.g.* in Ps. lxxi. 20 the LXX have ὕμνοι for "prayers" (תְּפִלּוֹת) and the Vulgate translates ὕμνοι into "laudes."

[1] All present must taste the four cups, and after the fourth no more wine could be drunk that night, to both of which points our Lord seems to allude (Mt. xxvi. 27, 29). The student interested in such matters may be referred to the fascinating article in Buxtorf's *Chaldee and Rabbinical Lexicon*, sub voc. הַלֵּל.

[2] There is, however, some doubt about the reading. Oehler reads "omnes psalmi *qui* Christi personam sustinent."

antiphonally—*i.e.* alternate verses of the psalms are chanted by each side of the choir. A legend given by Socrates attributes the introduction of the antiphonal chant to St. Ignatius. Theodoret, with better reason, says that it was begun at Antioch by the two monks Flavian and Diodorus, in Constantine's reign. This mode of singing came to the West some time later. Justina, the Arian empress, sought to imprison St. Ambrose. His people gathered round him in his church, and passed their time in the singing of psalms and hymns antiphonally. This was the earliest instance of the custom in the Latin Church.

Besides the hundred and fifty psalms, the Roman Breviary contained seven canticles taken from the Old and three from the New Testament. Their use in the offices is far more ancient than Amalarius, who wrote in 820,[1] since St. Benedict prescribes their recitation at Lauds by his monks: "sicut psallit Ecclesia Romana." In the new Breviary (1911) seven more have been added from the Old Testament. The following is a list of the canticles in question :—

1. "Benedicite," from the book of Daniel (the deuterocanonical portion), with abbreviations and ascription of praise to the Trinity inserted at the end. This addition, though not quite in the present form, is mentioned by Amalarius. This canticle is fitly said on Sunday, the first day of the creation, at Lauds.

2. "Benedictus es, Domine" (Dan. iii. 52–57). Sunday at Lauds from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday.

3. Canticle of David (1 Paral. xxix. 10–13). Monday at Lauds.

4. Canticle of Isaiah (Is. xii. 1–6). Monday at Lauds in the ferial office of Advent and Lent, and in the office of vigils.[2]

5. Canticle of Tobias (Tob. xiii. 1–10). Tuesday at Lauds.

6. The Canticle of Hezechiah (Is. xxxviii. 10–20). Tuesday at Lauds II.

7. The Canticle of Judith (Jud. xvi. 15–21). Wednesday at Lauds.

8. The Canticle of Hanna (Anna) (1 Kings (Samuel) ii. 1–10). Wednesday at Lauds II.

9. The Canticle of Jeremiah (xxxi. 10–14). Thursday at Lauds.

10. The Canticle of Moses (Exod. xv. 1–19). Thursday at Lauds.

11. The Canticle of Isaiah (xlv. 15–26). Friday at Lauds.

12. The Canticle of Habakkuk (Habacuc) (iii. 1–19). Friday at Lauds II.

13. The Canticle of Ecclesiasticus (xxxvi. 1–16). Saturday at Lauds.

14. The Canticle of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 1–43). Saturday at Lauds II.

The three New Testament canticles are the "Benedictus" or Song of Zachary, at Lauds; "Magnificat," called by Amalarius the "Hymn" of the Blessed Virgin, at Vespers; and the "Nunc Dimittis," or Song of Simeon, at Compline. At the chanting of these last all stand, out of reverence for the Incarnation, to which they directly refer.

Further, the Roman Church uses other canticles which are not to be found in Scripture—viz. the "Te Deum" and the "Trisagion," of which an account is given in separate articles, and the "Gloria in excelsis" and "Gloria Patri," of which we have spoken in the article DOXOLOGY. The Greek Church is rich in canticles. A beautiful evening hymn or canticle still used by them, and as old probably as the beginning of the third century, is given by Routh in the "Reliquiae Sacrae," vol. iii. p. 515. It belongs to the first division of our subject, for it is not metrical, and may be rendered thus :—"O joyful light of the immortal Father, who is heavenly, holy, blessed, O Jesus Christ, having come to the setting of the sun, and having seen the evening light, we hymn the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. Worthy art thou at all times to be hymned, with holy voices, O Son of God, who givest life: wherefore the world glorifieth thee."

II. *Hymns in the modern and more restricted sense.*—Hymn is now generally used for a religious poem adapted to be sung, and written in metre. The earliest hymn of this kind which we possess is by Clement of Alexandria. It occurs at the end of his "Paedagogus," and is entitled ὕμνος τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ. We have hymns by other Greek Fathers—*e.g.* by Gregory Nazianzen and Synesius—but the hymns actually used in the Greek offices are by later authors, St. John Damascene, Joseph of Constantinople, Cosmas and Theophanes. Hilary of Poitiers is the first Latin hymn-writer whose hymns survive; he was followed by Ambrose, Prudentius, Fortunatus, Paul the Deacon, Sedulius, Gregory the Great, Venerable Bede, St. Bernard, St. Thomas of Aquin, &c. &c. The Council of Agde, can. 30 (anno 506); that of Tours, can. 23 (anno 567); that of Toledo, can. 13 (anno 633), approve the use of hymns in the office; though it is plain from the words of the canon cited last that many felt an objection to using even the hymns of Hilary and Ambrose on the ground that they were not Biblical. It was, however, very late (not, according to Grancolas, till the thirteenth century) that the Roman Church admitted hymns to a place in her Breviary offices.

Hefele, "Beiträge," ii. p. 302, thus traces the origin of the hymns which occur in the Breviary and Missal. The list is in alphabetical order.

[1] His remarks on the canticles as used in the office are quoted by Gavantus, tom. ii. § 5, cap. 9.
[2] Called Lauds II. in the Breviary.

Breviary Hymns.

1. "A solis ortus cardine." Used at Christmas. This hymn is called Abecedarius; because the first verse begins with A, the second with B. In the unrevised version, used still in many churches, the alphabet is gone through at Christmas, and is resumed at the Epiphany at the letter H, "Hostis Herodes impie," now changed into "Crudelis Herodes, Deum." By Caelius Sedulius, a poet of the fifth century. Country unknown.

2. "Ad regias agni dapes." Used on Low Sunday. By a very ancient imitator of St. Ambrose.

3. "Ad sacros virgo thalamos." For the Feast of St. Gertrude. Author unknown; of the mediæval period.

4. "Adoro te devote." In the thanksgiving after Mass. By St. Thomas of Aquin († 1274).

5. "Aeterna Christi munera." For feasts of Apostles. Ascribed by the Benedictines to St. Ambrose. Mone doubts whether it is St. Ambrose's, but ascribes it to the fifth century.

6. "Aeterna coeli gloria." Friday at Lauds. By an ancient imitator of St. Ambrose.

7. "Aeterne rector siderum." For the feast of Angel Guardians. By Cardinal Bellarmine (*d.* 1621).

8. "Aeterne rerum conditor." Sunday at Lauds. St. Ambrose.

9. "Aeterne rex altissime." For the Ascension. St. Ambrose, but altered.

10. "Ales diei nuntius." Tuesday at Lauds. By Prudentius (born in Spain, 348).

11. "Alma Redemptoris Mater." Antiphon from Advent to the Purification. [See Antiphon.]

12. "Alto ex Olympi vertice." Dedication of churches. A continuation of "Coelestis urbs." See below.

13. "Antra deserti." For feast of St. John Baptist. By Paulus Diaconus, eighth century.

14. "Aspice infami." Feast of the Passion. Unknown author, sixteenth to eighteenth century.

15. "Aspice ut verbum Patris." Feast of Our Lord's Prayer. Author unknown, sixteenth to eighteenth century.

16. "Athleta Christi nobilis." Feast of Venantius. A continuation of "Martyr Dei Venantius."

17. "Auctor beate saeculi." Sacred Heart. Author unknown, sixteenth to eighteenth century.

18. "Audi, benigne conditor." For Lent. By Gregory the Great (*d.* 604).

19. "Audit tyrannus anxius." Holy Innocents. By Prudentius. See No. 10.

20. "Aurora coelum purpurat." Sundays after Lent. Old imitator of St. Ambrose.

21. "Aurora jam spargit polum." Saturday, lauds. Same as preceding.

21a. "Aurora soli praevia." A modern hymn for the Office of Our Lady of Lourdes (February 11).

22. "Ave, maris stella." Ascribed by Cardinal Thomasi to Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (*d.* about 600), but certainly much later. Daniel places the date of its origin between the sixth and ninth centuries. Mone considers even this date much too early.

23. "Ave, Regina coelorum." Antiphon at compline and lauds. Author unknown. [See Antiphon.]

24. "Beata nobis gaudia." For Pentecost. According to Daniel, by Hilary of Poitiers (*d.* 379); but this is very doubtful.

25. "Beate pastor Petre." Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, &c. By Elpis, the first wife of Boethius, the famous minister of Theodoric. Boethius was executed at Pavia in 524.

26. "Christe, sanctorum decus angelorum." On the feasts of Gabriel, Michael, and Raphael. By Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mayence (*d.* 856).

27. "Christo profusum sanguinem." Common of Martyrs. Except that the initial words are altered, this hymn is taken from the "Aeterna Christi munera." See No. 5.

28. "Civis beatae patriae." Feast of Holy Relics. A modern hymn.

29. "Coelestis agni nuptias." Feast of St. Juliana Falconieri. By her biographer, Lorenzini (anno 1719).

29a. "Coelestis aulae nuntius." The Dominican Rosary hymn, attributed to Eustace Serena, and introduced into the Roman Breviary by Leo XIII.

30. "Coelestis urbs Jerusalem." Dedication of churches. Author unknown. Date from tenth to fifteenth century.

31. "Coeli Deus sanctissime." Wednesday at Vespers. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose.

32. "Coelitum Joseph decus." Feast of St. Joseph. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

33. "Coelo redemptor praetulit." Maternity of Blessed Virgin. As preceding.

34. "Consors paterni luminis." Tuesday at Matins. St. Ambrose.

35. "Cor, arca legem continens." Sacred Heart. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

36. "Corpus domans jejuniis." A continuation of "Gentis Polonae gloria." See No. 54.

37. "Creator alme siderum" (in the original text "Conditor alme siderum"). Imitated from St. Ambrose, but at least 200 years later.

38. "Crudelis Herodes." Epiphany. Altered from Sedulius. See No. 1.

39. "Crux fidelis." Passion Sunday. A part of the "Pange, lingua, gloriosi lauream certaminis." By Venantius Fortunatus. See No. 22.

40. "Custodes hominum psallimus angelos." Guardian Angels. By Bellarmine (*d.* 1621).

41. "Decora lux." St. Peter and St. Paul. By Elpis (see No. 25), but much altered.

42. "Deus, tuorum militum." Common of a Martyr. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose.

43. "Domare cordis impetus." Feast of St. Elizabeth of Portugal. By Urban VIII. (*d.* 1644).

44. "Dum nocte pulsa lucifer." A continuation of "Martyr Dei Venantius." See No. 89.

45. "Ecce jam noctis tenuatur umbra." Saturday at Lauds. By St. Gregory the Great (*d.* 604).

46. "Egregie doctor Paule." St. Peter and St. Paul (June 29, 30), and Conversion of St. Paul. By Elpis (see No. 25).

47. "En clara vox redarguit." For Advent. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose. Altered from the original text.

48. "En ut superba criminum." Sacred Heart. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

49. "Ex more docti mystico." Sunday Matins in Lent. Attributed by Mone to St. Gregory the Great. Daniel puts it in seventh to ninth century.

50. "Exite, Sion filiae." Crown of Thorns. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

51. "Exultet orbis gaudiis." Feasts of Apostles. Tenth to fifteenth century.

52. "Festivis resonent." Precious Blood. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

53. "Fortem virili pectore." Commune non Virginum. Cardinal Sylvius Antonianus (*d.* 1603).

54. "Gentis Polonae gloria." Feast of St. John Cantius. By an author of the eighteenth century.

55. "Gertrudis arca numinis." Feast of St. Gertrude. Mediaeval author.

56. "Gloriam sacrae celebremus omnes Sindonis." Feast of Our Lord's Winding-sheet. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

57. "Haec est dies qua candida." Feast of St. Theresa. By Urban VIII.

58. "Hominis superne conditor." Friday Vespers. Ambrosian.

59. "Hujus oratu, Deus alme, nobis." Commune non Virginum. A part of "Virginis proles." See 171.

60. "Jam Christus astra ascenderat." Pentecost. Ambrosian, and, according to Mone, actually by St. Ambrose.

61. "Jam fasces lictor ferat." Feast of St. John Nepomuc. Eighteenth century.

62. "Jam lucis orto sidere." At Prime. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose.

63. "Jam noctis umbras lucifer." Feast of St. Catherine of Ricci. Eighteenth century.

64. "Jam sol recedit igneus." Trinity Sunday, and Saturday at Vespers. Imitated from Ambrose, hymn 11. Thomasi gives a similar hymn by Ennodius, bishop of Pavia (*d.* 521).

65. "Jam toto subditus." Seven Dolours. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

66. "Jesu, corona celsior." Common of Confessor not a bishop. By an imitator of St. Ambrose.

67. "Jesu, corona virginum." Common of Virgins. As preceding.

68. "Jesu, decus angelicum." Feast of the Holy Name. A part of "Jesu, dulcis memoria." See No. 70.

69. "Jesu, dulcis amor meus." Feast of the Winding-sheet. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

70. "Jesu, dulcis memoria." Feast of the Holy Name. Attributed to St. Bernard, but by an unknown writer in the thirteenth century.

71. "Jesu, redemptor omnium." Common of Conf. Pont. Tenth to fifteenth century.

72. "Jesu, redemptor omnium, quem." Christmas. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose.

73. "Jesu, rex admirabilis." Feast of Holy Name. A part of the hymn, "Jesu, dulcis memoria."

74. "Immense coeli conditor." Monday at Vespers. Imitated from St. Ambrose. Regarded by Mone as probably the work of St. Gregory the Great.

75. "In profunda noctis umbra." Feast of St. John Nepomuc (May 16). Eighteenth century.

76. "Invicte martyr." Common of Martyrs. Tenth to fifteenth century.

77. "Invictus heros." Feast of St. John Nepomuc. Eighteenth century.

78. "Ira justa conditoris." Precious Blood. Eighteenth century.

79. "Iste confessor." Common of Confessors. Mediaeval, but in the manner of St. Ambrose.

80. "Iste quem laeti colimus." Feast of St. Joseph. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

81. "Legis figuris pingitur." Crown of Thorns. As preceding.

82. "Lucis creator optime." Sunday at Vespers. Ambrosian, and older than St. Gregory.

83. "Lustra sex qui jam peregit." Passion Sunday &c. A part of the "Pange, lingua, gloriosi lauream certaminis." See No. 108.

84. "Lux alma, Jesu, mentium." Feast of Transfiguration. Urban VIII.

85. "Lux ecce surgit aurea." Thursday at Lauds. Slightly altered from Prudentius. See No. 10.

85a. "Lux O decora." In honour of SS. Cyril and Methodius, attributed to Leo XIII.

86. "Magnae Deus potentiae." Thurs-

day at Vespers. By an old imitator of St. Ambrose.

87. "Maria castis oculis." Feast of St. Mary Magdalen. According to some, by Gregory the Great; according to others, by Odo of Clugny (*d.* 942).

88. "Martinae celebri." For Jan. 30. By Urban VIII.

89. "Martyr Dei Venantius." Feast of St. Venantius. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

90. "Memento, rerum conditor." In the Little Office B.V.M. From "Jesu, redemptor omnium." See No. 72.

91. "Miris modis répente liber." Feast of St. Peter's Chains. Ascribed to Paulinus of Nola (?).

92. "Moerentes oculi." Feast of the Passion. Eighteenth century.

93. "Mysterium mirabile." Feast of the Winding-sheet. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

94. "Nocte surgentes." Sunday Matins. St. Gregory the Great.

95. "Nox atra rerum contigit." Thursday Matins. According to Thomasi, by Ambrose; to Daniel, merely Ambrosian; to Mone, by Gregory the Great.

96. "Nox et tenebrae et nubila." Wednesday at Lauds. By Prudentius Clemens (see No. 10), but altered.

97. "Nullis te genitor blanditiis." Feast of St. Hermenegild. From "Regali solio." See No. 122.

98. "Nunc sancte nobis Spiritus." At Tierce. Ascribed by Hincmar to St. Ambrose; probably only Ambrosian.

99. "O gloriosa virginum." Feasts of the Blessed Virgin. From "Quem terra, pontus, sidera." See No. 117.

99a. "Omnis expertem." A modern hymn for the feast of Our Lady of Lourdes.

100. 'O nimis felix." Feast of St. John Baptist. From "Ut queant laxis." See No. 164.

101. "O quot undis lacrimarum." Seven Dolours. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

102. "O sol salutis." Lent at Lauds. Tenth to fifteenth century.

103. "O sola magnarum urbium." Epiphany. By Prudentius Clemens. See No. 10.

104. "O stella Jacob." Purity of Blessed Virgin. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

105. "O virgo cui praecordia." Feast of St. Catherine of Ricci. Eighteenth century.

106. "Opes decusque." Feast of St. Elizabeth of Portugal. By Urban VIII.

107. "Pange, lingua, gloriosi corporis." Corpus Christi. By St. Thomas Aquinas (*d.* 1274).

108. "Pange, lingua, gloriosi lauream (praelium) certaminis." Passion and Palm Sunday, &c. By Venantius. See No. 83.

109. "Pange, lingua, gloriosae Lanceae praeconium." Feast of Lance and Nails. A mediaeval imitation of the preceding.

110. "Paschale mundo gaudium." On Feasts of the Apostles. From the "Aurora coelum." See No. 20.

111. "Paschali jubilo." Feast of the Lance, &c. Author unknown, but the hymn found in MS of fourteenth century.

112. "Pater superni luminis." Ascribed to Odo of Clugny, but perhaps by Bellarmine, who inserted it in the Breviary.

113. "Placare, Christe, servulis." For All Saints. Written late in the Middle Ages.

114. "Praeclara custos virginum." Purity of Blessed Virgin. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

115. "Primo die quo Trinitas." Altered from St. Gregory the Great.

116. "Quaenam lingua tibi." Feast of the Lance, &c. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

117. "Quem terra, pontus, sidera." Feasts of Blessed Virgin Mary. Altered from Venantius Fortunatus. See No. 22.

118. "Quicunque certum quaeritis." Sacred Heart. Of late and uncertain origin.

119. "Quicunque Christum quaeritis." Transfiguration. By Prudentius Clemens. See No. 10.

120. "Quodcunque in orbe." St. Peter's Chair. From the "Miris modis." See No. 91.

121. "Rector potens." At Sext. Ambrosian.

122. "Regali solio." Feast of St. Hermenegild. Urban VIII.

123. "Regina coeli, laetare." Easter Antiphon at Lauds and Compline. Tenth to fifteenth century.

124. "Regis superni nuntia." Feast of St. Theresa. By Urban VIII.

125. "Rerum creator optime." Matins of Wednesday. Ambrosian, and perhaps by Gregory the Great.

126. "Rerum Deus tenax vigor." At None. Ambrosian.

127. "Rex gloriose martyrum." Common of Martyrs. Written early in the Middle Ages.

128. "Rex sempiterne coelitum." Sunday Matins. Ambrosian.

129. "Sacras reliquias." Feast of Relics. See No. 28.

130. "Sacris solemniis." Corpus Christi. St. Thomas Aquinas.

131. "Saepe dum Christi." Feast of Blessed Virgin Help of Christians. Nineteenth century.

132. "Sacro dolorum turbine." Feast of the Passion. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

133. "Salutis humanae dator." All Saints. Late in Middle Ages.

134. "Salutis aeternae sator." Ascension. Ambrosian.

135. "Salve, Regina." Antiphon at Lauds and Compline. [See ANTIPHON.]

136. "Salvete, Christi vulnera." Precious Blood. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

137. "Salvete, clavi et lancea." Lance and Nails. As preceding.

138. "Salvete, flores martyrum." Holy Innocents. Prudentius.

139. "Sancta mater, istud agas." See "Stabat Mater."

140. "Sanctorum meritis." Common of Martyrs. Sixth to ninth century.

140a. "Sedibus coeli." SS. Cyril and Methodius. Attributed to Leo XIII.

141. "Solemne laudis canticum." Feast of St. Catherine of Ricci. Eighteenth century.

142. "Somno refectis artubus." Monday Matins. St. Ambrose.

143. "Splendour paternae gloriae." Monday Lauds. As preceding.

144. "Stabat Mater." Seven Dolours. According to Wadding, by Giacopone da Todi, a disciple of St. Francis in the thirteenth century. It is inserted in the works of St. Bernard as given in a MS. at Utrecht.

145. "Summae Deus clementiae." Seven Dolours. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

146. "Summae parens clementiae." Saturday Matins. Ambrosian.

147. "Summae parens clementiae." Trinity Sunday. Compiled from the preceding and other ferial hymns.

148. "Summi parentis filio." Sacred Heart. As No. 118.

149. "Summi parentis unice." St. Mary Magdalen's day. By Odo of Clugny (*d.* 942).

150. "Te deprecante corporum." End of "Gentis Polonae." See No. 54.

151. "Te Deum laudamus." Sunday Matins. [See TE DEUM.]

151a. "Te dicimus praeconis." Feast of Our Lady of Lourdes.

151b. "Te gestientem gaudiis." A Dominican Rosary hymn now in Breviary and feast days.

152. "Te Joseph celebrant." St. Joseph. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

153. "Te lucis ante terminum." Compline. Ambrosian.

154. "Te, mater alma." Feast of the Maternity. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

155. "Te redemptoris." Blessed Virgin Help of Christians. Modern.

156. "Te splendor et virtus Patris." St. Michael and All Angels. By Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mayence (*d.* 856).

157. "Telluris alme conditor." Tuesd[illegible] Vespers. Ambrosian, and, as Mone [illegible]nks, by Gregory the Great.

158. "Tibi, Christe, splendor Patris." St. Raphael. By Rabanus Maurus. An adaptation of the "Te splendor." See No. 156.

159. "Tinctam ergo Christi sanguine." Lance and Nails. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

160. "Tristes erant Apostoli." Feasts of Apostles. The second half of "Aurora coelum." See No. 20.

161. "Tu natale solum." Feast of St. Martina. Urban VIII.

162. "Tu Trinitatis unitas," with the second strophe "Nam lectulo." Friday Matins. Gregory the Great.

163. "Tu Trinitatis unitas," with the second strophe "Ortus refulget." Imitated and partly borrowed from preceding.

164. "Ut queant laxis." St. John Baptist. By Paulus Diaconus, properly Paul Warnefrid, a scholar at Charlemagne's Court, and author of the "History of the Lombards."

165. "Veni, Creator." Pentecost. Commonly attributed to Charlemagne, but found in MSS. written before his day. Probably by St. Gregory the Great.

166. "Venit e coelo." Agony in the Garden. Sixteenth to eighteenth century.

167. "Verbum supernum prodiens e Patris aeterni sinu." Advent. Ambrosian, and not later than second half of fifth century.

168. "Verbum supernum prodiens, nec Patris linquens dexteram." Corpus Christi. St. Thomas Aquinas.

169. "Verbum supernum prodiens, salvare quod perierat." Feast of Lance &c. A text of this hymn is given by Mone from a MS. of the fourteenth century.

170. "Vexilla regis." Passion Sunday, Finding and Exaltation of the Cross. Venantius Fortunatus. See No. 22.

171. "Virginis proles." Common of Virgins. A mediaeval imitation of St. Ambrose.

172. "Virgo virginum praeclara." From "Stabat Mater." See No. 144.

173. "Vix in sepulcro." Feast of St. John Nepomuc. Eighteenth century.

HYMNS AND SEQUENCES IN THE MISSAL.

1. "Dies irae." By Thomas of Celano, disciple of St. Francis, about 1250.

2. "Exultet jam angelica." Holy Saturday at blessing of the Paschal candle. Ascribed to St. Augustine. [See HOLY WEEK, p. 420.]

3. "Gloria in excelsis." [See DOXOLOGY.]

4. "Gloria, laus et honor." Palm Sunday at the procession. By Theodulf, bishop of Orleans (*d.* 821).

5. "Lauda, Sion." Corpus Christi. St. Thomas Aquinas.

6. "Salve, sancta parens." Introit in the Mass of Blessed Virgin. Sedulius, in fifth century.

7. "Stabat Mater." See above, No. 144.

8. "Veni, Sancte Spiritus." By the French King Robert, son of Hugh Capet (*d.* 1031).

9. "Victimae paschali." Easter. Attributed by an Einsiedeln MS. of the eleventh century to Wipo, chaplain to Conrad II. (eleventh century).

(Cardinal Thomasi, "Opp. tom. ii., continens psalterium," Romae, 1747; Daniel, "Thesaurus Hymnolog." Halle, 1841; and Mone, "Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters," Freiburg, 1853, are the chief authorities on the subject. Moull, "Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters," Einsiedeln, 1866; Schlosser, "Die Kirche in ihren Liedern," Freiburg, 1863; Neale, "Hymns of the Eastern Church," London, 1863; "Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences," 1863; Biraghi, "Inni sinceri e carmi di S. Ambrogio," Milan, 1862; Huemer, "Untersuchung über die ältesten lat. Christ. Rhythmen," Wien, 1879; Blume, in "Cath. Enc." *Hymnody*; Julian, "Dictionary of Hymnology," 1907, may also be consulted.)

HYPERDULIA. [See CULTUS.]

HYPOSTATIC UNION. The union of Christ's human nature to the hypostasis or person of God the Word. [See CHRIST.]

I

ICONOCLASTS ("Image-breakers"). A name given to the powerful party which set itself against the religious use of images, and disturbed the peace of the Church during the eighth and the former half of the ninth century.

1. *First Stage of the Controversy* (726–775).—Leo III., known in history as "the Isaurian" (717–741), published an edict against images. Both the exact date (Hefele places it in 726) and the purport of this edict are uncertain. The Emperor is said to have acted by the advice of Constantine, Bishop of Nacolia, in Phrygia, and it is certain that shortly before the Khalif Jezid II. had set the example—natural, of course, in a Mohammedan—of destroying images. Possibly Leo may have believed that he was removing a cause of scandal to Jews and Saracens, and taking away an occasion of superstition from ignorant Christians. Leo, however, met with immediate and strenuous opposition. The destruction of a famous image of Christ over the brazen door of the palace led to an uproar among the people. Leo was resisted by Germanus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and condemned by Pope Gregory II. St. John of Damascus, who was living under the rule of the Khalifs, published three discourses in defence of images, entitled λόγοι ἀπολογητικοί. The Emperor threatened to destroy St. Peter's image at Rome, and to take the Pope captive; and his rage was further inflamed by the rebellion of Cosmas. The suppression of the rebellion was followed by a new edict against images, in 730, and by fresh acts of violence. A fleet was sent to Rome, in order to revenge Gregory's anathema published in a Roman synod of the year 732; and, although this attack failed, Illyria was torn from the Holy See, and its possessions in Lower Italy seized. Leo's successor, Constantine V. (Copronymus), continued his father's work. Once more the Emperor's zeal against images caused a rebellion, but this, too, was quelled, and in 754 Constantine convoked a council of 338 bishops—with which, however, neither the Pope, nor the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, would have anything to do. This Council of Constantinople, which pretended to be oecumenical, anathematized those who venerated images, and this anathema was the excuse for additional severity. Monasteries were destroyed, and many monks—among them John of Monagria and the abbot Stephen—died as martyrs for the faith and traditional usage of the Church.

2. *Second Stage of the Controversy* (775–842).—The persecution abated, though it did not cease, under Leo IV. (775–780). His wife, Irene, who held the regency after her husband's death, set herself to restore the veneration of images and was supported by Tarasius, the new Patriarch. Irene and Tarasius convoked a general council, to which Pope Hadrian I. was invited, and to which he promised to send legates. The soldiers made it impossible to hold the assembly in the imperial city, but the Fathers met in 787 at Nicaea. The Papal legates—viz. the archpriest Peter and the abbot Peter—presided, their names being always mentioned in the Acts before those of the other members, but the business was mainly conducted by Tarasius. The decrees were signed by at least 308 bishops, or proxies for bishops, but it appears from the Acts that besides the bishops a large number of monks and clerics, not entitled to vote, were present at the deliberations. It was on October 13, and in the seventh session, that the definition of faith was issued. In it the council teaches that the figure of the cross, and "holy images, whether made in colours or of stone (mosaic ?), or of any other material," are to be retained. They are not to become objects of "adoration in the proper sense (τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν), which is to be given to God alone," but they are useful because they raise the mind of the spectator to the objects which they represent. It is right to salute, honour, and venerate them (ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν), to burn lights and incense before them, not only because this is in accordance with the tradition of the Church, but also on the ground that such honour is really given to God and His saints, of whom the images are intended to remind us. The council uses the word "worship" (προσκυνεῖ) of the veneration due to images, but, as we have seen, carefully explains the sense in which the word

is employed. This decision was approved by Pope Hadrian, as he himself declares in a letter to Charlemagne (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. pp. 741 *sqq.*).

The Iconoclast spirit revived in Leo V., "the Armenian" (813–820), Theodore, abbot of the monastery of Studion, at Constantinople, being the champion of the orthodox cause. Michael II., "the Stammerer" (820–829), tried to reconcile the friends and enemies of images, but his son Theophilus (829–842) persecuted the monks who adhered to the Nicene definition. On February 19, 842, his widow, Theodora, brought the images back in triumph to the chief church at Constantinople, and this day, which marks the close of a long and dreary strife, is still kept by the Greeks as the "Feast of Orthodoxy."

3. *The Controversy in the West.*—Pope Hadrian sent a very unfortunate translation of the Acts of the Nicene Council to Charlemagne. The latter stated his objections in a document sent to the Pope, and known as the "Libri Carolini."[1] He rejects both synods—the Iconoclast one at Constantinople in 754, and Second Council of Nicaea—and asserts that God alone is to be adored (*adorandus*) and worshipped (*colendus*), while the saints are only to be venerated (*venerandi*). A certain "adoration" (*adoratio*) may, indeed, be given to men—*e.g.* by bowing reverently before them, or by kissing, but even this is to be withheld from images, because they are lifeless, and it is foolish to burn incense or lights before them. Moreover, although images may lawfully be used in churches, their use is by no means necessary. The great Council of Frankfort, in 794, also rejected the Nicene decree, evidently misled, as Charlemagne had been, by the faulty translation, which made no distinction between supreme worship (λατρεία) and secondary and relative veneration. Indeed, this synod attributes to and condemns in the Nicene council a doctrine which it had expressly, and in set terms, rejected. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. pp. 1240 *sqq.*)

(See IMAGES. The principal ancient authority on the Iconoclasts is Theophanes (*d.* 818). His "Chronographia" is published among the Byzantine historians (Bonn, 1839). Later authors—*e.g.* Cedrenus (sec. xi.), Zonaras (sec. xii.), Constantine Manasses (sec. xii.), Glycas (sec. xv.)—draw from him. In modern times, the whole or part of the history has been investigated by the Protestants, Goldast, "Imperialia Decreta de Cultu Imaginum," 1608; Dallaeus, "De Cultu Imaginum," 1612; Spanheim, "Restituta Historia Imaginum," 1686; and by the Catholics, Maimbourg, "Histoire de l'Hérésie des Iconoclastes" (not always trustworthy), Paris, 1683; Marx, "Bilderstreit der Byzantinischen Kaiser," Trier, 1839; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc." *Iconoclasm*; and by Hefele-Leclercq, iii.—which last has been chiefly followed here.)

ICONOSTASIS (ἰκονόστασις). A wooden wall which in Byzantine churches separates the choir from the nave. It is so called because *icons* or images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, &c., are placed upon it. The iconostasis is found in Greek and Russian churches, but it is doubtful whether it was known before the Middle Ages. (Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," 403.)

IDIOMS, COMMUNICATION OF. [See COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM.]

IDOLATRY. [See IMAGES; SAINTS.]

IGNORANCE. St. Thomas (1ª 2æ, q. 76 a. 2) distinguishes ignorance from mere nescience. The latter he explains to mean the simple absence of knowledge; the former implies absence of knowledge in one who is capable of acquiring it. He proceeds to show that ignorance may easily involve sin, since a person is bound to use all reasonable means in order that he may have the knowledge necessary for the performance of his duties. Thus all men are bound to learn, so far as they can, the general principles of religion and morals; and a man sins grievously who remains from his own negligence in the belief that a false religion is true, or that an unlawful course of action which he is pursuing is really lawful. The degree of his sin will differ according as the obligations which he does not fulfil through ignorance are more or less serious, and according to the amount of negligence or malice which his ignorance implies. Thus, while a man is never excused from sin of omission or commission on the plea of ignorance which he can be fairly expected to overcome, this vincible ignorance, as it is called, admits of subdivisions, representing different grades of guilt. A man may use some but not enough industry in removing his ignorance, which in that case is said to be "simply vincible"; he may take scarcely any pains to remove it: then his ignorance is "crass"; he may positively wish to be ignorant, in order that he may sin more freely: then his ignorance is known as "affected." The reader must understand that up to this point we have been speaking of the sin which lies in the ignorance itself, not in the evil act to which the ignorance leads; and the conclusion which we have reached is that all vincible ignorance of the things a man's duty requires him to know is in itself sinful. A physician who practises his profession, without the knowledge which he can and ought to have, sins, even if as a matter of fact he happens to prescribe what is really best for his patients.

[1] Petavius (*De Incarnat.* xv. 12, 3, 8) thinks that only extracts from the "Libri Carolini" were sent to Pope Hadrian; and so Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 1086. The authenticity of the "Libri Carolini" was denied by Bellarmine, for reasons abundantly refuted by later Catholic scholars—*e.g.* Sismond and Natalis Alexander. An unsuccessful attempt to attack the authenticity was made once more by Dr. Floss, *De Suspecta Librorum Carolinorum . . . Fide*, Bonn, 1860.

With regard to the guilt of sins ignorantly committed, invincible ignorance altogether excuses from sin, because no man can incur moral guilt without any intention direct or remote to transgress God's law. A Protestant who thinks the Catholic religion idolatrous, and cannot reasonably be expected, considering his education, circumstances, &c., to think otherwise, is guiltless so far in the sight of God. So, again, if a person is aware that he sins but is invincibly ignorant of circumstances which aggravate or change the nature of his crime, he is responsible only so far as he knows or may know what he is about. A man, for example, who, meaning to kill his enemy, kills his father unawares, is of course a murderer, but he is not a parricide. We pause here to observe that although every man may know the first principles of the moral law and the most obvious deductions from them, he may be invincibly ignorant of certain precepts which belong to the natural law of right and wrong. This point is profusely argued and illustrated by St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." lib. i. § 170.

Supposing that a man is responsible for his ignorance, it may still diminish the guilt of the sins which he ignorantly perpetrates. Such is the case with ignorance "simply vincible," and even, though in a less degree, with "crass" ignorance. When, however, a man remains ignorant in order to sin more freely (*ignorantia affectata*) St. Thomas (*loc. cit.* a. 4) holds that "such ignorance seems to increase the voluntary character of his act and its sin" ("videtur augere voluntarium et peccatum").

Censures are not incurred by those who are invincibly ignorant of their existence, though they may be aware that the action forbidden under censure is wrong. If the censure is imposed only on those who sin knowingly, it is held by some theologians that even a person whose ignorance is "affected" escapes the censure. The other opinion is better supported; but "crass" ignorance undoubtedly would serve to save a person from a censure promulgated in these or similar terms.

We may mention in conclusion that St. Thomas (1ª 2æ, q. 6 a. 8) and other theologians also divide ignorance into that which is "antecedent"—*i.e.* which precedes all action of the will; "consequent" or voluntary ignorance; "concomitant," when a man acts in ignorance, but is so minded that he would act in just the same manner if he understood the nature of his deed. We need not, however, dwell on this distinction, since "antecedent" coincides with invincible, "consequent" with vincible ignorance, while "concomitant" ignorance has no influence on moral action.

IHS. A monogram for the Holy Name Jesus. It was originally formed from the Greek letters, ΙΗσοῦΣ, ΙΗΣ, latinized into IHS. It has been erroneously explained as the first letters of "Jesus Hominum Salvator." Other forms are IC (the old Greek form), and IH. These are often combined with the monogram XP (ΧΡιστός).

IMAGE OF GOD. We read, in Genesis i. 26, that God said "Let us make man to our image and likeness, and let him rule over the fishes of the sea and the birds of the air," &c. Petavius, "De Opificio Sex Dierum," lib. ii. cap. 2–4, elaborately discusses the meaning of these words and the history of their interpretation. We select the most important points from his account, adding a few remarks drawn from other sources.

1. Although the text quoted speaks of Adam only as created in God's image, it is plain that neither this likeness itself (see Genesis v. 1–3) nor the dominion over the beasts which flows from it (see Genesis ix. 3, and cf. Ps. viii. 6) has been wholly forfeited by the Fall. At the same time it has been partially lost, and thus St. Paul, Coloss. iii. 10, speaks of the likeness to God as restored in Christ.

2. We may at once dismiss the anthropomorphite error mentioned by Epiphanius, that the likeness to God consists primarily in the bodily shape. Such an interpretation is contrary to the principles of the Mosaic as well as of the Christian religion. God has no body, and no bodily form as such can be like Him (see Exod. xx. 4, Deut. iv. 15 *sqq.*, Is. xxxi. 3). Here we may observe that though many parallels to the expression with which we are concerned may be quoted from heathen writers (*e.g.*, Knobel and Dillmann, *ad loc.*, quote εἰκὼν θεοῦ from Lucian, "De Imag." 28, "Ad effigiem moderantum cuncta deorum," from Ovid, "Met." i. 83, and also refer to Juvenal xv. 142), the force of the passages is blunted by the fact that the heathen had much less perfect notions than the Jews of God's spiritual nature.

3. We may also set aside the beautiful explanation of Tertullian, who makes the likeness refer to the Incarnate Word, who made man in the likeness of that bodily form which He was to take. "So runs," he says ("Resurr. Carnis," 6, PL, ii. 802), "the speech of the Father to the Son, 'Let us make man,' &c. . . . He made him to the image of God, *i.e.* Christ. Thus that slime, even then taking the image of Christ who was to come in the flesh, was not only a work of God, but also a pledge." Even if the plural number indicates the mystery of the Trinity, there is no hint in the text that man was made in the image of one Divine Person rather than in that of another.

4. Petavius distinguishes that which was made like to God and that in which the likeness resides. The whole man, he says, with his double nature (bodily and spiritual), was made in the likeness of God. But he maintains following the general teaching of

the Fathers, that the reason or foundation of this likeness resides chiefly in the soul. The essential point of the resemblance lies in man's possession of intellect and will, which separates him specifically from the beasts and makes him like God. This essential likeness is perfected by accidental qualities —viz. by the natural and supernatural virtues —and in consequence of these accidental perfections one man may be more like God than another. In man, who is the head of the woman, this accidental likeness is more perfect than in woman (1 Cor. xi. 7).

5. He goes on to say that this likeness overflows (*redundat*) from the soul to the body, and no doubt his erect carriage, the perfection of his form, the way in which his intelligence manifests itself in his features, mark man out as like God and fit to rule over the lower creation. This seems to be the view adopted in the recent edition of our English Catechism, where man's likeness to God is said to reside "chiefly" in his soul.

6. From the time of St. Ambrose (Petavius quotes "De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae," cap. xi.), it has been common to see the image of the Trinity in the three powers of the one soul—viz. memory, understanding, and will. Different writers, however, have fixed upon different powers of the soul as representing the Persons of the Trinity.

7. Still older is a distinction made between "image" and "likeness." Irenaeus (v. 6, 1, PG, vii. 1137), whose view has been largely accepted in the Church, supposes that man was made in the image of God by nature, and became like God by the gift of the Holy Spirit. A similar distinction has been defended by so good a scholar as Delitzsch, but Petavius is surely right in rejecting it. The Hebrew (literally "in our image, according to our likeness") shows more clearly than the Greek or Latin, which insert the copula "and," that the two words are practically synonymous.

IMAGES. The idolatrous worship of images is vehemently condemned in the Scriptures, and in the Old Testament two forms of idolatry are specially reprobated. First, we find denunciations of worship paid to images of false gods, such as Moloch, Astarte, &c. Here the whole meaning and intention of the religious act was bad. No respect was due to such a divinity as Baal; to worship him was an act of treason against the living God, so that there could be no possible excuse for venerating his image. But besides this, the law and the prophets condemn worship given to images of the true God. It seems clear that the calf-worship begun at Mount Sinai, and continued in the northern kingdom at Bethel, &c., was meant as the worship of the true God set before Israel in this symbolical form.[1] But this worship also is denounced—*e.g.* by Amos and Hosea—and was really idolatrous, because it conveyed false notions of God, who is a pure spirit, so that although, *e.g.*, Jeroboam professed to worship Jehovah, he was really serving a god of his own imagination. To prevent such idolatrous errors, to which the Jews were constantly tempted by the example of the surrounding heathen, the Hebrew worship was regulated in each detail by God. Images they had in the tabernacle and the Temple, for the cherubim were placed in the holy of holies, and the walls and pillars were adorned with figures of palms, pomegranates, &c. But these figures were placed in the tabernacle from which the pattern of the temple was taken by the express ordinance of God, and the Jews were by no means left to their own discretion in the use of sacred images and symbols.

The prohibition of idolatry conveyed in the first commandment continues, it is needless to say, in full force. Idolatry is evil in its own nature, and necessarily a sin of the deepest dye, by whomever it may be committed. Moreover, it is possible to commit this sin without falling into the gross and brutal error of identifying a lifeless image with the Divinity. Therefore the Council of Trent (sess. xxv., De Invocatione &c.) not only reprobates the delusion that the Godhead can be really portrayed by material figures; it also states that in images there is no divinity or "*virtue on account of which they are to be worshipped*, that no petitions can be addressed to them, and that no trust is to be placed in them."

At the same time the Tridentine Fathers, following the Second Council of Nicaea, advocate the true use of images. The danger of idolatry has to a very great extent passed away at least from Christian nations. Further, God Himself has taken a human form which admits of being represented in art. So that the reasoning of Moses in Deut. iv. 15 no longer holds,[1] and on the whole matter the liberty of Christians is very different from the bondage of Jews. Images, according to the Tridentine definition, are to be retained and honoured, but abuses and all occasion of scandal to the rude and ignorant are to be removed. The object of images is to set Christ, His Blessed Mother, the saints and angels before our eyes, while the council adds that "the honour which is given to them is referred to the objects (*prototypa*) which they represent, so that through the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and kneel, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses they are." "The council," says Petavius, "De Incarnat." xv. 17, "could not have declared more expressly that the cultus of images is simply

[1] See Exod. xxxii. 5, where Aaron calls the idolatrous feast a feast to Jehovah; and 3 Kings xxii 6, from which it appears that prophets who sanctioned the calf-worship were still considered prophets of Jehovah.

[1] "Ye did not see any likeness on the day that the Lord spake to you on Horeb from the midst of the fire, *lest* ye should act wickedly and make for yourselves a graven image," &c.

relative (σχετικόν): that they are not in themselves and strictly speaking (*per se et proprie*) adored or honoured, but that all adoration and veneration is referred to the prototypes, inasmuch as images have the dignity or excellence to which such honour properly appertains." We cannot imagine any better exposition than that of this great theologian, who, among many other merits, is always distinguished for his sobriety and his avoidance of useless subtleties. His words explain the doctrine of the Church and remove all possibility of scandal, when we find the Church in the Good Friday Office inviting the faithful to adore the cross. It is the suffering Saviour, not the dead wood, which Catholics adore. [See CROSS.]

The use of images in the Church dates from the earliest times. The Church no doubt was cautious in her use of images, both because the use of them in the midst of a heathen population might easily be misunderstood, and also because the images might be seen and profaned by the heathen persecutors. It is, as Hefele and De Rossi maintain, for this latter reason that the Council of Elvira, in the year 306, forbade the placing of "pictures in the churches, lest what is worshipped and adored should be painted on the walls." But see the art. ELVIRA and Hefele-Leclercq, i. 240, where another explanation is given. Certainly the Church of that time did not reject the use of Christian art—witness the numerous sacred pictures recently brought to light in the Roman catacombs. Many ancient works of art which have come down to us from the old Spanish church—*e.g.* the beautiful sarcophagus of Saragossa—prove that there was no difference of feeling or opinion on this matter between Spanish and Roman Christians.

We can trace the veneration of images and the Tridentine doctrine concerning it through the whole history of the Church, but here a few instances must suffice. The early Christian poet Prudentius speaks of himself ("Peristeph." ix. 9 *seq.*) as praying before an image of the martyr Cassian. We read that at a conference held between St. Maximus and the bishop Theodosius the Fathers present bent the knee to the images of Christ and the Blessed Virgin.[1] The principles of Gregory the Great on the respect due to images are well known. When Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, removed images from the church on the ground that they had proved an occasion of idolatry, Gregory tells him (Ep. ix. 105) that he ought not to have broken images placed in the church as means of instruction, not objects of adoration. In sending Secundinus images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and St. Peter and St. Paul, Gregory writes (Ep. ix. 52): "I know you do not ask for the image of our Saviour to worship it as God, but that, being reminded of the Son of God, you may be inflamed anew with love of Him whose image you long to see. And we on our part do not prostrate ourselves before it as a divinity, but we adore Him whom by means of the image we bring to mind, in His birth, in His passion, or as He sits on His throne."

Two qualifications must be made to the doctrine stated in a previous part of this article. We have said that no images can really resemble the divine nature which is immaterial. But there is no harm in symbolical representations of the Holy Trinity, or of the divine Persons singly. The contrary proposition was condemned by Pius VI. (Synod of Pistoia, prop. 69), in the bull "Auctorem fidei." Again, though images have no virtue in themselves, God may be pleased to give special graces at particular shrines. This is taught in the same bull, and the words of St. Augustine (Ep. 78) are aptly quoted: "God, who divides special gifts to each according as He wills, was not pleased that these [marvels] should take place in all the shrines of the saints." (See ICONOCLASTS; CULTUS; St. Thomas, $2^a\,2^{ae}$, q. 94; Rock, i. 244 *sqq.*)

IMITATION OF CHRIST. Also known as "The Following of Christ." The title in the original Latin is "De Imitatione Christi." It is divided into four books: I. "Admonitions useful for the Spiritual Life"; II. "Admonitions leading to the Interior Life"; III. "Of Interior Consolation"; IV. "A Devout Exhortation to Holy Communion." Though addressed chiefly to monks, it is applicable also to persons living in the world. It appeals particularly to the affective side of our nature, and so is a useful corrective for the dry scientific treatment of some ascetical writers. Objection has been raised to the insistence on the cultivation of one's own sanctification; but zeal for souls, and even for the temporal welfare of others, is by no means excluded. The book was issued anonymously in 1418. The well-known words: "Inquire not who said this, but attend to what is said" (i. v.), show that the author wished to remain unknown. But as it began to be ascribed to various great writers (*e.g.* St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, Innocent III.) the real author, Thomas a Kempis (*b.* 1379–1380 at Kempen, in the diocese of Cologne, *d.* 1471), signed his name into a codex still extant containing the four books and other minor treatises. The original is in the Royal Library, Brussels; a facsimile was published in London in 1879. The best edition is that of Pöhl. Of the many translations into English, that published by Kegan Paul, founded on Challoner and revised by Cardinal Newman, is perhaps the best. A word of warning should be given against certain Protestant versions, in which the sense of the original, especially in Book IV., has been distorted. In some Protestant editions Book

[1] See Kraus, *Real-Encyklopäd.*, art. "Bilderverehrung."

IV. is omitted altogether. It is interesting to note that the original is for the most part written in rhyme. The discovery of this fact is due to Hirsche. An edition giving his Latin text and an English translation was published by Kegan Paul in 1892. (Scully, "Life of the Ven. Thomas a Kempis," and art. *Thomas a Kempis* in "Cath. Enc."; Cruise, "Thomas a Kempis"; Waterton, "Thomas a Kempis and the Imitation of Christ.")

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. 1. *The Meaning of the Doctrine.*—Benedict XIV. ("De Fest." clxxxvii. *seq.*), quoting Frassen, a Scotist theologian, distinguishes between active and passive conception. The former consists in the act of the parents which causes the body of the child to be formed and organised, and so prepared for the reception of the rational soul which is infused by God. The latter takes place at the moment when the rational soul is actually infused into the body by God. It is the passive, not the active, conception which Catholics have in view when they speak of the Immaculate Conception. For there was nothing miraculous in Mary's generation. She was begotten like other children. The body, while still inanimate, could not be sanctified or preserved from original sin, for it is the soul, not the body, which is capable of receiving either the gifts of grace or the stain of sin. Moreover, from the fact that Mary sprang in the common way from Adam our first father, it follows that she was the daughter of a fallen race and incurred the "debt" or liability to contract original sin. Adam was the representative of the human race: he was put on his trial, and when he fell all his descendants fell with him, and must, unless some special mercy of God interposed, receive souls destitute of that grace in which Adam himself was created. In Mary's case, however, God's mercy did interpose. For the sake of Him who was to be born of her and for "His merits foreseen" grace was poured into her soul at the first instant of its being. Christian children are sanctified at the font: St. John the Baptist was sanctified while still unborn. Mary was sanctified earlier still—viz., in the first moment of her conception. She received a gift like that of Eve, who was made from the first without sin, only the immaculate conception is rightly called a privilege, and a privilege altogether singular, because in the ordinary course of things the Blessed Virgin would have been conceived and born in original sin. We beg the reader to remember that what we have written up to this point is the universal teaching of theologians, and we have carefully abstained from entering on scholastic disputes (*e.g.* as to the remote and proximate debt of sin), because we believe that the mere statement of the doctrine is enough to remove many prejudices from the minds of candid Protestants. So far from derogating from, the Catholic doctrine exalts, the merits of Christ. He who redeemed us redeemed her. He who sanctified us in Baptism sanctified her in her conception. Nor could any Catholic dream of comparing Mary's exemption from sin, we do not say with the sinlessness of the Divine nature, for such a comparison would be insane as well as blasphemous, but with the sinlessness of Christ as man. Sin was a physical impossibility in the human soul of Christ, because it was hypostatically united to the Divinity. Mary, on the other hand, was sinless by the grace of God. "Thou art innocent," says Bossuet, addressing Christ, "by nature, Mary only by grace; Thou by excellence, she only by privilege; Thou as Redeemer, she as the first of those whom Thy Precious Blood has purified" ("Sermon pour la fête de la Conception de la Sainte Vierge"). No better summary could be given of the Church's doctrine.

2. *History of the Controversy on the Doctrine.*—The controversy, so far as we know, began in the twelfth century. The church of Lyons had adopted the custom, which already prevailed elsewhere (see the article on the feast), of celebrating the feast of Mary's conception. St. Bernard (*d.* 1153) remonstrated sharply with them, in great measure because the feast had not been approved at Rome. The authenticity of this letter has been disputed, but on grounds, as Benedict XIV. implies, absolutely insufficient. Besides, little would be gained even if the letter were spurious, for Petavius ("De Incarnat." xiv. 2) has proved, from other passages in his works, Bernard's opinion to have been that the Blessed Virgin was not conceived immaculate, but was sanctified in the womb like Jeremiah and St. John the Baptist. Benedict XIV., following Mabillon, declines to accept the theory that St. Bernard had the active, not the passive, conception in his mind. At the same time it must be remembered that the saint refers the whole matter of his dispute with the canons of Lyons to the judgment of the Roman Church. The quotations in Petavius from St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm, Peter Lombard, and others abundantly prove that St. Bernard's opinion was the prevalent one before and during his own age. In the following century St. Thomas (3^a, q. 27, a. 2) held that Mary was only sanctified in the womb after her body was already informed by the soul (*post ejus animationem*), and he argues that if the Virgin "had not incurred the stain of original guilt," she would have stood in no need of being saved and redeemed by Christ, whereas Christ, as the Apostle declares, is the Saviour of all men.[1]

[1] Cardinal Lambruschini, in a polemical dissertation on the Immaculate Conception (Romae, 1[illegible]), declared that here, as in other places, the MSS. of St. Thomas had been corrupted. But this position does not admit of serious defence.

But the strongest evidence to the prevalence of the belief that the Virgin was not conceived without sin is supplied by Scotus ("In Lib. III. Sentent." d. iii. qu. 1, n. 4) He gives his own opinion in favour of the immaculate conception with a timidity which clearly betrays his consciousness that the general opinion was on the other side. After maintaining that God might, had He so chosen, have exempted the Blessed Virgin from original sin, and might on the other hand have allowed her to remain under it for a time, and then purified her, he adds that "God knows" which of these possible ways was actually taken; "but, if it is not contrary to the authority of the Church or of the saints, it seems commendable (*probabile*) to attribute that which is more excellent to Mary."

Scotus, however, farther on in the same work (d. 18, qu. 1, n. 4), expresses a more decided view, and he inaugurated a new state of opinion, though the change did not come at once, and the story told by Cavellus, an author of the seventeenth century whom Benedict XIV. quotes, is probably a mere legend. According to this story, Scotus defended the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception at Cologne and Paris, and a disputation which he held in the latter place induced the Paris University to adopt the doctrine, and won for Scotus himself the title of the "Subtle Doctor." Scotus died in 1308, and events which happened in 1387 show how rapidly the Scotist opinion had spread and how deeply it had struck root, at least in France. A Dominican doctor, John Montesono, had publicly denied the Immaculate Conception, whereupon he was condemned by the University and by the Bishop of Paris, and though he appealed to the Avignon Pope Clement VII., he did not dare to appear, and was condemned for contumacy The Fathers of the Council of Basle begged Cardinal Torquemada (Turrecremata) to prepare a treatise on the question, and so he did; but circumstances prevented him from laying it before the council, and his treatise, which was adverse to the doctrine, was practically unknown till it was published by the Master of the Sacred Palace with the consent of Paul III., then Pope. The decree of Basle, which defined that the doctrine asserting Mary's immunity from original sin was "to be approved, held, and embraced by all Catholics, as being pious and consonant to the worship of the Church, to Catholic faith, right reason, and Holy Scripture," was passed in 1439, when the council had become schismatical, so that it in no way bound the consciences of Catholics. It serves, however, to mark the general feeling of the time; and other signs of the hold the doctrine had obtained are not wanting. It was asserted at a provincial synod in Avignon in 1457. Forty years later the University of Paris required an oath to defend the doctrine from all who proceeded to the doctor's degree, and the tenet was embraced with ardour by the Carmelites, the different branches of the Franciscan order, and by men of the highest distinction among the secular clergy.

The matter gave rise to keen discussion at Trent, and although most of the bishops held the doctrine, the council contented itself with a declaration that in defining the truth that the whole human race fell under original sin it did not intend to include in the decree "the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary," but desired that the Constitutions of Sixtus IV. (a Franciscan) should be observed. These Constitutions had been issued in 1476 and in 1483. In the former the Pope granted indulgences to those who said the Mass and office which he had approved for the feast of the Conception. In the latter he condemned those who accused persons who celebrated the feast of mortal sin, or those who maintained that the doctrine itself was heretical. Pius V., in 1570, forbade all discussion of the doctrine in sermons, permitting, however, the question to be handled in assemblies of the learned. Paul V., in 1617, prohibited attacks on the doctrine in public assemblies of any kind, while Gregory XV., in 1622, strictly forbade anyone to maintain, even in private discussions, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin. He made an exception, however, in favour of the Dominicans, to whom he granted leave to maintain their own opinion in discussions held within their own order, and he was careful to add that he in no way meant to decide the theological question, but, on the contrary, forbade anyone to accuse those who denied the Immaculate Conception of heresy or mortal sin. Benedict XIV., writing about the middle of the eighteenth century, sums up the whole state of the question in his day thus: "The Church inclines to the opinion of the Immaculate Conception; but the Apostolic See has not yet defined it as an article of faith."

So matters stood, when on February 1, 1849, Pius IX. wrote from Gaeta to the bishops of the Catholic world. He asked them for an account of their own opinion and of the feeling entertained in the churches subject to them on the expediency of defining the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin was immaculate in her conception. The Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese bishops, about 490 in number, were nearly unanimous in their wish for the definition. On the other hand, there were bishops of great eminence in France, Germany, and Switzerland who were of a different mind. Some of these last thought that the doctrine was not prominent enough in Scripture or tradition to be made an article of faith; others deprecated a definition which would put fresh difficulties in the way of Protestants or timid Catholics; others, again, were afraid to pronounce at all on so hard a matter. Nearly six years later

the question was closed. On December 8, 1854, Pius IX., in the presence of more than 200 bishops, issued his solemn definition that the Immaculate Conception of Mary was a truth contained in the original teaching of the Apostles and an article of divine faith. The definition was accepted by Gallicans as well as by Ultramontanes, for it was notorious that the entire episcopate gave full assent to the doctrines of the Papal bull. Indeed, the opposition made within the Church to the new definition was of the most insignificant kind.

3. *The Doctrine in its relations to Scripture and Tradition.*—A Catholic is bound to hold that the doctrine recently defined was contained in the faith once delivered to the saints by the Apostles. On the other hand, he is under no obligation of believing it possible to produce cogent historical proof (over and above the Church's decision) that the doctrine was so contained. It is enough to show that no decisive argument can be brought against the Apostolic origin of the Church's present belief, and there are at least probable traces of its existence in the Church from the earliest times. Petavius—justly, as we think—dismisses many passages from the Fathers, which have been cited in support of the doctrine. He points out that if the Fathers speak of Mary as "stainless," "incorrupt," "immaculate" (ἄχραντος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀμίαντος), it by no means follows that they believed her to have been conceived immaculate. Still tradition does supply solid arguments for the belief in question.

First, from the earliest times and in every part of the Church, Mary in her office at the Incarnation was compared and contrasted with Eve before the Fall. We find the parallel between the two drawn by Justin Martyr ("Trypho," 100, PG, vi. 700), by Irenaeus (iii. 22, 34, v. 19, PG, vii. 958, 961, 1175), by Tertullian ("De Carne Christi," 17, PL, ii. 781), not to speak of later Fathers; indeed, the doctrine that Mary is in some sense the second Eve is a commonplace of primitive theology. This comparison enters into the very substance of the theology of St. Irenaeus. He urges the parallel between Mary and Eve, just as he insists on the resemblance between Adam and Christ, the second Adam. As Eve was married and yet a virgin, so Mary, "having an appointed husband, was yet a virgin." Eve listened to the words of an angel: so also Mary. Eve's disobedience was the cause of our death: Mary, "being obedient, became both to herself and all mankind the cause of salvation." "The knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by Mary's obedience." The Virgin Mary became "the advocate of the virgin Eve." It is true that whereas Eve of course when made was immaculate, yet this is just the point where Irenaeus fails to draw the parallel between Eve and Mary. It must be remembered, however, that in Irenaeus, as in the Ante-Nicene Fathers generally, there is no explicit statement of the doctrine of original sin, so that we cannot expect an explicit statement that Mary was exempt from it. There is further a presumption that if Irenaeus could have had the question "Was Mary conceived in sin?" proposed to him he would have answered in the negative. His whole theory of the Incarnation turns on the proposition "Man could not break the bonds of sin, because he was already bound fast by them." He, in Adam, had been already worsted by the devil. When, therefore he tells us that Mary untied the knot of Eve's disobedience, we may infer that she never had been bound by it in her own person.

The tradition that Mary was the second Eve was familiar to great Fathers of the later Church. But one of these, St. Ephrem (A.D. 379), gives much more explicit evidence—the most explicit evidence, so far as we know, to be found in patristic writings—of belief in the Immaculate Conception. Not many years ago the famous Syriac scholar Bickell edited, with a Latin version of the Syriac, the "Carmina Nisibena" of the saint. There is no doubt as to the authenticity of these poems. In hymn 27, strophe 8, St. Ephrem speaks thus: "Truly it is Thou and Thy Mother only who are fair altogether. For in Thee there is no stain, and in Thy Mother no spot. But my sons [*i.e.* the members of the Church of Edessa] are far from resembling this twofold fairness." Elsewhere Ephrem places first among fallen men infants who die in baptismal innocence; so that it must be freedom from original, not actual, sin which he ascribes to Mary. So (ii. 327 a.), "Two were made simple, innocent, perfectly like each other, Mary and Eve, but afterwards one became the cause of our death, the other of our life." It is most important to appreciate this testimony at its real value. It is not only or chiefly that it proves the existence of the belief which we are discussing, in the fourth century. This no doubt it does, and it enables us summarily to dismiss the confident assumption of many Protestant scholars that the belief arose for the first time in the Middle Ages. But besides and above this, St. Ephrem supplies an authentic commentary on the meaning of the tradition that Mary was the second Eve. We may well believe, considering how early and in what various quarters it appears, that this tradition was Apostolic. And just at the time when the doctrine of original sin becomes prominent in Christian theology, St. Ephrem assumes without doubt or question that this tradition implies Mary's entire exemption from the cause, and supplies us with reasonable grounds for believing that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is coeval with the foundation of the Christian Church.

A word or two must be said about St. Augustine. Undoubtedly his theory on the transmission of original sin by the act of generation drove him to believe that Mary, being conceived in the ordinary way, must have been conceived in sin. So Petavius understands him, and the Saint's own language seems to be clear and decisive on this point. Thus ("De Nuptiis et Concep." i. 12, PL, xliv. 121), he teaches that all flesh born "de concubitu" is "flesh of sin," and ("In Genesim ad lit." x. 118, PL, xxxiv. 422), he expressly affirms that on this ground Mary's flesh was, while Christ's was not, "caro peccati." Again, in "Contr. Julian." v. 15, PL, xliv. 814, his language is still more definite, for he says that original sin passes to the child from the "concupiscentia" of the parents, and that therefore original sin could not infect the flesh of Christ, since his Virgin Mother conceived Him without concupiscence. It may, we think, be affirmed without irreverence to so great a doctor, that this language about sin passing to the flesh involves confusion of thought, and probably very few nowadays would maintain that "concupiscentia" in itself natural and innocent, though caused as a matter of fact by the Fall, can possibly be the cause of original sin. The fact that St. Augustine is driven to the position he takes with regard to Mary by the exigencies of a theological theory, probably mistaken, and certainly never approved by the Church, diminishes, if it does not altogether destroy, the force of his testimony. On the other hand, great weight belongs to the testimony which St. Augustine bears to the Immaculate Conception, because in giving it he speaks, not as a theologian, but as a Christian. He is impelled in this latter case by Catholic instinct and tradition, not by any theory of his own. His testimony is as follows. He is arguing ('De Natura et Gratia," cap. 36, PL, xliv. 267) against the Pelagian theory that some of the saints had been wholly exempt from actual sin. He denies the truth of the statement altogether. All have sinned, "excepting the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom, for the honour of the Lord, I would have no question raised in treating of sin. For how do we know what excess of grace to conquer sin on every side was bestowed on her whose lot it was (*quae meruit*) to conceive and bring forth Him who certainly had no sin?" We fully admit that it is actual, not original, sin which St. Augustine is thinking of directly. But on his own principles he was bound to hold that exemption from actual implied freedom from original sin. Thus he asserts categorically ("Contr. Julian." v. 15, PL, xliv. 815) that if Christ had been conceived in sin He must needs have committed actual sin ("peccatum m[illegible]or fecisset, si parvulus habuisset"). Let the reader observe that this theory, unlike that referred to above on the transmission of sin, is supported by the tradition and subsequent decision of the Church. It is of course conceivable that Mary might have been conceived in sin and then enabled by a special and extraordinary grace to avoid all actual trespass. In any case we may safely say that St. Augustine might easily have accepted the Church's present doctrine. It would have satisfied most fully this inclination to believe that Mary "for the honour of the Lord" was enabled to "overcome sin on every side." The freedom from actual would have followed suitably upon her preservation from original sin, and the progress of her life would have been consonant with its beginning.

Finally, the rapid acceptance of the doctrine within the Church, when once it came under discussion, might of itself dispose individual Christians to believe it and prepare the way for definition. The one positive objection was that, if Mary was conceived immaculate, Christ could not have been her Saviour and Redeemer. When once the truth was apprehended that Mary's exemption from original sin was due to the merits of her Divine Son, and magnified instead of detracting from them, the belief in this exemption grew and spread throughout the Catholic world. We cannot expect Protestants to appreciate this argument. But to a Catholic, who believes that the Holy Spirit directs the minds of the faithful, and specially those of the saints, the very fact of the doctrine's acceptance affords a strong presumption of its truth. He would naturally be loath to believe that God allowed the Christian people to cling so zealously to a doctrine which had no solid foundation, and which, if untrue, would be an error of a very serious kind. He would recognize in the belief of so many saints a judgment superior to his own, and a greater quickness to discover the "analogy of the faith." The solemn definition of the Church would but enable him to hold with greater security what he already held as a certain and pious opinion.

(The evidence for and against the doctrine is given by Petavius, "De Incarnat." xiv. 2. Perrone published his treatise "De Immaculato B.V.M. Conceptu: an dogmatico decreto definiri possit," at Rome in 1853. Still better known is the work of Passaglia, also at that time a Jesuit, "De Immaculato B.V. Conceptu," Romae, 1854. A collection of ancient documents relating to the doctrine was made by a third Jesuit, Ballerini. The dogmatic theologians generally deal with the Immaculate Conception in connection with Original Sin, or else in treating of the Mother of the Redeemer. There is a useful little book in English, by Bp. Ullathorne, "The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.")

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, FEAST OF. The Greek emperor Manuel Comnenus

(died 1180), in a Novel quoted by Balsamon, mentions the feast of the Blessed Virgin's Conception as one to be observed by the people on December 9. In the West it is kept on December 8. England, it is said, was the first among the countries of Western Europe to keep this feast, and a Council of London, held in 1328, attributes its introduction to St. Anselm; but an Epistle of the Saint which begins with a formal notice on the subject is probably spurious.

From England the celebration seems to have passed to Normandy, and then south to Lyons. St. Bernard reproved the canons of that city for introducing a custom which had not the sanction of the Roman Church. St. Bonaventure (died 1274) ("In Lib. III. Sentent." d. iii. qu. 1) mentions the custom of keeping the feast, and says he does not dare either to approve or disapprove it. It is certain, however, that the feast had established itself in the calendar of the Roman Church before the middle of the fourteenth century. Sixtus IV., towards the close of the fifteenth century, sanctioned an office and Mass proper to the day; for which, however, a new office was substituted by Pius V. Clement VIII. made the feast a greater double, Clement IX. added an octave; Clement XI. made it a holiday of obligation. Under Pius IX. the office was again changed, and the feast was entitled that of the "Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary." Leo XIII. raised it to a double of the first class. (Benedict XIV. "De Festis.")

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL. [See SOUL.]

IMMOVEABLE. [See FEASTS.]

IMMUNITY. Ecclesiastical immunity is defined to be "the right by which churches and other sacred places, as well as ecclesiastical persons and their property, are free and discharged from secular functions and burdens, and from acts repugnant to the sanctity and reverence which are due to them."[1] It is of three kinds—local, real, and personal. On local immunity, which is of ecclesiastical institution, see SANCTUARY and ASYLUM. Real immunity is the right whereby it is claimed that the property of the Church and the clergy are exempted from secular jurisdiction and from all fiscal and other burdens imposed by secular authority. Personal immunity is the right of the clergy to be exempted from all lay jurisdiction [see JURISDICTION].

The real and personal immunity of the clergy are generally held by canonists to be of divine right. Several passages are adduced from the Old Testament, among which the most striking is 1 Esdr. vii. 24, where the emperor Artaxerxes, addressing through Esdras the "keepers of the public chest" beyond the river, gives them to understand that "concerning all the priests, and the Levites, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nathinites, and ministers of the house of this God," they, the keepers, "have no authority to impose toll or tribute or custom upon them." The words of Christ (Mt. xvii. 24, 25) form an important text bearing on the subject. Earthly kings exempt from tribute their own children and their servants; Christ, therefore, as the Son of God, is rightfully exempt from the payment of the didrachma, which was destined for the support of the divine worship in the Temple. Moreover, the words "that we may not scandalize them" show that Peter and the other Apostles, as Christ's servants, are included under the same exemption. In Peter it is held that the clergy of the Catholic Church of every age is included by representation. Christ and His servants the clergy are therefore by right exempt from tax or tribute; nevertheless, sooner than cause scandal by availing Himself of this exemption, Christ bade Peter pay the sum demanded for them both; and the pastors of the Church have generally acted similarly in later times.

Political reasoning on general grounds might be employed in support of the claim of the clergy to an exemption from taxation. As kings do not tax their own children, so governments, in a natural state of things, do not tax their own servants or officials. The officials of a government constitute the agency by which it fulfils its duty of protecting and regulating society; and taxes are raised in order that it may have the means of supporting these officials while so engaged. To make the officials themselves pay taxes is, theoretically, an absurdity; it is giving them money with one hand and taking it away with the other; though of course there may be sound reasons of practical convenience why this should be done. So it is with the Catholic clergy; regarding them as the moral police of society, a wise State would recognize them as its children and its servants, and assume that, as a general rule, they would spend their own money in such a way as to promote peace, order, and well-being more effectually than would be the result if the State were to tax them to the same amount, and spend the money for them.

The early history of clerical immunity is given in great detail by Thomassin.[1] Constantine exempted from all tribute his private property and "ecclesias Catholicas"; he also ordered that no public functions of a lay character should be imposed on the bishops.[2] Constantius, early in his reign, passed edicts highly favourable to this immunity, but revoked them after the Council of Ariminum (359), except in the case of clerics who were very poor, and whose temporal business was of trifling value. By a law passed shortly before his death he replaced things nearly on their old footing. These vacillations in the

[1] Ferraris, *Immunitas Ecclesiastica*, i. 4.

[1] III. i. 33–45.

[2] Euseb. *H.E.* x. 5.

policy of the emperors were of continual occurrence; thus while Julian the Apostate abolished all clerical immunities, Valentinian restored them. The great bishops of the fourth century took patiently the imperial demands on their temporalties, and complied with them; but on the spiritual side they were inflexible. Writing of his refusal to grant one of the Milan churches to the Arians, at the request of Valentinian II., St. Ambrose said "If he asks for tribute, we do not refuse it. . . . We pay to Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things which are God's. A church belongs to God, and ought not certainly to be assigned to Caesar." Thomassin argues that St. Ambrose was quite aware that immunity was the Church's right, but that he preferred to pay taxes rather than cause offence. "Ambrose knew that from Christ—the Church—the Clergy—tribute was not due, but yet was paid; and paid all the more nobly because it was not owed."

In the feudal ages, when fiefs and manors were granted to the Church to be held on feudal terms, the question of ecclesiastical immunities became much complicated. As a bishop who held a fief under some secular prince had to do homage to him for it, kneeling before him, placing his hands between the lord's hands, and swearing to become his "man"—a spectacle which moved grief and indignation in the breast of many a zealous pontiff and saint—so, as to all other services (rent, corvées, troops, &c.) which the vassal was bound to render to his lord by the condition of his tenure, he could not, if a churchman, plead the ecclesiastical immunity, though it still subsisted in full force as to lands held in *frank-almoigne*. (Choupin, in DThC.)

The Council of Trent[1] entreated all Catholic princes not to allow their servants and officials to violate, through cupidity or carelessness, "the immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons which had been established by the ordinance of God and canonical sanctions." At the present day, through the continual encroachments of the lay power, immunity as regards taxation exists nowhere in Europe; and even that shred of privilege by which the burden of military service was taken off the necks of aspirants for the priesthood has been swept away by the so-called Liberals in France and Italy

The exemption of the clergy in England from all liability to serve on juries or as representatives in Parliament is a vestige of their one-time absolute immunity. (Ferraris, *Immunitas Ecclesiastica*; Thomassin, iii. 1, 33; Boudinhon in "Cath. Enc.")

IMPANATION. An heretical doctrine concerning the mode of our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist, according to which the substance of bread remains whole and entire together with the substance of Christ's body. The word is founded on the analogy of the Incarnation: *Christus panis factus est.* Another name for the heresy is Consubstantiation (see EUCHARIST, p. 326; BERENGARIUS; Franzelin, "De SS. Euch. Sacramento," thes. xv., scholion; Scannell in "Cath. Enc." *Consubstantiation*).

IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE. The contract of marriage between certain persons and in certain cases is null and void by the law of God, natural and revealed. So far Protestants are at one with us, for they would not dream of holding that marriage between father and daughter or brother and sister was valid. But Catholics further maintain with the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. De Matrimon. can. 4) that the Church may institute impediments which nullify the contract of marriage. The principle on which this tenet rests is a very simple one. Marriage between baptized persons, according to the Catholic doctrine, is a sacrament, and therefore this contract falls under ecclesiastical authority. Just as the State may pronounce certain natural contracts, which are lawful in themselves, null and void—just as, for example, it may for the general good nullify certain engagements made by minors or at play—so the Church may interfere with the freedom of the marriage contract. The State, on the contrary, has no power to nullify marriage, because the sacrament of marriage does not fall under civil jurisdiction, although, as the formalities of marriage affect the public order, the State may regulate them—*e.g.* provide that persons about to be married should have their names registered, &c.

Impediments are of two kinds. They may render marriage unlawful merely, in which case they are called "mere impedientia"; or they may nullify it, in which case they are known as "dirimentia." We shall treat of these impediments as settled by the existing law, adding historical notices.

1. *Impedimenta mere Impedientia*:—

(*a*) *Time.* The solemnities of marriage must not take place between Advent Sunday and Epiphany, or between Ash Wednesday and Low Sunday. So the Council of Trent, sess. xxiv. De Reform. Matr. cap. 10. Marriage, solemnly celebrated, is forbidden in these times because they should be devoted to penance or else to a joy purely spiritual. Marriages in Lent were generally prohibited in ancient times: marriages in Advent and Christmas time only in certain places, though Gratian inserts this latter prohibition in his "Decretum." Some provincial councils forbade marriage on Sundays, from three days before the Ascension to the first Sunday after Pentecost, &c.[1]

(*β*) *Ecclesiastical Prohibition.*—This in

[1] Sess. xxv. De Reform. c. 20.

[1] See Chardon, 1031.

cludes the marriage of a Catholic with a baptized person not a Catholic, which marriage is valid, but, unless a dispensation has been obtained, unlawful. Such marriages are forbidden by the Councils of Elvira (anno 306) cap. 16, and of Laodicea, can. 10 and 31. The Council of Chalcedon, can. 14, forbids "readers and singers" (ἀναγνῶσται καὶ ψαλται) to marry an heretical girl. The reason of this prohibition has always been the same, viz. the danger that the children will not be brought up Catholics [see MIXED MARRIAGES]. Hence in some of the rules just quoted exception is made in favour of marriage with heretics who promise to become Catholic. Marriages without previous proclamation of banns are also forbidden by the Church.

(γ) Simple vow of chastity, such as is made privately or in congregations like the Sisters of Mercy, &c., which are not religious orders in the canonical sense.

(δ) Previous engagement to another person, unless the engagement has been lawfully annulled—*e.g.* by mutual consent. This impediment, like (γ), depends on the natural law.

2. *Diriment Impediments* :—

(*a*) *Error* and *conditio* affecting the substance of the contract. Thus a man who goes through the form of marriage with one woman, mistaking her for another, really marries neither. This impediment comes from the natural law. If a person marries a slave unawares, the marriage is null. For the Roman and early Church law on this subject see Döllinger, "Hippolytus and Callistus," Engl. transl., p. 147.

(β) Vows of chastity, if solemn, and holy orders. The reader will find under the article CELIBACY an account of the gradual process by which holy order came to be a diriment impediment. The ancient Church did not expressly distinguish between simple and solemn vows, but Chardon quotes a letter of Pope Innocent I. to Victricius of Rouen in which a very similar distinction is recognized. The Pope divides nuns who have made the vows of continence into two classes—viz. those who have and those who have not received the veil publicly from the Church. The former, if they marry, he treats as unfaithful to Christ their Spouse, and excludes from communion till the person they marry is dead. On the latter he merely imposes penance for a time. Moreover, the Council of Elvira, canon 13, forbids virgins consecrated to God, in case they break their vows, to communicate even on their deathbeds, unless they have done penance and ceased to cohabit ("abstineant a coitu").[1] So again the First Council of Toledo (anno 400), canon 16, only admits a nun ("devota") to penance if separated from the man she has unlawfully married ("caste vivere coeperit, recesserit et poenituerit"). So the Second Synod of Orleans, canon 17, with respect to deaconesses and many other ancient authorities. The Trullan Synod, canon 44, treats the marriage of a monk as an act of unchastity.

(γ) *Consanguinity* and *affinity*. [See the articles so entitled.]

(δ) *Public decorum* ("publica honestas"). If A is or has been betrothed to B, A cannot validly marry a third person related in the first degree of kindred to B. He cannot, *e.g.*, marry B's mother, daughter, or sister. A similar rule, of course, binds B. So the Council of Trent, for in the older canon law the impediment from betrothal extended to the fourth degree. Again, if A has been married to B, but has not consummated the marriage, he cannot afterwards marry anyone related to B, in the first, second, third, or fourth degree. This impediment was adopted from the Roman law, and is not referred to by the Fathers.

(ε) *Crime*. (1) Adultery between two persons accompanied by a promise of marriage when they are free to contract it. (2) Successful conspiracy to murder a husband or wife in order that the conspirators may marry. (3) Adultery and murder with the intention of marriage combined, even if there be no conspiracy or previous promise of marriage, are diriment impediments. Also from the Roman law.

(ζ) *Difference of religion* ("disparitas cultus") makes the marriage of a baptized and unbaptized person null. In the early Church, such unions, though often prohibited, were not regarded as invalid, and nearly all theologians, according to Chardon, are agreed that custom only has made the impediment a diriment one.

(η) *Grave fear*, if unjustly caused with a view of bringing marriage about. Probably this cause nullifies marriage by the natural law.

(θ) *Another marriage tie* still existing ("ligamen"). If one of the parties has been previously married, there must be a moral certainty that his or her previous partner is dead. In any case in which the priest or the parties themselves doubt, recourse must be had to the bishop, who will judge whether the moral certainty exists.

(ι) *Defect of age*. Boys cannot marry before completing their fourteenth, girls before completing their twelfth year, "nisi malitia suppleat aetatem."

(κ) *Clandestinity*. No one doubts that from the earliest times marriages, wherever it was possible, were contracted in the face of the Church; indeed Tertullian ("De Pudic." c. 4, PL, ii. 987) tells us that marriages contracted otherwise were thought extremely disreputable. Chardon quotes a declaration of Charlemagne, Capitularies of French kings, and decrees of Eastern emperors, which prove that marriage without the ecclesiastical

[1] Even then only in case this fall has been a single act of weakness atoned for by a life-long penance.

ceremonies was treated as absolutely null, and such was the discipline both in East and West till the twelfth century, for Ivo of Chartres quotes the False Decretals to this effect. But, soon after, the discipline changed in the West. The validity of clandestine marriages was fully recognized by the Church, and the common opinion of the mediaeval doctors made the essence of marriage consist in the free consent of the contracting persons. The Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. cap. 1, *De Reform. Matrim.*) introduced a new condition for the validity of the contract, and therefore of the sacrament. It declared all marriages null unless contracted before the parish priest, or another priest approved by him for the purpose, and two or three witnesses. But in order to avoid the difficulties which would otherwise have arisen, the decree of Trent was not promulgated in Great Britain, Scandinavia, Denmark, several German States—indeed, in Protestant countries generally; so that the marriages of Protestants or Catholics made before the Protestant clergyman or magistrate or without any functionary in these countries were valid. In 1741 Benedict XIV. declared clandestine marriages in the Low Countries valid unless both of the parties were Catholics. Pius VI. in 1785 made a similar declaration with regard to Ireland.

It is interesting to note that, two centuries after the Council of Trent, Lord Hardwicke's Act (1753) assimilated the law of England to that of the Church by declaring all marriages null and void unless celebrated by a Church of England clergyman in the presence of two witnesses, after three consecutive publications of the banns.

Important changes were made in the Tridentine law by the Decree "Ne temere" (August 2, 1907), which came into force on Easter Sunday, 1908. (See NE TEMERE.) As far as clandestinity is concerned, it is no longer the parish priest (or Ordinary) of the parties, but the rector (or Ordinary) of the *place* where the marriage is celebrated who is now the valid assistant. But permission should be obtained from the parish priest (or Ordinary) of one of the parties, unless that party has lived for one month in the place of the marriage. This law is binding even in mixed marriages.

(λ) *Impotentia* (*antecedens et perpetua*).

(μ) *Raptus*. If a man carries off a woman from one place to another with the view of marrying her, the Church nullifies any marriage between them so long as the woman is in the man's power. The impediment still exists even if the woman consents to the marriage. The Church will accept no proof of freedom on the woman's part short of her removal from her suitor's power. Severe laws were made against the crime of *raptus* by the Roman emperors, beginning with Constantine. Justinian absolutely prohibited marriage between the raptor and the woman he had carried off. So did Charlemagne in his Capitularies; and the Greek Church maintained a similar discipline. "It is," says Chardon, speaking of the Western Church—"it is specially in the ancient councils of France that *raptus* has been expressly declared a diriment impediment." The councils he quotes range from the sixth to the eighth century, and they certainly prohibit subsequent marriage between the raptor and his victim, though it may be doubted whether they meant to pronounce it null. However, in the anarchy towards the end of the ninth and during the tenth centuries these canons fell into disuse. Pope Lucius III. decided that, when a girl was carried off, her marriage with the man who had seized her was valid, provided she consented to it freely. Innocent III. followed the same principles. The Council of Trent introduced the present rule at the request of the French king. The reader will observe that it is less strict than the prohibitions of the old French canons. The Council of Trent permits marriage between the raptor and the raptee, provided the latter is out of the former's power when she gives her consent.

3. *Dispensations from Impediments.*—If the impediments arise from the natural or divine law, no human power can dispense from them. The Pope may dispense from such as are of ecclesiastical origin; while bishops, in virtue of their ordinary power, can only set aside the "impedimenta mere impedientia."[1] Bishops, however, may often dispense from certain diriment impediments as Apostolic delegates. The facility with which dispensations are given has increased enormously since the thirteenth century. Gregory the Great granted marriage dispensations in favour of the English who were just converted to the faith. So Gregory II. in favour of the Germans. But in numerous instances dispensations, such as would easily be granted nowadays to ordinary Catholics, were refused even to crowned heads. It was in vain that the Council of Trent tried to restore the ancient rigour. (See MARRIAGE; Chardon, 1058 *sqq.*; Gibert, "Histoire ou Tradition de l'Église sur le Sacrement du Mariage." The moral theologians and the canonists deal with Impediments in their treatises "De Matrimonio," *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moralis," lib. vi. tract. vi.; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. vi. p. 398 *sqq.*)

IMPOSITION OF HANDS even in the old dispensation (Gen. xlviii. 14, Deut. xxxiv. 9) symbolized the conveyance of grace and power. The rite has been retained under the new law, and in two instances (the imposition of hands in ordination and confirmation) it has received a sacramental efficacy. The following are the most noteworthy instances in which the Church employs or once employed the rite.

(1) As Christ blessed the children, laying

His hands on them (Mt. xix. 13), so the bishop laid his hands on the catechumens as they made the first step towards reception into the kingdom of God. Thus Eusebius ("Vit. Constant." iv. 61, where see the note of Valesius) tells us that Constantine, when preparing shortly before his death for Baptism, first received the imposition of hands accompanied with prayer (*τῶν διὰ χειροθεσίας εὐχῶν ἠξιοῦτο*). This ceremony was repeated during the catechumen's course of preparation, at the renunciation of the devil (Tertull. "De Coron." 3, PL, ii. 79) and at the exorcisms (Orig. "In Jos." Hom. xxiv. 1, PG, xii. 940). Probably it is this imposition of hands which is intended in can. 39 of the Council of Elvira and can. 6 of the Council of Arles (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 242 *sqq.*), and it is still retained in our baptismal rite.

(2) As Christ laid His hands on the sick, so did the Church's ministers ("Constit. Ap." ii. 41; Cyprian, "De Laps." 16, ed. Hartel, p. 248) on those who were spiritually sick—viz. on penitents. In early ages the imposition of hands was so notable a feature in the administration of the sacrament of Penance as to give it one of its most usual names. The usage is still perpetuated in the ceremonial raising of his hand by a priest when giving absolution: he recites the sacramental formula with the right hand outstretched over the penitent.

(3) Hands were also laid on heretics when reconciled to the Church. "Let no change be made" [or, nothing fresh be done], such are the words of Pope Stephen (*apud* Cyprian, Ep. 74, ed. Hartel, p. 800), "beyond the traditional usage of laying hands on them unto penance."

(4) Imposition of hands was also used in blessing marriages (Clem. Al. "Paed." iii. 11, p. 291, ed. Potter; PG, viii. 637), in miraculous healing of the sick (Irenaeus, *apud* Euseb. "H.E." v. 7), in consecrating virgins and ordaining deaconesses. These last customs do not exist in the modern Church, except that in the ceremonies which precede Extreme Unction the priest holds his hand over the sick man.

(5) The imposition of hands in Confirmation and Order is treated of in the articles on these sacraments, but it may be convenient to notice here a rite which occurs in the Roman Mass, just before the consecration, though it does not, strictly speaking, form part of our present subject, since it is an extension and not an imposition of hands. It is, however, connected with an imposition of hands in the Old Law. Then he who offered sacrifice put his hand on the head of the victim (see Levit. i. 4, iii. 2, 8, 13, iv. 5, 15), whether the sacrifice was a holocaust, eucharistic, or expiatory. This rite indicated the "personal and intimate relation between the worshipper and the victim" (Kalisch on Levit. i. p. 176). It is with the same intention that the priest holds his hands extended at the prayer "Hanc igitur" over the gifts of bread and wine "which are soon to be changed into the victim of our peace." The rite does not appear to be ancient, for the Ordo Romanus down to the fifteenth century simply prescribed the extension of the hands at this prayer, and Le Brun ("Explic. de la Messe," part iv. a. 5) does not seem to have found our present rubric in any missal older than 1481.

IMPRIMATUR. ("Let it be printed.") The technical term for license to print. It does not imply any direct approval of the work, but merely certifies that the limits of Catholic orthodoxy have been observed. [See INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS.]

INCARDINATION and **EXCARDINATION** (*cardo*, hinge). These terms are used for the full and perpetual transference from the jurisdiction of one bishop to that of another. Excardination is the going out from the old diocese; incardination is the entry into the new diocese. *Cardinare* is used by St. Gregory the Great; and *incardinare* is found in the "Diurnus Romanus" in the sense of inscribing on the list or *matricula* of a church.

The transference from one diocese to another may take place for the purpose of ordination [see DIMISSORIALS] or may be the transfer of an already ordained priest. The conditions of the former are laid down by a decree of the S. Cong. of the Council (July 20, 1898). As regards priests, special rules have been enacted for those ordained *ad titulum missionis*, and for emigrants to N. America and some other countries. (See Taunton; Dunford in "Cath. Enc.")

INCARNATION. The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation has been already explained under the word CHRIST. Here we confine ourselves to an account of the word and its synonyms.

The history of the word and its synonyms is given with great fulness by Petavius, "De Incarnat." ii. 1. In St. John's gospel we are told that the Word "was made flesh," where, as Maldonatus remarks, "flesh" (like the Hebrew בָּשָׂר: *e.g.* in Gen. vi. 12, "all flesh had corrupted its way") is only another word for "man," though the word is fitly chosen to mark the extreme condescension of God the Word. St. Justin, "Apol." i. 61, combines the two words "became flesh" into the single verb "flesh-made" (*σαρκοποιηθείς*[1]); while in the Latin version of Irenaeus, v. 1, 3, PG, vii. 1122, we meet with the technical term which has been so familiar ever since, viz. Incarnation (*incarnatio*). The Greek Fathers use a word nearly equivalent, viz. *σάρκωσις*. They also employ *ἐνανθρώπησις*, "being made man," for which St. Ambrose has the

[1] Cf. *σαρκωθέντα* in the Nicene Creed.

word *humanatio* in order to express the truth that the Word took perfect human nature, that He had a human intelligence as well as a human body and animal soul, and so to exclude the heresy of Apollinaris. The Fathers also use other words which are less plain and explicit. Most commonly they call the Incarnation the "economy" (*οἰκονομία*), meaning that Christ took flesh in order to *provide for* our salvation. They often substitute for the bare word "economy" fuller expressions, such as "the economy according to the flesh," "according to man," and the like. They also speak of the Incarnation as the "condescension" (*συγκατάβασις*), the "taking," "assuming," "clothing Himself in flesh," as the "mingling" (viz. of the two natures), incorporation (*incorporatio*); &c. &c. [Authorities are given in the article CHRIST.]

INCENSE. It is certain from Tertullian, "Apol." 42, PL, i. 493, and from many other early writers down to St. Augustine, that the religious use of incense was unknown in the primitive Church. Le Brun quotes St. Ambrose to prove that incense was used in the churches of his day, but the quotation can scarcely be said to prove the point. On the other hand, Dionysius the Areopagite—whose works were first quoted in 532, but may have been written a good deal earlier—distinctly mentions ("Hierarch. Eccles." iii. § 2), the censing of the altar by the chief priest. The use of incense is also mentioned in the first Ordo Romanus, which may belong to the seventh century, and in the liturgies which go by the names of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom. Possibly also the fourth (*al.* third) canon of the Apostles which forbids anything to be placed on the altar at the oblation except "oil for the lamp and incense" may refer to the incense as liturgically used If so, we should be justified with Le Brun in supposing that incense was introduced into the Church services when the persecution of the heathen ceased and the splendour of churches and ritual began.

Some authors believe that incense was at first introduced to sweeten the air, and certainly a "Benediction of Incense" used in the time of Charlemagne and given by Martène points in this direction. But the mystical significations of incense are obvious. It symbolizes the zeal with which the faithful should be consumed; the odour of Christian virtue; the ascent of prayer to God (Ps. cxl. 2; Apoc. viii. 3, 4). It is used before the introit, at the Gospel, offertory, and elevation in High Mass; at the Magnificat in Vespers; at funerals, &c. In the symbolism of the Liturgy incense has two distinct uses:

(1) Persons or things are perfumed with it for the purpose of justifying or hallowing them, following as a rule on their being sprinkled with holy water. Thus ashes, palms, &c. &c., are incensed, as are the priest who is about to celebrate Mass, the faithful who assist at the Divine Offices, the altar itself and the unconsecrated bread and wine placed upon it. And in such case the incense before being used is previously blessed with a special prayer.

(2) The offering of incense is (as in the Old Law and among heathen nations) made the expression of an act of adoration, or of veneration. Hence the Blessed Sacrament, the Holy Cross, the pictures and statues of saints are incensed. For this use incense requires no previous blessing and the interdicting of such blessing is yet in force when incense is offered at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and at the Elevation during High Mass and in some other similar circumstances. (Rock, "Hierurgia," ii. 332 *sqq.*)

INCLUSI, INCLUSAE. A monk or nun might, with the permission of the superior, be shut up permanently in a cell, either near to or within the precincts of the monastery, whence he or she could not come forth but by licence of the bishop. Cassian describes the *inclusi* of his day; as a class, they were not then held in great esteem. The manner of life of a female recluse in the twelfth century may be clearly seen from the treatise "De Institutione Inclusarum" (PL, cxcv.), ascribed to St. Ælred of Rievaulx. The writer addresses his counsels to his own sister, who had retired into a cell; he earnestly warns her to shun idleness and frivolous conversation; from the general tone of his remarks it is plain that the life of a female recluse was beset by great and peculiar dangers and temptations. (Ducange, *Inclusi.*)

IN COENA DOMINI (the feast of the Lord's Supper, Holy Thursday). A papal bull formerly published every year on that day. [See BULL IN COENA DOMINI.]

INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS (INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM ET EXPURGANDORUM). The perception of the influence for good or evil exerted by books has induced the authorities of every strongly constituted State to control their circulation. Not to search for other instances, the speech which Livy[1] puts in the mouth of the consul Postumius (B.C. 186) shows the sternness of Roman feeling on the subject. Addressing the assembled people in the forum, and about to denounce the foul Bacchic rites of which he had discovered the trace, "How often," he says, "in the time of our fathers and grandfathers, was the duty imposed on the magistrates of forbidding the practice of foreign rites; of driving away [foreign] priests and prophets from every corner of the city; *of searching for and burning books of magic*; of putting a stop to every system of sacrificing that was not according to the custom of Rome!" In Christian times the danger of bad books was recognized from the first. The converts at Ephesus (Acts xix. 19) voluntarily brought their magical books to

[1] Book xxxix. c. 16.

St. Paul and cast them into the flames. One of the Apostolic Canons (lx.) orders the deposition of any one in the ranks of the clergy who should publish in the Church as holy "the falsely inscribed books of the impious." The practice of the primitive Church in condemning and suppressing heretical or dangerous books was uniform. The erroneous writings of Origen were brought to the Roman Pontiff, Pontianus, to be condemned by him; Leo the Great by letter suppressed and prohibited the books of the Priscillianists.[1] Descending to the Middle Ages we find Leo IX. in a synod at Vercelli (1050) condemning and ordering to be burnt the writings of Erigena and Berengarius on the Eucharist.[2] The Council of Constance (1415) ordered all the books of John Hus to be publicly burnt at the council, and that all bishops should make diligent search for copies and burn them wherever found. Leo X. in the bull *Exsurge, Domine* (1520), condemned the earlier heretical writings of Luther. The invention of printing, and the extension of facilities of communication between State and State, made it evident to the hierarchy that if the influence of books was to be kept under control, new methods must be adopted. When copies of books were slowly multiplied by the labour of scribes, it was sufficient to await their publication before examining them, and trust to being able, if they were to be suppressed, to call in, get hold of, and cancel the few copies in circulation. But when the printing-press could turn out a thousand copies of a work in a few days everything was changed. It then became necessary that the books should be examined before they were printed; *censors* were appointed, and a system of *licensing* came into force. "The first known instance of the regular appointment of a censor on books is in the mandate of Berthold, archbishop of Mentz, in 1486"; and a few years later, in 1501, "a bull of Alexander VI., reciting that many pernicious books had been printed in various parts of the world, and especially in the provinces of Mentz, Cologne, Treves, and Magdeburg, forbade all printers in these provinces to publish any book without the licence of the archbishops or their officials."[3]

In the movement of what is called the Reformation, a deluge of books containing doctrine more or less erroneous was poured over Europe, and it became evident that if booksellers were to know with certainty what they might sell and the Christian faithful what they might read, it would not do to trust to an "imprimatur" on the title-page, which might be forged, or come from Protestant censors; but that a list or catalogue of books condemned by the Church must be drawn up and published. The matter was taken up by the Council of Trent (sess. xviii.), which appointed a commission of some of its members to consider and report on the steps which it was advisable to take about books generally. This commission compiled an Index of Prohibited Books accordingly, but the council in its last session (1563) remitted the whole matter to the Pope. In conformity with this reference, St. Pius V., a few years later, erected the Sacred Congregation of the Index. Sixtus V. confirmed and enlarged their powers.

"The Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books consists of a competent number of Cardinals, and has a secretary taken from the Order of Preachers, and a great number of theological and other professors who are called Consultors, the chief of whom is the Master of the Apostolic Palace [CURIA ROMANA], the primary and official Consultor of this Congregation."[4]

A Constitution of Benedict XIV. (1753) gives minute instructions as to the principles and methods to be observed by the Congregation in its work of examining and judging books. Some idea of these principles may be gained from the following paragraph: "Let them know that they must judge of the various opinions and sentiments in any book that comes before them, with minds absolutely free from prejudice. Let them, therefore, dismiss patriotic leanings, family affections, the predilections of school, the *esprit de corps* of an institute; let them put away the zeal of party; let them simply keep before their eyes the decisions of Holy Church, and the common doctrine of Catholics, which is contained in the decrees of General Councils, the Constitutions of the Roman Pontiffs, and the consent of orthodox Fathers and Doctors; bearing this in mind, moreover, that there are not a few opinions which appear to one school, institute, or nation to be unquestionably certain, yet nevertheless are rejected and impugned, and their contradictories maintained, by other Catholics, without harm to faith and religion—all this being with the knowledge and permission of the Apostolic See, which leaves every particular opinion of this kind in its own degree of probability."

The ten rules sanctioned by the Council of Trent have in course of time been modified by the various Pontiffs. At length in our own day a fresh set of rules was drawn up by Leo XIII. (*Officiorum et Munerum*, January 25, 1897). They deal first with the prohibition, and secondly with the censorship of books. As the regulations are of a highly technical character, reference should be made to their exact wording in the document itself. Here it may be sufficient to say that they forbid all books defending heresy or schism, or attacking the foundations of religion; and all books by non-Catholics treating expressly of religion, unless it is clear that they contain

[1] Fleury, xxvii. 10.
[2] *Ibid.* lix. 69.
[3] Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*, i. 254.
[4] Ferraris, "Congregationes."

nothing contrary to the Catholic faith. Editions, published by non-Catholics, of the original text of Scripture, or of versions in any dead language, are allowed only to those engaged in theological or biblical studies. Vernacular versions by non-Catholics are not allowed (except to students as above); nor even those by Catholics, unless expressly approved by the Holy See or by the Bishops. Obscene books are absolutely forbidden, except "classical authors, ancient or modern . . . on account of the elegance and beauty of their diction," but are not to be used in teaching boys, unless expurgated. There are also rules as to books treating of the various kinds of superstition, and also those narrating new visions, prophecies, and miracles; and rules as to sacred pictures and indulgences, liturgical books, and prayer-books. Newspapers and periodicals which designedly attack religion or morality are forbidden, and Catholics must not write in them without reasonable cause. Then follow the rules concerning permission to read forbidden books, and the denunciation of bad books. This leads to the second part of the constitution, the censorship of books. The instructions issued by Benedict XIV. (see *supra*) are confirmed. All the faithful are bound to submit to censorship all works of a religious or moral character; and the clergy, "out of respect for their ordinaries," ought not to publish books on any subject without their knowledge. Printers and publishers are also subject to certain regulations.

The same constitution also ordered a revised edition of the Index of Prohibited Books. Further, Pius X., when reconstituting the Roman Congregations ("Sapienti Consilio," June 29, 1908), laid down that "henceforth it will be the task of this S. Cong. (of the Index) not only to examine carefully the books denounced to it, to prohibit them if necessary, and to grant permission for reading forbidden books, but also to supervise, *ex officio*, books that are being published and to pass sentence on such as deserve to be prohibited. Its further task is to remind the bishops of their sacred duty to oppose the publication of pernicious writings and give information about them to the Apostolic See." [See MODERNISM.] (There is a good account of the whole subject in Lehmkuhl's "Theol. Moral.," ed. 10^a, ii. pp. 807–820; Ferraris; Forget in DAp; Périès, "L'Index.")

INDICTION. A fiscal term, meaning the proclamation of a tax, "quicquid in praestationem indicitur." After the reorganization of the empire under Diocletian and Constantine, it was customary to proclaim the taxes yearly, and the name of the notice thus given, *indictio*, was transferred to the year itself. Every fifteen years there was a re-valuation of property, which would lead to material alterations in the terms of the tax-notices. To one of these quindecennial periods the name of "circle of indictions," and then briefly "indiction," was given. This came to be used as a means of denoting the date of a transaction; a thing was said to happen "indictione V." or "X."—that is, in the fifth or tenth year of the circle of indictions then current. Of course the denotation of time was incomplete, for it included no statement of the *number* of such circles which had elapsed since the epoch from which the computation started. This mode of reckoning the years, which makes its appearance about the middle of the fourth century, continued to be used even into the Middle Ages, after all notions connecting it with taxation had disappeared. The first indiction is supposed to have commenced on September 24, 312, on which day Constantine gained a great victory over Maxentius. The rule for finding the indiction of any year is as follows: to the given year A.D., reckoning it to commence on January 1, add 3; divide the amount by 15; the remainder is the number of the indiction; if there is no remainder, the indiction is 15. The number 3 must be added, in order to make the portion of the date A.D. which is anterior to the commencement of the indictions (312 years) divisible by 15 equally with the portion subsequent to that date. Suppose we wish to know the indiction of A.D. 595: $\frac{595+3}{15} = 39$, with rem. 13; the indiction number for this year is therefore 13. "Indict. XV." applies only to the portion of the year from January 1 to September 24; from the latter date to the end of the year it is Indict. I.

INDUCTION (CANONICAL). [See INSTITUTION.]

INDULGENCE. *Indulgentia* is a technical term in the Roman law, meaning amnesty or pardon; and in much the same sense it occurs in the Latin of the Vulgate, where it is synonymous with *remissio*, as may be seen by comparing Isa. lxi. 1 with Lk. iv. 18. In the language of the Church it has acquired a much more definite and restricted meaning, and an indulgence in the theological sense of the word is defined by Amort, in his classical work on the subject, as "a remission of the punishment which is still due to sin after sacramental absolution, this remission being valid in the court of conscience and before God, and being made by an application of the treasure of the Church on the part of a lawful superior."

I. *The Catholic Doctrine on Indulgences*, as given in the preceding definition, implies several points of Catholic belief which need elucidation.

(*a*) An indulgence does not remit either the guilt or the eternal punishment of sin, much less are the authorities of the Church wicked and blasphemous enough to give permission to commit sin for the future. The

guilt of sin is forgiven chiefly by the sacraments of Baptism and Penance, and even these are of no avail unless the sinner turns to God with sincere and supernatural sorrow and with firm purpose of amendment. An indulgence cannot be obtained for unforgiven sin. Before anyone can obtain for himself the benefit of an indulgence the guilt must have been washed away, and the eternal punishment, if his sin has been mortal, must have been forgiven. Thus, instead of being an encouragement to sin, the desire to obtain an indulgence is a powerful motive to repentance. If the phrase "remission of sin" occurs in the grant of an indulgence, the Church, after the example of Scripture (*e.g.* 1 Pet. ii. 24), uses the word to denote the remission of punishment. Benedict XIV. ("De Syn. Diocc." xiii. 18, 7) holds that indulgences granted "from punishment and guilt" ("a poena et culpa") are spurious. Others (see Ferraris, art. *Indulgentia*) understand the form as conveying to the confessor power to absolve sacramentally from reserved cases.

(β) Even when the guilt of sin and the eternal punishment sometimes due to it have been removed by repentance and absolution, a temporal punishment may still remain. Even after Nathan told David his sin was forgiven, it was nevertheless punished by the death of his child. Baptism, it is true, annuls both the guilt and all the penalty due to sin. The absolution accorded in the sacrament of Penance is less efficacious (Concil. Trid. sess. xiv. De Poen. can. 15). St. Paul made the incestuous Corinthian suffer in this world that his soul might be saved. The Church of all ages, in giving sacramental absolution, has imposed penances on the sinner. Usually speaking, the sacramental penance, at least in the present mild discipline of the Church, leaves a debt of temporal punishment, and this debt is cleared by grant of an indulgence. The grant of this indulgence is an act of jurisdiction, not of order, and it is quite distinct from sacramental absolution. Of course, this indulgence cannot free the repentant sinner from temporal punishments involved in the very fact of repentance —*e.g.* from restoring stolen goods, retracting calumnies, taking the necessary means, however painful, to avoid future falls; or, again, from the natural consequences of sin, such as shame, sickness, and the like. Nor, again, does the Church ever excuse a sinner from all sacramental penance; nay, more, a person most enlightened on the real value of indulgences, and most eager to gain them, is of all others the most likely to afflict himself with voluntary mortifications, recognising in them powerful helps to overcome himself, to obtain that perfect aversion from sin which is required before a plenary indulgence can be gained, and to avoid future falls. Heaven helps those who help themselves. We have seen that indulgences are a powerful incentive to repentance; now we see that they encourage strictness of life and, indeed, all Christian virtue.

(γ) Indulgences are not merely a remission of canonical penances (this error is condemned by the Church, Thes. Lutheri, prop. 19; Synod. Pistoi. prop. 40), but they also avail before the justice of God. Otherwise, as St. Thomas argues ("Suppl." q. 25, a. 1), the indulgence would be a loss and not a gain, and the Church would excuse her children from canonical penances, and abandon them to more grievous sufferings in Purgatory. The error of Luther and the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia on this part of the subject really springs from misconceiving the nature of canonical penance. This will appear more fully when we discuss the history of indulgences. Here it is enough to say that just as in imposing canonical penance the Church acts in the name of God and exercises a power of binding given by Him for the profit of souls, so in remitting it she exercises a power of loosing by the same divine authority. The power of the keys (Mt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18; cf. Jn. xx. 22, 23) enables her not only to forgive sins, but to open the kingdom of heaven. Thus St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 4) imposed penance "with the power of the Lord Jesus" and relaxed it (2 Cor. ii. 10) "in the person of Christ." Penalty so relaxed was no longer due, either here or hereafter, so that the doctrine of indulgences exhibits at once the justice of God and His infinite mercy.

(δ) An indulgence does not only remit, but also satisfies the justice of God for, the temporal punishment of sin. The Church has recourse to the infinite merits of Christ, which suffice to satisfy for all guilt and all penalty, and to the merits of saints who have done penance more than sufficient to pay the temporal punishment due to their own sins. They obtained an abundant reward for their own good deeds, but many of their actions had a penitential character which availed for others if not needed for themselves. Theologians express this characteristic of an indulgence when they say it is *solutio* as well as *absolutio*, both payment and remission; or, again, that it is "a juridical absolution," including a payment of the debt from the treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints.

We may end this explanation by quoting the words of the council, which anathematizes those who "assert that they [indulgences] are useless, or deny that the power to grant them exists in the Church."

II. *The History of Indulgences* confirms the teaching of the present Church, because it shows that the difference between ancient and modern practice is to be explained by change of circumstances, not of principle.

(α) In primitive times many years of heavy penance were exacted for great sins, but these penances were curtailed if the

penitent had displayed great contrition (Cyprian, Epp. 15–17 and 33, ed. Hartel, 513, 568), and this indulgence was usually granted when persecution was impending or begun (Cyprian, Ep. 57, 1, ed. Hartel, 648). We read of one case (Euseb. "H.E." v. 32) in which the canonical penance, which had, as a rule, to be performed before absolution, was wholly remitted. The way in which this indulgence was most commonly granted deserves particular notice. A confessor in prison and expecting death for Christ sent a letter of peace ("libellus pacis") to the bishop in favour of some brother who was under penance—*e.g.* for apostasy—and the bishop, if satisfied of his contrition, restored him to the peace of the Church. Here we have the modern doctrine of indulgence in full operation among the Christians of the third century. We find the belief in the "treasure of merits," for Tertullian ("De Pud." 22, PL, ii. 1027), when he had become a Montanist, reproaches the Catholic Church on this very ground. "You give," he says, "even your martyrs this power. Who permits man to grant the things which must be reserved for God? Who pays for another's death" (*i.e.* the death due to sin) "save only the Son of God?" The indulgence was given by ecclesiastical authority, as has been already shown. Lastly, it availed before God, and was no mere remission of canonical penance. For Cyprian (Ep. 18, ed. Hartel, p. 523) speaks of those "who have received letters from the martyrs, and can be assisted by this prerogative before God." "He [the Lord] can mercifully pardon him who repents, labours, prays; He can set down to his account whatever the martyrs have asked, and the bishops (*sacerdotes*) have done for such persons" ("De Laps." 36, ed. Hartel, 263). No modern theologian could put the Church's doctrine better.

(β) *From the Seventh Century to the Crusades.* As public was gradually replaced by private penance (though canonical penance was still very severe), indulgences were often granted in the form of commutation—*i.e.* a lesser work was supplemented from the "treasure of merits" and made equivalent to a greater one. Alms to churches, monasteries, or the poor, the pilgrimages—greatly in vogue from the tenth century onwards—to Jerusalem, Rome, and Compostella, were substituted for so many days, years, &c., of canonical penance. This commutation is said to have begun in England and then to have spread south; and we may notice here the origin of the terminology still in use, when indulgences are granted for forty days, seven years, &c. After the eleventh century plenary indulgences, though rare, are met with. Thus Urban II., in the famous assembly at Clermont to promote the Crusades, gave a plenary indulgence to the Crusaders ("iter illud pro omni poenitentia reputetur") by the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul. At the First General Council of Lyons, Innocent IV. gave a plenary indulgence to those who went on the Crusade at their own cost, provided they were contrite for their sins; and an indulgence proportioned to their zeal to those who helped the Crusaders by money or advice.

(γ) *Later History of Indulgences.*—The period of the Crusades marks a turning-point in the history of indulgences, for they were given more and more freely from that time onwards. In the first place it is to be noted that indulgences were given for wars analogous to the Crusades. For example, at the Council of Siena, in 1425, a plenary indulgence was offered to those who took arms against the Hussites; while wars against the Waldenses, Albigenses, Moors and Turks, were stimulated by the same means. From the eleventh century indulgences were given at the dedication of churches and on the anniversaries of such dedications. Innocent III., in 1215, at the Fourth Lateran Council, limited these spiritual favours to the grant of a year's indulgence at the dedication and one of forty days at the anniversary. The great indulgence of the jubilee was given first in 1300. Urban IV., Martin V., Eugenius IV., granted indulgences to those who assisted at the divine office on Corpus Christi. The canonization of saints was accompanied by grants of indulgence, the first known instance being an indulgence given by Honorius III. at the canonization of Lawrence, Archbishop of Dublin. Since the Dominicans made the use of the rosary, and the Franciscans that of the crucifix, popular in the Church, it became customary to attach indulgences to such objects of devotion, and at last indulgences were so freely given that there is now scarcely a devotion or good work of any kind for which they may not be obtained. This common use of indulgences led theologians to draw out more fully the theory on which the doctrine of indulgences rests, and thus, just at the beginning of the eleventh century, the phrase "treasure of merits" occurs. The attacks of Wyclif, Hus, Luther, and the Jansenists served to develop the teaching of the Church on this head still more perfectly. The Council of Trent, however, energetically prohibited the "disreputable gains" made from those who desired to obtain indulgences ("pravos quaestus pro his consequendis"), "from which a most plentiful cause of abuses had flowed into Christian nations" (sess. xxv. Decret. de Indulg.).

III. *Application of Indulgences to the Dead.* In the ninth century Pascal I. and John VIII. bestowed such indulgences on the souls of those who had fallen fighting for the Church, and it is evident from the language of St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 71, a. 10) that such indulgences were common in his day. No doctrinal difficulty will be felt on the matter if the real intention of the Church be appre-

hended. Sixtus IV., in his Constitution of Nov. 27, 1477, lays down the principle that indulgences of this kind are only given "by way of suffrage." His meaning is that the Church has no direct power over the souls of the departed. She can but humbly entreat God to accept the merits of Christ, and, having respect to them, mercifully to remit the whole or a portion of the pains due to the souls suffering in Purgatory. The Church has reprobated the error of those who maintained that indulgences could not profit the dead (Prop. Lutheri, Prop. 22; Synod. Pistoi. Prop. 42).

IV. *Indulgences may be given* by the Pope throughout the Church; by primates, metropolitans, and bishops within the limits of their jurisdiction. By bishop must be understood a bishop actually ruling a diocese; bishops *in partibus*, and even coadjutors with the right of succession, have no such power; nor again have vicars general or capitular, abbots, generals of orders, &c., &c. The power, however, may be delegated to any cleric. Moreover, the Fourth Lateran Council, can. 62, confined the bishop's power in the matter to an indulgence of a year at the dedication of a church, and of forty days on other occasions. Nor can a bishop add another forty days for an indulgence already given for the same good work by his predecessor (see the decree of Clement IX., Nov. 20, 1668). Archbishops may give the same indulgences as bishops, not only in their own dioceses, but also in those of their suffragans, and this even if they are not engaged in visitation (cap. "Nostro; De Poen. et Rem.," v. 38). Cardinals, even if not bishops, may give an indulgence of 100 days in their titular churches; the Great Penitentiary exercises the same power; while legates and nuncios may give an indulgence of 100 days and more (not, however, of a year) within the territories committed to their care, and may also grant an indulgence of seven years and seven periods of forty days to those who visit a particular church or chapel, provided they worthily confess and communicate and pray according to the intention of the Pope. By a rescript of 1903, enlarging their powers, bishops can now grant indulgences of fifty days, archbishops of one hundred days, and Cardinals of two hundred days. All persons who grant indulgences are bound to do so only for reasonable causes, and to take care that there is some proportion between the work done, or at least between the object in view, and the grace accorded. Thus the Council of Constance orders persons suspected of heresy to be asked "if they believe the Roman bishops can grant indulgences for reasonable causes."

V. The conditions on which indulgences may be obtained are that the person desirous of gaining them be a member of the Church; that he should perform the good work exactly as prescribed; and that he should be, at least before concluding the work prescribed, in a state of grace. Whether this last condition is necessary to obtain indulgences for the dead is uncertain; it can hardly be so in the case of indulgences applicable only to the dead—*e.g.* in the case of a Requiem Mass at a privileged altar. In order to gain the whole of a plenary indulgence, it is further necessary to detest and have the purpose, at least implicitly, of avoiding so far as possible even the last venial sin. If an indulgence is granted for a particular day, the day is reckoned from midnight to midnight, unless the day be a feast with a vigil, for then the time for gaining the indulgence extends from first to second vespers. For plenary indulgences, it is usual to prescribe confession, communion, and prayer for the Pope's intention. Those who are accustomed to confess every eight days may, without further confession, gain all indulgences which are offered during the week. But by a concession of Pius X. those who, living in a state of grace, are in the habit of receiving Holy Communion daily are dispensed from the obligation of going to Confession, so far as their doing so would otherwise be a requisite for gaining a plenary indulgence. Communion may be made the day before the feast on which the indulgence is given.

VI. *Divisions of Indulgences.*—Plenary remit all, partial a portion, of the temporal punishment due to sin—*e.g.* an indulgence of forty days, as much as would have been atoned for by forty days of canonical penance. "Indulgentiae pleniores" convey to the confessor faculties to absolve from reserved cases: "plenissimae" further faculties to commute vows. Indulgences may be temporal—*i.e.* granted only for a time; or again perpetual or indefinite, which last till revoked. Even indulgences granted by delegated power continue in force after the death of the cleric who bestows them. If a feast on which an indulgence is given is transferred, the indulgence remains attached to the original day, unless the celebration *in foro*—*i.e.* the abstinence from servile work, &c.—is transferred also. Personal indulgences are those granted to particular persons—*e.g.* to an order, confraternity. Local indulgences may be gained only in a particular place. Supposing a church is pulled down to be re-erected under the same title, or if it is replaced under competent authority by a church with the same title in another place, the indulgences may be gained in the new building. But a church which possessed indulgences as the church of a religious order, forfeits them if it passes into the hands of seculars; however, French churches which belonged to Franciscans before 1789 and are now Franciscan no longer, still have the indulgence of Portiuncula. Real indulgences are those attached to crucifixes, medals, &c. It is only the original owner of these objects (*i.e.* the first owner

after the indulgence was attached) who can gain the indulgences, and the indulgence is lost if the object is sold or given away. A person, however, may get objects indulgenced with a view of distributing them to others. In that case the indulgences remain good, even if they pass through the hands of any number of persons, provided that they have not been appropriated to use by the intermediate persons. The owner must have the object with him, though not necessarily in his hands, unless this condition is expressed in the grant.

Among the most famous of plenary indulgences are that of the jubilee already mentioned; the indulgence given by priests (who receive power from the Pope to confer it) to the dying; the indulgence given with the Papal blessing [see the article BLESSING]. The most celebrated local indulgences are gained by visiting the seven chief churches and privileged altars at Rome; by pilgrimages to the holy places in Palestine; or visiting the stations mentioned in the Missal. The Popes (especially Clement XII., in 1731) gave all the indulgences to be gained at the holy places to those who make devoutly the Way of the Cross at the "Stations" erected by Franciscans. Faculties similar to those of the Franciscans are now granted to others. An account of other indulgences, such as that of the Portiuncula and the Sabbatine indulgence, will be found under special articles. Indulgences without number have been given to confraternities, persons who wear scapulars, medals, &c. Large and often plenary indulgences are attached to the recitation of short prayers (though usually confession and communion are required, if the indulgence is plenary), and to the use of blessed crosses, medals, &c. Sixtus V., at the close of the sixteenth century, introduced the custom of blessing objects, and so attaching indulgences to them. A priest with the necessary faculties has only to make a sign of the cross over the rosary, medal, &c., by which sign of the cross he communicates, according to a concession of 1914, all the indulgences it is in his power to grant. Other acts of piety—*e.g.* examination of conscience, hearing sermons, visiting the Blessed Sacrament, reading the Scriptures—are also largely indulgenced.

VII. *Indulgences which have been abrogated or declared apocryphal.*—(α) According to a supposed decree of September 18, 1669, and Benedict XIV. ("De Syn." xiii. 18, 8), no partial indulgence of 1000 years or upwards is authentic. But the decree cannot be found in the Archives of the Congregation of Indulgences, and its existence is disputed. (β) The Council of Trent (sess. xx. cap. 9) lays down the principle that indulgences must be given everywhere gratis, and the bull "Etsi dominici" of Pius V., issued in 1567, annuls the indulgences of the quaestors and collectors of alms. (γ) Clement VIII. and other Popes have abrogated indulgences said to be given in the form of a jubilee, as also (δ) the indulgences given to rosaries, images, &c., before the rescript of Clement VIII. "De forma indulgentiae" (anno 1597). (ε) All indulgences given before the Constitution of Clement VIII. "Quaecunque" (March 7, 1604), "Romanus Pontifex" (May 13, 1606), and before the Constitution of Paul V. (November 23, 1610), to orders, confraternities, colleges, or chapters, are revoked unless these indulgences have been renewed. (ζ) The indulgences said to have been given by Alexander VI. to the Bridgettine rosary are apocryphal, though to this devotion many authentic indulgences are attached; so are those which Urban VIII. is said to have given to the crosses of St. Turibius, and Pius V. to the crosses of Caravaca in Spain. A long list of apocryphal indulgences is given in the decree of Innocent XI. "Delatae saepius" (March 7, 1678).

(The chief authorities on the subject are the decree of the S. Cong. of Indulgences, Aug. 10, 1899; Bellarmine, "De Indulg. et Jubilaeo libri duo"; Amort, "De Orig., Progressu, Valore ac Fructu Indulg.," Aug. Vind. 1735; Theodorus a Spir. S. "Tract. dogmatico-moralis de Indulg.," Romae, 1743; Benedict XIV. "De Syn. Dioec." lib. xiii. cap. 18; Ferraris, *Indulgentia*. We have been chiefly indebted to Amort and to the excellent article "Ablass" in "Kirchenlex."; see also Kent in "Cath. Enc." and Galtier in DAp; Lea (Protestant), "A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences," has been answered by Baumgarten, "Lea's Historical Writings," and by Boudinhon.)

INDULT (*indultum*, something granted by favour). A licence or permission granted by the Pope, whether to a corporation or to an individual, authorizing something to be done which the common law of the Church does not sanction. A familiar instance is that of the Lenten indults, by which the Pope authorizes the bishops, according to the circumstances of different countries, to dispense more or less with the rigour of the canons as to the Lenten fast. In former times indults chiefly related to the patronage of church dignities and benefices. (Taunton.)

INFALLIBILITY. [See CHURCH OF CHRIST and POPE.]

INFIDEL. One who is not among the *fideles*, the faithful of Christ. Popularly, the term is applied to all who reject Christianity as a divine revelation. In order to reject it, they must have heard of it; those, therefore, who have never heard of Christianity are not in popular language called infidels, but heathens, though they are included under the theological term "infideles." Nor are heretics, perhaps not even Unitarians, to be called infidels, for they do accept the religion of Christ as divinely revealed, however erroneous

or fantastic their notions as to the nature of the revelation may be.

INFRALAPSARIANS (*infra lapsum*, after the Fall). In the article CALVIN AND CALVINISM, we have already shown that, according to that heresy, God ordains some to everlasting punishment. To mitigate the awful rigour of this doctrine, certain of Calvin's followers taught that this reprobation was the consequence of the fall of all mankind in Adam. Calvin's own teaching is clearly supralapsarian, *i.e.* God's decree of reprobation is precedent to, and entirely independent of, Adam's fall, which indeed is the consequence of the divine decree. [See ORIGINAL SIN; PREDESTINATION.]

INITIATION, CHRISTIAN. [See BAPTISM.]

INNOCENTS, HOLY, FEAST OF, is celebrated in the Latin Church on December 28, in the Greek on December 29. Among the Greeks the feast is known as that of the "14,000 holy children" (*τῶν ἁγίων ιδ' χιλιάδων νηπίων*).

From the earliest times the Church has regarded the children whom Herod slew, in his desire to make sure of killing Christ, as martyrs. Irenaeus (iii. 16, 4, PG, vii. 924) asserts this clearly, and so does St. Augustine ("De Symbolo ad Catech." iii. 4; PL, xl. 655). But it is uncertain when this feast began to be kept. A homily, attributed to Origen, in which this feast is mentioned is certainly spurious, and although in an ancient catalogue of St. Augustine's discourses we find two "tractatus" "De Octavis Infantium," Thomassin ("Traité des Festes," p. 275) explains this as referring to Low Sunday, the octave of Easter Sunday, on the vigil of which children were in those times commonly baptized. However, a separate festival of the Holy Innocents is mentioned in the "Calendar of Carthage," the date of which may be approximately fixed from the fact that the latest martyrs whose names it gives died in 484. In the rule of Chrodegang (d. 766) the feast is placed among the "chief solemnities." The Mass is said in purple vestments, probably because the Innocents did not enter heaven immediately after their martyrdom. They had to wait till Christ at His Ascension opened it to "those who believe." On the Octave, Mass is celebrated in red, the usual colour of martyrs.

St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 124, a. 1) mentions the opinion of some who thought that the use of reason was accelerated in the case of the Innocents, so that they were able consciously to embrace death for Christ. But he himself dismisses the opinion as without warrant in Scripture. "The shedding of blood," he says, "for Christ takes the place of baptism. Whence, as in children, the merit of Christ operates through the grace of baptism, and obtains glory for them, so in those slain for Christ the martyrdom of Christ operates and obtains for them the palm of martyrdom."

In the Middle Ages it was usual for children to keep a time of festivity in honour of the Holy Innocents, which lasted, according to Durandus, from St. Stephen's Day to the Octave of the Epiphany. Boys used to sit in the canons' stalls; one of them, who was vested in episcopal robes, gave his blessing pontifically. The Council of Basle (sess. xxii.) condemned the extravagances of this celebration, which was accompanied by the celebration of the Feast of Fools. But the feast of children is still innocently observed in some monasteries and convents, and Thomassin surely errs by excess of rigour when he speaks of it as impious.

IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM. [See BISHOP IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM.]

IN PETTO. (Ital. for *in pectore*, in the breast, in the heart.) At times the Pope declares that in addition to those whom he has publicly made cardinals, he has made one or more others whose names he reserves *in petto*. When these are subsequently made known, they take rank from the date of their original nomination. Boudinhon states that in 1875 Pius IX. endeavoured to make "posthumous" cardinals by appointing and reserving them *in petto*, and publishing them by a letter to be opened after his death. But the canonists threw such doubt on the validity of this action that the Pope published the names at the next consistory. [See CARDINAL.]

INQUISITION (HOLY OFFICE). In no age of Christianity has the Church had any doubt that in her hands, and only in hers, was the deposit of the true faith and religion placed by Jesus Christ, and that, as it is her duty to teach this to all nations, so she is bound by all practicable and lawful means to restrain those who would corrupt the message or resist the teacher. Some have maintained that no means of coercion are lawful for her to use but those which are used in the internal forum [FORUM ECCLESIASTICUM] and derive their sanction from anticipated suffering in the next world. The power of the Church, according to Fleury,[1] is "purely spiritual," and he held with Marsilius that the Pope could employ no coactive punishment of any kind unless the emperor—*i.e.* the civil power—gave him leave. From such a view it logically follows that St. Paul ought to have asked the permission of Sergius Paulus before striking Elymas the sorcerer with blindness. The overwhelming majority of the canonists take the opposite view—namely, that the Church can and ought to visit with fitting punishment the heretic and the revolter; and since the publication of the numerous encyclical letters and allocutions of Pope Leo XIII. treating of the relations between Church and State, and the inherent rights of the former, the view of Fleury can no longer be held by any Catholic.

[1] Fleury, *Dernier Discours*, ch. 14.

For many ages after the conversion of Constantine it was easier for the Church to repress heresy by invoking the secular arm than by organizing tribunals of her own for the purpose. Reference to ecclesiastical history and the codes of Justinian and Theodosius shows that the emperors generally held as decided views on the pestilent nature of heresy, and the necessity of extirpating it in the germ before it reached maturity, as the Popes themselves. They were willing to repress it; they took from the Church the definition of what it was; and they had old-established tribunals armed with all the terror of the law. The bishops, as a rule, had but to notify the appearance of heretics to the lay power, and the latter hastened to make inquiry, and, if necessary, to repress and punish. But in the thirteenth century a new race of temporal rulers rose to power. The emperor Frederick II. perhaps had no Christian faith at all; John of England meditated, sooner than yield to the Pope, openly to apostatize to Islam; and Philip Augustus was refractory towards the Church in various ways. The Church was as clear as ever upon the necessity of repressing heretics, but the weapon—secular sovereignty—which she had hitherto employed for the purpose seemed to be breaking in her hands. The time was come when she was to forge a weapon of her own; to establish a tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity of which she could trust; which in the task of detecting and punishing those who misled their brethren should employ all the minor forms of penal repression, while still remitting to the secular arm the case of obstinate and incorrigible offenders. Thus arose the Inquisition. St. Dominic is wrongly said by some to have first proposed the erection of such a tribunal to Innocent III., and to have been appointed by him the first inquisitor.[1] Other writers trace the origin of the tribunal to a synod held at Toulouse by Gregory IX. in 1229, after the Albigensian crusade, which ordered that in every parish a priest and several respectable laymen should be appointed to search out heretics and bring them before the bishops.[2] The task of dealing with the culprits was difficult and invidious, and the bishops ere long made over their responsibility in the matter to the Dominican order. Gregory IX. appointed none but Dominican inquisitors; Innocent IV. nominated Franciscans also, and Clement VII. sent as inquisitor into Portugal a friar of the order of Minims. But the majority of the inquisitors employed have always been Dominicans, and the commissary of the Holy Office at Rome belongs *ex officio* to this order.

The Congregation of Cardinals of the Holy Inquisition was first erected by Paul III. (1542), and remodelled by Sixtus V. about forty years later. "It is composed of twelve cardinals; of a commissary . . . who discharges the functions of a judge ordinary; of a counsellor or assessor, who is one of the presidents of the Curia; of consultors, selected by the Pope himself from among the most learned theologians and canonists; qualificators, who give their opinions on questions submitted to them; an advocate charged with the defence of persons accused, and other subordinate officials. The principal sittings of the congregation are held under the immediate presidency of the Pope." This supreme court of inquisition proceeds against any who are delated to it, and in former times used to hear appeals from the sentences of similar courts elsewhere, and to depute inquisitors to proceed to any place where they might appear to be needed. The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favour, or can be compelled to favour, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down that they "have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statutes against heretics to be observed," and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can "compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication"; also that inquisitors in causes of heresy "can use the secular arm," and that "all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith."[1] No such state of things as that here assumed now exists in any part of Europe; nowhere does the State assist the Church in putting down heresy; it is therefore superfluous to describe regulations controlling a jurisdiction which has lost the *medium* in which it could work and live.

The canon law also assumes that all bishops, being themselves inquisitors *ex vi termini* into the purity of the faith in their respective dioceses, will co-operate with the official inquisitors. Each may inquire separately, but the sentence ought to proceed from both; if they disagree, reference must be made to Rome. The proceedings taken against the Lollard followers of Wyclif by Archbishops Arundel and Chichele between 1382 and 1428,[2] illustrate both the points noticed above: 1, that the civil power in pre-Reformation times was wont to give vigorous aid to the bishops themselves in extirpating heresy; 2, that the bishops themselves could and did exercise stringent inquisitorial powers apart from the appointment of special inquisitors.

It does not appear that Papal inquisitors were ever commissioned, *eo nomine*, in England. In France the Inquisition was established in pursuance of the decrees of the

[1] Ferraris, *Inquisitionis S. Officium*. This is proved to be false by the Bollandists, *Aug.* i. pp. 410–1.
[2] Möhler, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 651.

[1] Ferraris, *loc. cit.* §§ 33–37.
[2] Lewis' *Life of Wyclif*, p. 126.

synod of Toulouse (1229) already referred to. Its tribunals were converted into State courts by Philip the Fair, who made use of them to condemn and ruin the Templars. In this condition they remained till the Reformation. In 1538 the Grand Inquisitor, Louis de Rochette, was convicted of Calvinism and burnt; soon afterwards the powers of these courts were transferred to the parliaments, and finally to the bishops (1560). In Germany, Conrad of Marburg, a man of a harsh and inflexible temper, the confessor of St. Elizabeth, attempted to establish an inquisition in the thirteenth century: he was assassinated, and the tribunal never gained footing in the country. On the Spanish Inquisition, see the next article. (See Guiraud, in DAp, an admirable article with copious bibliography; Vacandard, "L'Inquisition"; Douais, "L'Inquisition: ses Origines, sa Procédure"; Lea, "History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages"—a bitter Protestant account, answered by Baumgarten, "Lea's Historical Works," Eng. tr.)

INQUISITION, SPANISH, THE. It was founded by Ferdinand and Isabella at Seville in 1481, the first judges of the tribunal being two Dominicans. The clergy and many of the laity of the Castilian kingdom had for some time pressed the adoption of some such measure in order to check the profanations and frauds which the sham conversion to Christianity of a large number of Jews and Moors had occasioned. Even the episcopal thrones of Spain are said to have been not always preserved from the intrusion of these audacious hypocrites. Torquemada, another Dominican, appointed in 1483, was Grand Inquisitor for fifteen years. Under him three new tribunals of the Holy Office were erected, at Cordova, Jaen, and Villa Real; afterwards a fifth was added at Toledo. These tribunals were always popular with the lower orders and the clergy in Spain, but terrible in the eyes of the nobles and the rich middle class, who believed that they were often used by the government as engines of political repression in order to diminish their influence. Ranke calls the Spanish Inquisition "a royal tribunal, furnished with spiritual weapons." In 1492 an edict was issued for the banishment from Spain of all Jews refusing to embrace Christianity, chiefly on account of their alleged incorrigible obstinacy in persisting in the attempt to convert Christians to their own faith and instruct them in their rites.[1] About a hundred thousand went into banishment, and an equal or greater number are supposed to have remained in Spain, where their merely nominal Christianity and secret addiction to their ancestral doctrines and usages gave employment to the Inquisition for centuries.

The history of the Spanish Inquisition was written by Llorente, who was secretary to the tribunal of Madrid from 1790 to 1792. Hence he has been supposed to have possessed great opportunities for obtaining exact information; and his statement, that during its existence of 330 years the Spanish Inquisition condemned 30,000 persons to death, has been quoted with credulous horror in every corner of the civilized world. Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg, has examined with great care and ability[2] the worth of the above statement, and the question of the credit due to Llorente. First, there is the general fact of the greater relative severity of penal justice in all countries alike, till within quite recent times. The Carolina, or penal code in force under Charles V., condemned coiners to the flames, and burglars to the gallows. Burying alive and other barbarous punishments were sanctioned by it, none of which were allowed by the Inquisition. In England, in the sixteenth century, persons refusing to plead could be, and were, pressed to death. The last witch burnt in Europe was sentenced in the canton Glarus by a Protestant tribunal as late as 1785. Secondly, Llorente omits to draw attention to the fact that the Spanish kings obliged the Inquisition to try and sentence persons charged with many other crimes besides heresy—*e.g.* with polygamy, seduction, unnatural crime, smuggling, witchcraft, sorcery, imposture, personation, &c. A large proportion of criminals of this kind would, down to the last century, have been sentenced to death on conviction in any secular tribunal in Europe. Thirdly, Llorente does not pretend to base the above statement as to the number executed by the Inquisition on written documents, but on calculations of his own making, in some of which he can be proved to be inexpert and inexact. Fourthly, Hefele gives a list of palpable misstatements and exaggerations which he has detected in Llorente's volumes. Fifthly, the man's career, when closely examined, does not invite confidence. At the end of the last century he was a liberal ecclesiastic, imbued with French ideas and on intimate terms with Freemasons. In 1806, at the instigation of Godoy, he wrote a book against the *fueros*, or ancient privileges, of the Basque provinces. He accepted employment from the usurping government of Joseph Bonaparte. Banished from Spain on the fall of Joseph, he escaped to Paris, and published his "History of the Inquisition" in 1814. He next translated the abominable novel "Faublas" into Spanish; and, being exiled from France in 1822, died at Madrid the next year.

"The celebrated *Autos-da-Fé* (*i.e.* Acts of the confession of the faith)," says Möhler,[3] "were as a rule bloodless. But few inquisitorial processes terminated with the death of the accused." The *auto*, speaking generally, was a form of reconciling culprits to the Church. Nevertheless, the severities practised

[1] Prescott's *Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, ii. 122.

[2] In his *Life of Cardinal Ximenes*, translated by Dalton, 1860.

[3] *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 655.

by the tribunals were such that Rome frequently interfered. The Spanish Inquisition was abolished by the Revolution in 1820. The foundation of the Spanish Inquisition is admirably told by Pastor ("Hist. of the Popes," Eng. tr., vol. iv. p. 98 *sqq.*). He maintains that it was "a mixed, but primarily ecclesiastical, institution. The fact that the condemned were handed over to the secular arm testifies to the correctness of this view. Had the Spanish Inquisition been a state institution, a royal court of justice, there would have been no necessity for this" (p. 403). A good bibliography will be found in the note on this page. See also Newman, "Present Position of Catholics in England," p. 210 *sqq.*

INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE. The word "inspiration," like many other theological terms, comes to us from the Latin version of the Bible. Thus St. Paul's words, 2 Tim. iii. 16, *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*, "Every Scripture breathed by God," is rendered "omnis Scriptura divinitus *inspirata*," and again when St. Peter, 2 Ep. i. 21, speaks of the prophets as *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*, "moved by the Holy Ghost," the Latin has "Spiritu sancto *inspirati*." Just as God is said in Genesis ii. 7, and Wisdom xv. 11, to have breathed man's soul into his body; just as in Job xxxii. 8, the "inspiration of the Almighty" ("inspiratio omnipotentis") is said to "give understanding," so the sacred writers are described as inspired because God breathed into them or, to drop the metaphor, suggested the thoughts which they wrote down. Inspiration, therefore, may be defined as a supernatural impulse by which God directed the authors of the canonical books to write down certain matter predetermined by Him. Inspiration is a grace *gratis data*—*i.e.* it was bestowed upon the writers for the edification of others, and, like all graces, it is specially attributed to God the Holy Ghost.

To a certain extent the Old Testament claims to be inspired. Thus the prophets constantly represent their own words as being in reality the oracles of God. Our Lord and His Apostles confirm this claim. Christ, for example, in Mt. xxii. 43, declares that David spoke "in the Spirit," while St. Peter, Acts i. 16, and St. Paul, Acts xxviii. 25, use similar language. Ecclesiastical writers, from the time when the New Testament canon was first recognized in the Church, speak in just the same way of the books which went to make it up. St. Irenaeus regards ("Adv. Haer." iii. 14, 2) the influence of the Holy Ghost as extending to the least word in the gospels, for he maintains that the divine Spirit directed St. Matthew in i. 18 to write the "generation of Christ" instead of the "generation of Jesus." "The divine Scriptures," "the divine oracles," "the Scriptures of God," "the Scriptures of the Lord," are the usual phrases by which the Fathers express their belief in inspiration. The actual term apparently is of rare occurrence in the early ages. However, in the Acts of the Martyr Speratus (Acta SS. Jul. 17, p. 214) we are told that when the proconsul asked him what the books were which Christians "read with adoration" (quos adoratis legentes), the saint replied that they were the four Gospels, St. Paul's Epistles, "and all the divinely inspired teaching" (omnem divinitus inspiratam doctrinam). In the "Symbol of Faith" which was approved by Leo IX., and which is still used in the consecration of bishops as a test of orthodox belief, God is affirmed to be the "one author" of the Old and New Testaments. The same words (*unus auctor*) are repeated in the definitions of Florence (Bull "Cantate Domino"), and of Trent (sess. iv. Decret. de Can. Scr.). On the other hand, the Vatican Council (sess. iii. cap. 2) comes nearer to the actual word "inspiration," for it defines that the Bible was written "Spiritu sancto inspirante."

Moreover, the Vatican Council made the idea of inspiration more precise, and settled a question once debated among Catholics. The great Jesuit theologian Lessius, a man who has many titles to respect, was charged with maintaining that a book might justly claim to be inspired, although it had been written by mere human industry, provided the Holy Ghost had afterwards declared by the mouth of the Church that the book in question was free from error. His enemies said he looked upon the second book of Machabees as a possible instance of such a book, and Bonfrère in his "Praeloquia" maintained that such a case was at least possible. The view was condemned by the chief theological faculties of the day, and surely with good reason; for how can we call a book inspired if the Holy Ghost had no special connection with its origin and merely approved it when already written? This theory is now distinctly proscribed. The Church, according to the Vatican Council (*loc. cit.*), does not count books canonical because they were written naturally and afterwards approved by her, or because they contain revelation without error, but because they were inspired in the first instance and have God for their Author and as such were committed to the Church.

The common teaching of theologians helps us to understand the definitions which have just been given. They distinguish first of all between inspiration and the mere "assistentia" or assistance of the Holy Ghost, the latter conveying a merely negative, the former a positive idea. General councils have the "assistentia" of the Holy Ghost because He protects them from error in their decrees, although the Pope, in convoking the council and proposing to it the subjects, may have been guided only by the ordinary motives

of faith and reason. Inspiration implies over and above this protection, a special impulse of the Holy Ghost to write, and to write on particular subjects. Next, a clear line must be drawn between revelation and inspiration. God reveals to the soul truths which it did not know before, without necessarily prompting the recipient to commit the revelation to writing; an inspired author has received the impulse to write, and is directed from above in his work, but it is not necessary that any new truths should be communicated to him. There is no reason to suppose that the author of the book, *e.g.*, of Esther, received any revelation.

In an inspired book there are evidently two factors—the natural powers of the writer on one side, and the impulse and direction of the Holy Ghost on the other. The Church has not decided where the one factor ceases and the other begins to operate. In our own time Schegg, a priest and commentator of high repute among German Catholics, maintained the existence of trifling error in Scripture. Thus, in his commentary on the Gospels, vol. iii. p. 552 *seq.*, he discusses the famous difficulty in Mt. xxiii. 35, "Zacharias, the son of Barachias," and explains it on the supposition that Jesus mentioned Zacharias merely, while the Evangelist, in adding the father's name, made a mistake from defect of memory. Cardinal Newman was of opinion that "obiter dicta" in Scripture were not inspired ("Nineteenth Century," Feb. 1884). In Jan. 1893, Mgr. d'Hulst drew attention to two schools of apologists: "those who consider as true history, infallible by reason of its being inspired, every narrative not manifestly a parable; and those who, after having first put aside all that is dogmatic and moral, consider that a sifting process (*triage*) may be made of the remainder according to the methods of historical criticism." This latter "broad" (*large*) school would restrict inspiration to matters of faith and morals, and would admit the possibility of error in the uninspired portions. In the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" (Nov. 18, 1893), Leo XIII. condemned both of these latter positions; he declared that it "would never be lawful to restrict inspiration to certain parts of the Holy Scriptures, or to admit that the sacred writer himself could have made a mistake. Nor may the opinion of those be tolerated who, in order to get out of difficulties, do not hesitate to suppose that divine inspiration extends only to what touches faith and morals, on the false plea that the true meaning is to be sought for less in what God has said than in the motive for which He has said it." On the other hand, the sacred writer must adapt himself to the circumstances of those whom he is addressing. As St. Jerome says: "Many things are related in the Scriptures according to the opinion of the day in which the facts occurred, and not according to what in reality took place (*et non juxta quod rei veritas continebat*)." ("In Jerem. Proph." xxviii., PL, xxiv. 855). And St. Thomas (1^a, q. 70, a. 1) tells us that Moses, talking down to the rude intelligence of the people, "went by appearances" (*Moyses, rudi populo condescendens, sequutus est quae sensibiliter apparent*). Further "we have to consider that the sacred writers, or more accurately, the Holy Ghost Who spake by them, did not intend to teach men those things (*i.e.* the essential nature of the things of the visible universe)—things in no way profitable to salvation" (Leo XIII., *ib.*, quoting St. Augustine, "De Genesi ad Lit." ii. 9, 10, PL, xxxiv, 270). Others (and this opinion, which seems to find some support in the Fathers, found wide acceptance among the older Protestant theologians) have believed in what is known as "verbal inspiration"; they have argued as if the authors of the Biblical books were no more than scribes who wrote down the words which the Holy Ghost had dictated. But this view certainly sins against the most patent facts.[1] Evidently, the style and method of the sacred writers are coloured throughout by their own individuality, and the differences in thought and language between Isaiah and Ezechiel are utterly inexplicable if we regard them as passive agents under a mechanical inspiration. St. Augustine in well-known words formulizes the prevailing belief of the Church, without falling into the exaggerations of the theory that inspiration is mechanical. "To those books," he says, "which are already styled canonical, I have learned to pay such reverence and honour as most firmly to believe that none of their authors has committed any error in writing. If in that literature I meet with anything which seems contrary to truth, I will have no doubt that it is only the manuscript which is faulty, or the translator who has not hit the sense, or my own failure to understand" (Ep. 82, PL, xxxiii. 277). (From Kaulen, "Einleitung in die heilige Schrift.," part I., pp. 12 *sqq.*, The nature of Inspiration has been keenly discussed, especially since the Vatican Council, and there is a vast literature on the subject. We can mention only a few works: St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, qq. 71–74; Franzelin, "De Divina Trad. et Script." 321–405; Vacant, "Etudes Théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican," i. 458 *sqq.*; Billot, "De Inspiratione S. Scripturae"; Lagrange, "Historical Criticism and the O.T." (Eng. tr.), p. 83 *sqq.*; Durand in "Cath. Enc." and in DAp.)

[1] Kleutgen cites some of the greatest theologians of the Church against the theory that the Holy Spirit dictated the material words to the sacred author. Thus he quotes Suarez, *De Fide*, disp. 5, § 3, n. 3, 5, who maintains that it is enough to believe that the Holy Spirit "specially assisted him (the author of the inspired book, while writing) and kept him from all error and falsehood, and from all words which were not expedient." To the same effect Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei*, lib. v. 15; Melchior Canus, *De Loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. 17 et 18.

INSTALLATION (Low Lat. *stallum*, a stall). The actual visible establishment (*institutio corporalis*) in the possession of an ecclesiastical dignity or benefice. In early times money often passed on such occasions; in one of the Novels, Justinian forbids that any payment should be made on installation to the clergy of any church excepting only the great church at Constantinople. In another place he says that the custom, though intrinsically a bad one, is too firmly rooted to be destroyed; he therefore decrees that twenty pounds of gold may be paid on installation by the patriarch of any one of the five sees—Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—if the custom is to that effect, but no more. The sum to be paid by a metropolitan or a bishop he limits to 100 shillings for enthronisation, and 300 shillings given to notaries and other officials. In spite of his apparent zeal for purity of election, Justinian was the first emperor who exacted payment for confirming the election of the Roman pontiffs; this abuse was not removed till the time of Constantine Pogonatus.

Installation, in the case of a bishop, is called enthronization; it is the solemn entry into possession of his cathedral and episcopal residence on the part of the newly consecrated bishop, who wears all his pontifical insignia on the occasion. When a bishop is consecrated in his own church, the enthronization becomes identified with the consecration; but when the latter rite has been performed in another diocese, then, according to the ancient tradition, the bishop, dressed in the garb of a pilgrim, with his crozier in his hand, and the pastoral hat on his head, is received on arriving at the boundary of his diocese by the chapter and clergy of the cathedral city and district; by them he is escorted to some neighbouring church, where, after a short prayer, he is presented with the episcopal ornaments and insignia, and then conducted in solemn procession to the sound of bells into his cathedral, where he is welcomed with the anthem *Ecce sacerdos magnus* and the *Te Deum*, while he takes his seat on his throne, from the raised dais of which he imparts to the assembled throng his episcopal benediction. After this he is escorted to his palace, the cross being borne before him.

The installation of a canon is his solemn reception into a cathedral or collegiate chapter. In presence of the dignitaries and canons seated in the chapter-house the new titular, after being chorally vested, makes his profession of faith and takes the capitular oath. He is then admitted to his seat in chapter, and afterwards conducted into the church, and *installed* in his proper stall in the choir.

In the case of a simple parish priest the installation is usually effected by a delegate from the bishop, who admits the new incumbent both to the spiritual and temporal rights of his benefice. In some countries a commissary attends on the part of the civil government, and admits him with certain formalities into the possession of his temporals. (Thomassin, iii. 1, 56; Taunton, *Institution*.)

INSTITUTE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. ("Dames Anglaises," "English Ladies," or "English Virgins.") The foundress, Mary Ward, the eldest daughter of Marmaduke Ward, of Givendale, near Ripon, a gentleman of good estate and ancient lineage, was born in 1585. Her parents were steadfast Catholics, and dedicated the child to the Blessed Virgin from her cradle. She was very beautiful, and projects were formed with a view to her marriage, but she resisted all solicitations, and left England and her father's house in 1606, and passed over to St. Omer, At first she entered the convent of Colettines, at St. Omer, as a lay sister. In May or June 1607, with the advice of the novice-mistress, and after having experienced, while in prayer on St. Gregory's Day, a strong inward impulse, prompting her to found a convent of the order for English women exclusively, Mary quitted the Colettine convent. With the help of her confessor, Father Roger Lee, and the good bishop Blaise, of St. Omer, she obtained access to the Archduke Albert and his wife Isabella, and obtained from them the grant of a vacant piece of ground at Gravelines, and permission to build a house of English Poor Clares upon it. Many English ladies (for the persecution at home at that time caused numbers of Englishwomen to seek freedom and security in Catholic countries) joined her, and the new community was begun at Christmas 1607, in a large hired house at St. Omer, pending the erection of a convent at Gravelines. Being, however, more and more convinced that she was called to another way, she left the Poor Clares in the spring of 1609, having first made a vow of perpetual chastity before her confessor, and also one of obedience to his directions. Her conduct drew upon her censure from many quarters, and she was for a long time in great perplexity, but her confidence in God never wavered. Gradually the conception of a teaching order, recruited from the ranks of her Catholic countrywomen, not cloistered, nor under obedience to any other order, but living under the rule of the Society of Jesus, and bound by terminable, not perpetual, vows, took form within her mind. She returned to England and founded the first community of the "English Virgins" at Spitalfields in 1611. A year or two later she returned to St. Omer, and there also succeeded in establishing a community. Before his death in 1616, Father Lee had come round to her views and laboured effectually to procure the confirmation of her institute from Rome. A letter addressed to her by order of the Archduke in May 1613 sets forth the precise nature of her work. He says he has heard with pleasure that she and her

companions are established at St. Omer, "where you receive and teach a number of young girls of your nation, in order that, after they have been well instructed in all that belongs to our holy faith, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, and carefully trained to virtue, they may be sent back to their parents, to be married and bring up their children in the fear of God, unless they prefer to stay in our countries and become religious." In 1616 a letter came from Rome signed by Cardinal Lancelotti, the president of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, recommending the new community to the care of Bishop Blaise, and speaking of the probability of a formal confirmation at a future day. In the years between 1613 and 1627 Mary paid several visits to England, during one of which she was arrested and imprisoned by order of Archbishop Abbott, who said that "she did more harm than six Jesuits." Details are wanting; we are only told that "sentence of death was passed upon her for religion, but that there was no execution, for fear of odium." In 1617 she opened a second house at Liège; and about the same time the Bishop of St. Omer wrote to Mary a "public letter of approval of the Institute, by which he constituted its members as religious." Pope Gregory XV. (1621–3) gave her permission to found houses of her Institute at Rome and in other Italian cities. In 1627 she established a house at Munich. Charges being brought against the purity of her faith, Urban VIII. ordered, in 1630, that she should be examined, and that her houses should be (provisionally) closed. Through the intercession of the good Maximilian, elector of Bavaria, the nuns were still allowed to continue the common life, under certain restrictions. The result of the examination was favourable to her, and Mary succeeded in obtaining a decision from Rome that the bull of 1630 closing her houses should be regarded as tacitly abolished; but it was only in 1703, many years after her death (which happened in 1645), that the Institute was again formally confirmed by Clement XI. Since that time the succession in her community has never failed; and at this day her order is a very flourishing religious institute, largely instrumental in the education of girls of all classes, in Bavaria, Hungary, Roumania, Italy, and other parts of the Continent, and is commonly known as the Institute of the "English Virgins." During her lifetime Mary Ward established two communities in England, one in London and the other at Heworth Hall in Yorkshire. The latter did not long survive her; but the London community continued until about 1689, when they joined a community sent to England from Munich, under the protection of Catherine of Braganza. They settled at Hammersmith. After doing good work for many years, especially as a teaching order, this community gradually declined; but an offshoot, planted once more in Yorkshire, has continued to flourish until the present day. In 1686 a house outside Micklegate Bar, York, was purchased, where the convent now stands. [For the Irish branch see the art. LORETTO NUNS.]

The foundress imprinted the seal of perpetuity even on the community which she abandoned. The English Poor Clares, after she left them, prospered greatly at Gravelines, and sent forth several filiations. In the French Revolution the nuns "had their full share of suffering, though they escaped the guillotine." Banished from France, they took refuge in England, and finally established themselves at Clare Abbey, near Darlington, "which now represents the Gravelines foundation and those of its three daughter-houses." (Chambers, "Life of Mary Ward"; M. Loyola in "Cath. Enc.," *Institute of Mary*, and *Ward, Mary*; Guilday, "English Catholic Refugees," ch. vi.; B. Ward, "The Dawn of the Cath. Revival in England," i. 35 *sqq.*)

INSTITUTION. An ecclesiastical act by which a person who already has a right to a benefice is put into actual possession thereof. It must be carefully distinguished from collation (*q.v.*) and presentation [see PATRON]. The subject is also treated under the articles INVESTITURE and INSTALLATION. (Ferraris; Taunton.)

INTENTION. [See SACRAMENTS, p. 745.]

INTERCALARY YEAR. [See CALENDAR.]

INTERCESSION OF SAINTS. [See SAINTS, INTERCESSION OF; MEDIATOR.]

INTERDICT. 1. The *interdictum* of a Roman praetor was a decree pronounced between two litigants, ordering, or (more commonly) forbidding, something to be done. A banished man was also said to be *interdicted* from the use of fire and water in Italy (*aqua et igne ei interdictum est*). Something of each of these notions—*e.g.* the prohibition of saying Mass, and the interdiction of the guilty, and often of the innocent also, from approach to the sacraments—appears in the ecclesiastical interdict, which is defined to be "an ecclesiastical censure, by which persons are debarred from the use of certain sacraments, from all the divine offices, and from Christian burial." [1]

Interdicts are divided into local, personal, and mixed. In the first kind a place is interdicted, so that no divine office may be celebrated or heard in it, either by the inhabitants or by strangers. By the second kind, persons are interdicted, so as to be debarred from using the sacraments or exercising the functions prohibited, in whatever place they may be. By the mixed kind both place and persons are directly interdicted—*e.g.* a city and its inhabitants. Again, each of the first two kinds may be either general or particular. A particular

[1] Ferraris, *Interdictum*.

local interdict strikes a single locality—*e.g.* a church; a general one comprehends many localities, being pronounced against a kingdom, a province, or a city. A particular personal interdict strikes a single person; a general one of the same class is extended to a number of persons—*e.g.* to all the people in a province, all the members of a university, all the monks in a convent.

A general interdict of the clergy in a country does not touch the religious orders in that country unless it be so expressed, or unless the intention to include them can be clearly inferred from the circumstances, and the same holds good *vice versa*. Nor does a general interdict of the clergy include bishops unless it be so expressed.

When a city is laid under an interdict its suburbs are understood to be included, even though they belong to a different diocese; otherwise the interdict might be rendered nugatory through the citizens being able to hear Mass, &c., in the suburban churches. In the same case the cathedral church no less than others is interdicted, and also the churches of regulars.

Interdicts are either imposed *per modum poenae*, as a punishment for a particular offence, in which case they last for a prescribed period, and then cease—or *per modum censurae*, as a weapon to beat down contumacious resistance to the laws and discipline of the Church. In this last case they ordinarily last till the resistance ceases, and the offender makes amends, and are then relaxed.

Interdicts proceed either *a jure* or *ab homine*, that is, either by operation of law or by the act of someone competent to impose them. Everyone who can excommunicate or suspend can also interdict, except the superiors of monasteries, both because their jurisdiction is not local but personal, and also because, if they had the power of interdicting, the effects of their action would extend to and damnify lay persons who are not in any sense their subjects (*subditi*).

The law declares persons or places interdicted in a great variety of cases. As instances may be given: hindrance of a Papal legate or nuncio from discharging his duty, in which case all the dominions of the prince or State so hindering are interdicted; the burial of a heretic, knowingly, in a church, in which case the church is interdicted; appeal from the Pope by any university chapter or college to a future general council, the result being the interdict of the offending corporation; and the illegal alienation of Church property by bishops or abbots.

In order that innocent persons might suffer as little as possible from the effects of an interdict the canon law gradually introduced mitigations. Baptism and Confirmation might be administered to persons in danger of death; the sacrament of Penance was open to all but those guilty of having caused the interdict (who could not approach it before having made satisfaction); marriage might be celebrated, but without solemnities; ordinations might be made if there was a deficiency of priests; ecclesiastics who had observed the interdict might be buried in the churchyard, but in silence; one Low Mass might be said every week, and High Mass might be sung on the five great festivals of Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday, Corpus Christi, and the Assumption, the persons guilty of the interdict being carefully excluded.

General interdicts are rarely mentioned in ecclesiastical history before the eleventh century, and for this three causes are assigned: (1) the comparatively stronger sense of religion in the Christian society of the earlier times, restraining a whole people from themselves falling into, or conniving at in their rulers, any notorious transgression; (2) the salutary dread of excommunication everywhere prevailing, so that that form of censure was sufficient of itself to restrain offenders; (3) the general readiness of temporal princes in those times to aid the Church in maintaining her discipline.

Non-Catholic writers are prone to judge a Papal interdict according to the measure of what they deem its *success*. If the contumacy of the prince whom it strikes is overcome, the firmness and policy of the Pope are usually commended; but if, as has sometimes happened, it be not overcome, the inference drawn by such writers is that the increasing intelligence and civilization of the age have deprived the "Papal thunders" of their terrors, and that the time has come for disowning and abandoning the use of them for evermore. Such language shows an ignorance of the deep foundations on which the interdict, with other Church censures, rests. Our Lord gave the power of binding, as of loosing, to His Apostles, and He has never withdrawn it. But Jesus Christ did not tell them that whatever they should "bind on earth" should also be punished on earth, but that it should be "bound also in heaven." Through the dwindling of faith and the decay of virtue a people may sink so low as to countenance its rulers in resisting the Church; the rulers themselves may be atheists and disregard ecclesiastical censures; and all this may pass with apparent impunity. What then? If the interdict or other censure be just, there is no real impunity; the sin of the offender is "retained" in heaven as the priest has retained it on earth, and if he make not amends in this life he will have to make all the more amends in the next. Nevertheless the Church has with good reason suspended for a long time past the proclamation of these general censures; lest, if the contumacious were to contemn them with impunity, and so gain an apparent triumph, the faith of the common people, already weak and assailed from many quarters, might be still more shaken and impaired.

2. In canon law the term "interdict" is also used of a judicial order, in the sense familiar to the civil law, from which the threefold distinction into interdicts for restoring, obtaining, and retaining, and numerous other provisions, are also borrowed. (Ferraris, *Interdicta, Interdictum*; Taunton.)

INTEREST. [See USURY.]

INTERIM. A temporary arrangement in religious matters entered into with those outside the Church. It is applied especially to the Interim of Ratisbon (July 29, 1541) and that of Augsburg (June 30, 1548). The object of these interims was to bring about reunion of the Protestants with the Catholic Church by conceding to them some important points, *e.g.* the marriage of the clergy and Communion under both kinds, and the postponement of the decision of disputed matters until the meeting of a general council. (See REFORMATION; Janssen-Pastor, "Hist. of the German People," Eng. tr., vi. 140, 389; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," Eng. tr., xi. 420, xii. 409; Kaulen in "Kirchenlex.")

INTERNAL FORUM. [See FORUM ECCLESIASTICUM.]

INTERNUNCIO. A papal diplomatic agent in countries where for various reasons regular diplomatic intercourse has not been established or has been suspended. His powers vary according to the conditions of the country to which he is sent. At present Apostolic Delegates are usually appointed instead of Internuncios. [See LEGATE.]

INTERSTICES (*interstitia*). The intervals which canon law requires between the reception of the various degrees of orders. The Council of Trent recommends that even minor orders be conferred at intervals, so that the candidate should have time to perfect himself in the theory and practice of each, before proceeding to the next; this, however, it leaves to the discretion of the bishops. After taking the last grade of minor orders, the Council requires the interval of a year before the candidate proceeds to the sub-diaconate, "unless necessity or the good of the Church should in the bishop's judgment dictate a different course." (Sess. xxiii. c. xiv., De Ref.) With the like salvo, it is provided that a full year must elapse between the sub-diaconate and the diaconate, and the same period between the diaconate and the priesthood. This full year need not be the solar year of 365 days, but may be the ecclesiastical year, as from one Lent to another, or from one Pentecost to another. A bishop cannot dispense with the interstices in ordaining candidates coming to him from another diocese, unless in their dimissorial letters [DIMISSORIALS] this privilege is allowed them. The members of religious orders can be ordained in many cases by virtue of special concessions obtained from the Holy See, without observing the interstices; this is notably the case with regard to the Society of Jesus. The non-observance of the interstices on the part both of the ordinans and the ordinand is a sin; but no penalty is affixed to it in the law. (Ferraris, *Interstitia.*)

INTROIT. Words said in the Mass when the priest has finished the Confiteor and has ascended to the altar. Le Brun and Benedict XIV. attribute the introduction of introits to Gregory the Great. The name refers either to the fact that it is said at the beginning or "entrance" of the Mass, or else to the practice of having the introit sung by the choir as the priest "entered to" the altar.

The introit consists of an antiphon, Gloria Patri, and usually of a psalm, which it was once the custom to sing entire. But some introits, called by Durandus irregular, are taken from other parts of Scripture. Such are the "Puer natus" on Christmas Day, "Spiritus Domini" on Pentecost, "Viri Galilaei" on the Ascension. Some few in our present Missal give verses from uninspired writers. Such are the "Salve Sancta Parens," "Gaudeamus omnes in Domino," "Benedicta sit Sancta Trinitas." On Whit Tuesday the verse of the introit is taken from the fourth (apocryphal) book of Esdras, and on the Sunday within the octave of the Epiphany from the similarly uncanonical book of Enoch. The version of Scripture used in the introits is usually the Old Latin, not the Vulgate.

The word for introit in the Ambrosian Mass is "Ingressa"; in the Mozarabic, Carthusian, Dominican, Carmelite Missals it is called "Officium." No Eastern rites have an introit in any form. (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 216.)

INVESTIGATION, COMMISSION OF. A body of priests appointed by the bishop in synod to inquire into the circumstances concerning the final deprivation of a rector. [See RECTOR; Taunton, *Commission of Investigation.*]

INVESTITURE (Low Lat. *investire*, to put in possession). This, according to Ducange, answered nearly to what English lawyers call "livery of seisin." It was the putting in possession of a person entitled to property; the delivery of possession being symbolized by the passing from hand to hand of some tangible token, such as a rod, a staff, a fish, or a bird. Ducange enumerates one hundred and twenty-nine forms of investiture. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, great temporal possessions having accrued to the Church all over Europe, and the patronage of the sees and abbeys being largely in the hands of princes, a tendency arose on the part of the latter to usurp the whole affair of episcopal or abbatial nomination and installation into their own hands. Nor was this tendency wholly blameable; for when a bishop, as often in Germany, was the ruler over extensive territories, or when an abbot possessed plenary jurisdiction and the power of life and death

within the broad conventual domains, it was both the interest and the duty of the sovereign to take care that those administering such weighty functions should be men of loyalty, capacity, and energy. This control may be exercised directly—as by the acclamations of the clergy and faithful at elections in early Christian times—or through the intervention of princes and magistrates. A joint control over ecclesiastical elections on the part of Church and State seems to be the happiest and the best compromise in all cases in which the bishop or other prelate becomes by the election not only a pastor of souls but also a public officer of the State having civil duties to perform. A temporal government, uncontrolled, would never place a St. Charles Borromeo in the see of Milan; on the other hand, the ecclesiastical authority, unchecked by lay power, may easily make such mistakes as the elevation of Pietro Morone to the supreme pontificate.

In the eleventh century St. Gregory VII. (1075) published a decree absolutely prohibiting the lay investiture of bishoprics. By this he could not have meant that bishops should not be put in possession of the temporalities of their sees in due legal form, nor that they should not be responsible to princes for their management of those temporalities. His prohibition had reference to an encroachment and an abuse, then prevalent both in Germany and in England, by which the sovereign pretended to give investiture to a newly-appointed bishop, "per annulum et baculum," by ring and crosier. These symbols were held to indicate spiritual and ecclesiastical power, and the delivery of them to be tantamount to the transmission of the whole episcopal authority. To stop this abuse, Gregory VII. claimed the rights of canonical election by the chapters, and free consecration. The decorum with which the unchecked control of the State over the Church of England or the Russian Church is exercised blinds us to the depth of degradation really involved. The bishops are wealthy —have social influence—the State is undisturbed; but at what cost? At the cost of exclusion from the Catholic Church, and loss of communion with the see of Peter. The Gregories, Celestines, and Innocents resisted this consummation; the noblest Christian men in Germany and England aided them; and the fatal breach was postponed for four centuries. St. Anselm fought the battle for England, and in 1106 Henry I. resigned the claim to investiture by ring and crosier, while stipulating that, on being admitted to their temporalities, bishops and abbots should, in compliance with the rules of the feudal system, swear fealty and do homage to the sovereign. A similar compromise was effected for the Empire by the Concordat of Worms, concluded between Henry V. and Calixtus II. in 1122. It was in the form of a double declaration; the Pope granting that the elect bishop or abbot should receive the regalia [REGALIA] from the Emperor by the sceptre, excepting what belonged to the Roman Church, and should discharge the duties thereof as he was legally bound to do; the Emperor renouncing all investiture by ring and crosier, and granting in all the churches of his empire canonical elections and free consecrations. In fact, Henry V. had come to see that in battling for the objectionable form of investiture he was almost contending for a shadow. When he was in France, in 1121, he had conversed with French bishops, and had learnt from them that investiture by ring and crosier had never been the custom in France, and yet the bishops had been loyal to the French kings, and the legitimate influence of the latter in important appointments had not been nullified.

Thus the particular contest about investitures was settled; but of course the general contention as to the respective shares which the Church and the State should have in the appointment of bishops still went on. In France the Concordat of 1516 between Leo X. and Francis I. gave all the episcopal appointments to the French crown; whence the rise of Gallicanism. [GALLICANISM.] In England, for a long time before the Reformation, an understanding prevailed between Rome and the English kings, and they filled up the vacant sees in concert. (Lingard, "Hist. of England," ii. 14 *sqq.*; Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 1026 *sqq.*, where a résumé will be found of Scharnagel, "Der Begriff der Investitur"; Lesne in DAp.)

INVITATORIUM. (*Invitatory Psalm.*) The invitatory psalm, *i.e.* Ps. 94, "Come, let us rejoice before the Lord," is said at the beginning of Matins on all days except the Epiphany and the last three days of Holy Week. The invitatorium has an antiphon, the whole of which is repeated six times, and the half three times, in the recitation of the psalm. The recital of the invitatory psalm at the beginning of the divine office is prescribed in the rule of St. Benedict. Amalarius (anno 822) tells us that in his time the invitatory was used by the Romans in the dominical but not in the ferial office, so that the present practice on the last three days of Holy Week is a relic of the ancient use. The invitatory psalm, with its antiphon, is omitted on the Feast of the Epiphany simply because Ps. 94 occurs in the third nocturn. Mystical reasons, *e.g.* detestation of Herod's calling together the scribes, and again because the Magi came to adore Christ without invitation, are suggested by mediaeval writers. (Batiffol, "Hist. du Bréviaire Romain," p. 90.)

INVOCATION OF SAINTS. [See SAINTS, INTERCESSION AND INVOCATION OF.]

IRISH CHURCH. In the fifth century Ireland was divided, as it was for centuries afterwards, into several small kingdoms.

Some unknown preachers must have found their way into the country even before the mission of Palladius, and converted some of the natives to the faith of Christ, for St. Prosper in his chronicle (published about 434) writes that Palladius was sent by Pope Celestine in 431 "ad Scotos in Christum credentes," to the Scots believing in Christ. No one now doubts that by Scots Prosper meant the natives of Ireland. This mission of Palladius, who was deacon of the Roman Church, did not last long, and bore little fruit. So much we learn from the Book of Armagh (written before 700), with the additional fact that Palladius died in Britain on his return from Ireland.

The general conversion of the Irish nation was reserved for St. Patrick, who was probably born at the place now called Kilpatrick on the Clyde,[1] whence he was carried as a slave into the north of Ireland while still a youth. The degradation and darkness of the inhabitants profoundly impressed his pure and generous heart, and from the time when he regained his liberty, at the age of twenty-one, he devoted himself to the divine service, and the task of spreading the doctrines of salvation. After going through a course of study at Marmoutier and Lerins, he repaired to Rome. We next hear of him as accompanying St. Germanus and St. Lupus on their anti-Pelagian mission to Britain. Being selected by St. Germanus to preach the faith in Ireland, he went first—if we may accept the testimony of Probus [2]—to Rome to obtain the apostolic blessing. Celestine dying soon after, Patrick left Rome and journeyed towards Ireland. Hearing on his way of the death of Palladius, he went to St. Amatorex, who ordained him bishop. Landing in Ireland in 432, he attended the assembly of the Irish kings and chieftains held on the hill of Tara in that year. His reception was not very encouraging; however, he converted several, and among others the father of St. Benignus, his immediate successor in the see of Armagh.

St. Patrick fixed his principal residence at Armagh, which became the primatial see of the island. In the course of his long career, extending beyond sixty years, he visited and converted the greater part of Ireland, and established bishoprics in all the provinces. Among his chief companions and assistants were Auxilius, Isserninus, and Secundinus. The Irish people received the Gospel with extraordinary readiness. St. Patrick left few writings behind him; his "Confession," a kind of autobiography, is his chief work. We have also his circular letter against Coroticus, and the canons of a synod which he held with Auxilius and Isserninus, about 453, to regulate Church discipline. In his "Confession" he does not mention the Pope or the Holy See, and Bede, in his "Ecclesiastical History," is silent about St. Patrick's mission. Hence Protestant writers have inferred that he had no mission from Rome, and preached a Christianity of his own, distinct from that of the Popes; in short, that he was a kind of Protestant. This hypothesis has been exploded by Dr. Lanigan, Card. Moran, and others, who show that although St. Patrick, having a special object in view when he wrote the "Confession," says nothing in it about Rome, yet the history of the early Irish Church is unintelligible unless we assume a close and filial relation to the Holy See to have existed from the first. Within a century after St. Patrick, St. Columbanus, the great Irish missionary of the sixth century, said to the Pope "The Catholic faith is held unshaken by us, as it was delivered to us by you, the successors of the holy Apostles." [1] Another theory was put forward by the learned Ussher, the Protestant Archbishop of Armagh; it was that Ireland did not owe her Christianity to Rome, nor even to St. Patrick, since she already possessed a hierarchy at the time when the saint arrived. But when the names of the bishops supposed to have belonged to this hierarchy—Ailbe, Declan, Ibar, Kieran, &c.—came to be examined, Dr. Lanigan was able to prove that they were all posterior in date to St. Patrick.[2]

With respect to Bede, although it is true that he does not mention St. Patrick in his "Ecclesiastical History," the circumstance—singular as it must be admitted to be—may perhaps be explained on the ground that he chose to confine himself strictly to the religious concerns of the Angles and Saxons. It is impossible to infer from it that Bede passed over the conversion of Ireland in silence, because he, a zealous adherent of Rome, disapproved of a work effected independently of Rome. Had he so felt, he would have studiously avoided speaking of St. Patrick in his other writings, as well as in his history. But the fact is that in both his "Martyrologies" Bede *does* give the name of St. Patrick. In the prose one, under March 17, he says "In Scotia, the birthday of the holy Patricius, bishop and confessor, who first in that country preached the gospel of Christ." In his metrical martyrology, under the same day, he says "Patricius, the servant of the Lord, mounted to the heavenly court."

The death of the apostle of Ireland occurred in 493. The present sketch of the history of the Church in Ireland from that time to our own day will be divided into three periods: 1, that of sanctity, learning, and missionary energy (493–800); 2, that of invasions and usurpation (800–1530); 3, that of persecution (1530–1829). The period commencing at the last-named date will be regarded by

[1] Card. Moran, who formerly leant to the opinion that the place was near Boulogne in France, afterwards wrote convincingly in favour of the Scottish site.

[2] Probus wrote a *Life of St. Patrick* in the tenth century; see O'Curry's *Materials of Ancient Irish History*.

[1] Moran, *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, 1864.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 40.

our descendants, if present appearances may be trusted, as an era of restoration.

1. The Irish saints are divided by the national hagiographers into three classes. In the first, which consists of those of the earliest Christian age down to about 530, the principal figures are those of St. Patrick himself, St. Brigid of Kildare, St. Ibar, St. Declan, and St. Kieran. The second class, from 530 to 600, contains St. Coemgen or Kevin, the two Brendans, Jarlath of Tuam, and the great St. Columba or Columbkill. The third class, whose period is from 600 to about 660, contains St. Maidoc the first Bishop of Ferns; St. Colman of Lindisfarne, Ultan, Fursey, &c. The first class, in the words of the ancient authority quoted by Dr. Lanigan,[1] "blazes like the sun, the second like the moon, the third like the stars . . . the first most holy, the second very holy, the third holy."

That learning, in all the branches then known, was eagerly followed by Irish students from the time of the conversion, is a fact of which there is abundant evidence. A copious literature sprang up, consisting of monastic rules, tracts on ritual and discipline, homilies, prayers, hymns, genealogies, martyrologies in prose and verse, and lives of saints. This literature, as was to be expected, was partly composed in the vernacular and partly in Latin; but the bulk of it was in the Gaelic. The extant remains are still considerable; that they are not yet more copious is explained by Professor O'Curry in a remarkable passage, which will be cited in a different connection further on.

The English Bede bears ungrudging testimony to the high character of the Irish missionaries who had laboured in Northumbria, and to the general belief in the excellence of the Irish schools. "The whole solicitude of those teachers," he says, "was to serve God, not the world; their one thought was how to train the heart, not how to satisfy the appetite."[2] The special excellence of the Irish schools was the interpretation of Scripture; thus, about 650, Agilbert, a French bishop, resided a long time in Ireland "for the sake of reading the Scriptures."[3] Some years later (664) it became a common practice with the Northumbrian thanes to visit Ireland, either with a view to greater advance in the spiritual life, or for the sake of biblical knowledge, "divinae lectionis." These last would go from place to place attending the cells of the different masters; and so generous were the natives, that they provided for them all "their daily food free of cost, books also to read, and gratuitous teaching."[4]

The missionary energy of the Irish church, commencing with a little island off the coast of Mull, which it made a basis for further operations, ended by embracing France, Switzerland, and Italy within the scope of its charity. St. Columba, of whom Montalembert in his "Monks of the West" has given to the world a graphic portraiture, founded the monastery of Hy (or Iona) in 563, chiefly with a view to the conversion of the Picts dwelling in the north of Scotland. For more than 230 years Iona continued to flourish, and was a centre of pure religion, education, art, and literature to all the surrounding countries. Here, as in a "sacred storehouse,"[1] rest the bones of not a few Irish, Scottish, and Norwegian kings. It was devastated by the Danes in 795, and the monks were dispersed a few years later. From Iona the monk Aidan, at the invitation of king Oswald, came into Northumbria, the Angles of which were still mostly Pagans, and founded in 633 a monastery on the isle of Lindisfarne, of which he became the first bishop. To him and his successors the conversion of the northern English was chiefly due. Lindisfarne in its turn became a great school of sacred learning and art, and its bishopric ultimately grew into the palatine see of Durham. In East Anglia the Irish St. Fursey assisted Felix the Burgundian in the conversion of the natives; in Wessex the Irish Maidulf founded the great convent of Malmesbury. In the sixth and seventh centuries Irish missionaries were active in France: Fridolin restored religion at Poitiers, and recovered the relics of St. Hilary; St. Fursey founded a monastery at Lagny; St. Fiacre settled at Paris; and Columbanus founded in Burgundy the historic monastery of Luxeuil. In Switzerland the name of the town and canton of St. Gall perpetuates the memory of an Irish anchorite, who in 613 planted a cross near a spring in the heart of a dense forest, south of the lake of Constance, and by despising the world drew the world to him. Bobbio, in Italy, was the last foundation and resting-place of St. Columbanus. In Germany, the Irish Fridolin, the hero of many a tender *Volkslied* and wild legend, was probably the first apostle of the Alemanni in Baden and Suabia.[2]

The well-known controversy respecting the right observation of Easter, which raged in the seventh and eighth centuries between those who had received a Roman and an Irish training respectively, turned on the fact that the Irish Church, from its isolation in the far west, and the difficulties of communication with the centre of unity, had fallen somewhat behindhand in ecclesiastical science, and not adopted the improved methods of calculation which had come into force in Latin Christendom generally.[3] After there had been time

[1] *History of the Church of Ireland*, ii. 330.
[2] *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 26. [3] *Ibid.* iii. 7. [4] *Ibid.* iii. 27.

[1] Shakesp. *Macbeth*, Act II. sc. 4.
[2] Art. "Fridolin," by Hefele, in *Kirchenlex.*
[3] The erroneous practice was not that of the Quartodecimans [CYCLE, EASTER], for the Irish always waited for Sunday before celebrating the feast; it consisted in keeping Easter from the fourteenth to the twentieth day of the first month, instead of from the fifteenth to the twenty-first; the consequence being that when Sunday fell on the fourteenth, Easter began to be kept on the evening of the thirteenth day, that is *before* the occurrence of the Paschal full moon.

for a full discussion and comparison of views, the Irish gradually came round to the better practice. At a synod held at Old Leighlin, in 630, a letter having come from Honorius I., the Roman cycle and rules for computing Easter were adopted in all the south of Ireland.[1] At Iona and in the north of Ireland the necessary change was deferred for many years. Adamnan, Abbot of Hy, laboured hard between 701 and 704 to introduce the Roman Easter, and met with considerable success. But the decisive adoption of it at Iona is said to have been due to the persuasions of St. Egbert, about 706.[2]

2. *Period of Invasions.*—The Danes (called "Ostmen" by the Irish) appeared on the Irish coasts about the end of the eighth century. Wherever they came they desecrated churches, burnt monasteries, destroyed books, pictures and sculptures; murdered priests, monks and poets. To the ferocity of the wild beast they joined the persevering energy of the Teuton; their arms were better than those of the Irish, and perhaps they had more skill in handling them. Confusion and lamentation were soon in every part of the island. Men, after a while, seeing the continued success of these odious Pagans, began to doubt of Providence, and to grow slack in faith. *Sauve qui peut* became the general feeling, and the generosity towards the Church of the converts of the age of St. Patrick underwent a selfish but not unnatural reaction in their descendants. "When foreign invasion and war had cooled down the fervid devotion of the native chiefs, and had distracted and broken up the long-established reciprocity of good offices between the Church and the State, as well as the central executive controlling power of the nation, the chief and the noble began to feel that the lands which he himself or his ancestors had offered to the Church, might now, with little impropriety, be taken back by him, to be applied to his own purposes, quieting his conscience by the necessity of the case."[3] The beautiful Glendalough, founded by St. Kevin about 549, being near the sea, was peculiarly exposed to Danish assault; but not one of the principal monasteries—Armagh, Kildare, Clonmacnoise, Slane, &c.—escaped destruction at one time or other. Dublin—of which the Irish name is "Athcliath"—became a Danish city. From time to time the invaders were heavily defeated—as in the battle of Clontarf (1014), when the victorious Brian Boru fell in the hour of victory. Gradually they adopted Christianity, lost their national language, and were blended with the natives, never having, as in England, succeeded in subjecting the whole island to their rule.

In the course of the twelfth century, the power of the O'Neils of Ulster, who had for a long period been over-lords of the whole of Ireland, declined, and the O'Connors of Connaught attempted to take their place. But it was a weak and wavering sovereignty, and the kings of the five petty kingdoms were continually plotting, combining, and making war one against another. A state of general insecurity and lawlessness was the natural result; and though the faith of the people remained intact, moral disorder in every form was rampant, and the discipline of the Church was often set at naught. The clergy, probably for the sake of greater stability and safety, tended to cluster together under some monastic rule; and the laity, abandoned to themselves, fell a prey to gross superstitions and excesses. The Popes, by sending legates, and writing admonitory letters from time to time, attempted to reform the state of society. In the first half of the twelfth century a powerful influence for good was exerted by the admirable sanctity of St. Malachy, who died at Clairvaux under the eyes of St. Bernard, in 1148, and whose life was written by his great friend. The state of things at Armagh, when Malachy was elected to the primacy in 1125, is a good illustration of the disorder which pervaded the Irish Church. A certain powerful family had for more than two hundred years claimed the primatial chair as a hereditary possession; for fifteen generations they had made good their claim; and of these fifteen occupants of the see only six were in holy orders, the rest being married laymen, who, though they did not presume to exercise the episcopal functions, enjoyed the title and emoluments of the bishopric.[1] Celsus, the last of the series, being a good man, procured the election of St. Malachy as his successor; but the family resented this intrusion on their "rights" and presented to the see one of themselves, Maurice by name, upon the death of Celsus. For the sake of peace, St. Malachy waited five years before entering Armagh; on the death of Maurice, in 1133, he was peaceably installed. In 1138 the saint visited Rome, where the Pope, Innocent II., received him with the highest honour, and appointed him his legate in Ireland. His zeal, but still more his saintly example, effected a salutary change in the northern parts of Ireland, where, having obtained leave to resign the primacy, he spent the last ten years of his life as bishop of the small see of Down.

At the beginning of his reign, Henry II. is said to have obtained the approbation of Pope Adrian IV., an Englishman, for his project of entering Ireland, ostensibly with a view to extirpating vice and ignorance among the natives, and attaching the island more closely to the see of St. Peter.[2] Of this bull Henry made no use for many years, and the

[1] Lanigan, ii. 389. [2] Bed. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 22.
[3] O'Curry, *Materials*, &c., p. 343.

[1] Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.* ii. 89.
[2] On the disputed Bull "Laudabiliter," see Cleigh in "Cath. Enc." *Adrian IV.*

actual invasion of Ireland by Strongbow and other Norman knights was in a manner accidental. For several generations things went on much as before; the English power was confined to the "Pale," or strip of country on the eastern coast; in the rest of Ireland the native princes, though they often recognized an ill-defined over-lordship in the English kings, reigned practically after their own fashion. Outside the Pale, Brehon, not feudal, law prevailed. One benefit, at least, resulted: the Normans were great builders; and noble churches of stone soon covered the land. It is true that in this reform they were preceded by St. Malachy, who had built a church of stone at Bangor, near Carrickfergus, to the great amazement of the natives, who till then had seen only their own ingeniously constructed edifices of timber and wickerwork.

Three great Irish synods were held in the twelfth century. At the first, that of Kells (1152), at which a Roman cardinal presided, the metropolitan dignity of the three sees of Cashel,[1] Dublin, and Tuam was solemnly recognized; but the primacy over the whole island was still reserved to Armagh. At the second, that of Cashel (1172), held immediately after the invasion, Church property was declared to be exempt from the exactions of the chieftains, the regular payment of tithes was enjoined, and it was ordered that all matters of ritual should be arranged in future "agreeably to the observance of the Church of England"—in other words, according to Roman usage. The third synod, that of Dublin (1186), passed several canons of ritual; it is chiefly noted for a sermon, preached before it by Gerald de Barri, or Cambrensis, in which, while praising the orthodoxy and the continency of the Irish clergy, he lamented that too many of them were addicted to intemperance.

Many of the English and Normans who settled in Ireland after the invasion adopted by degrees the dress, customs, and laws of the natives, and became no less intractable than they in their attitude towards the English government. An effort was made to stop this process by the Statute of Kilkenny (1367), which made it treasonable for those of English descent to marry, or enter into the relation of fosterage, or contract spiritual affinity with the natives; and forbade to the same class, on pain of forfeiture of property, the adoption of an Irish name, or the use of the Irish language, dress, or customs. But this statute was to a great extent inoperative, and from the date of its enactment to the time of Henry VIII. there were two parties in continual opposition to the government, the "English rebels," and the "Irish enemies."[2] The demarcation between English and Irish, which the civil government thus did its utmost to maintain, was partially introduced, and with the most unhappy results, into the administration of Church affairs. In the counties of the Pale it was scarcely possible for an ecclesiastic of Irish race to obtain preferment. The invasion by the Scots under Edward Bruce in 1315, though ultimately defeated, caused great confusion, and called forth during its continuance many tokens of sympathy from the Irish clergy. This, says Malone, was made a pretext for "throwing off the mask,"[1] and under colour of disloyalty Irishmen were excluded from all the higher dignities and benefices. Yet it would appear that this exclusion could not have extended much beyond the Pale; for if we examine the lists of bishops occupying the Irish sees in 1350, we find that out of thirty-three names, eighteen are certainly Irish, thirteen English, while two may be doubtful. All through this time of confusion and disunion a strong religious feeling was abroad, animating the men of both races alike, and directing them to common objects. In the thirteenth century we hear of 170 monasteries being founded; about 55 in the fourteenth; and about 60 in the fifteenth. Two unsuccessful attempts were made to found universities: one at Dublin (1320) by Archbishop Bicknor; the other at Drogheda, by the Parliament which sat there in 1465.

3. *Period of Persecution.*—By the aid of Brown, the Archbishop of Dublin, an Englishman who had embraced the Lutheran opinions, Henry VIII. had some success in imposing his doctrine of the royal supremacy on the Irish clergy.[2] Under Mary all progress in this direction was reversed. Soon after the accession of Elizabeth, in 1560, a packed Parliament was convened at Dublin which passed an Act of Uniformity, declaring the royal supremacy over the Church, and imposing the Protestant Prayer-book. By many Protestant writers[3] it has been maintained that the bishops, with the exception of two, either approved of, or acquiesced in, the new order of things, and that the people for many years frequented the churches where the English service was performed. The falsehood of all such statements has been exposed by Cardinal Moran.[4] The real state of the case appears to have been this. The Archbishop of Dublin, Curwin, conformed to Protestantism, and O'Fihel, Bishop of Leighlin, did the same. The conduct of four bishops (Ossory, Ferns, Cork, and Clonfert) is more or less suspicious.

[1] Cashel was already regarded as a metropolitan see as early as 1111, and its bishops exerted corresponding powers to some extent; in 1140 it was formally recognized as such by Innocent II. at the request of St. Malachy (Lanigan, iv. 20).

[1] *Church History of Ireland*, ch. ix.

[2] On the Reformation struggle in Ireland see MacCaffrey, *Hist. of the Cath. Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution*, vol. ii.

[3] Bishop Mant, Dean Murray, &c.

[4] *Episcopal Succession in Ireland.* See also an article in the *Contemporary Review*, for May 1880, on "Dr. Littledale," &c.

The remainder of the Irish hierarchy, viz. the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam (the see of Armagh was vacant), two bishops holding sees in the Pale (who were deprived by the government), and sixteen other bishops of suffragan sees, remained faithful to their canonical obligations. As these bishops died, or as, in the course of the Elizabethan wars, the government was able to consolidate its power in the remoter parts of Ireland, the cathedrals, Church lands, and other Church property were made over to Protestant bishops and ministers appointed under the Act of Uniformity. The Catholic Bishop of Kilmore, Richard Brady, was expelled from the see so late as 1585. The Holy See did all that it could to support the oppressed Church of Ireland, and animate the clergy to meet their sufferings with an unbending fortitude. A nuncio was sent to reside at Limerick, money and arms were liberally provided, the intervention of Spain solicited, and Irish ecclesiastics visiting Rome welcomed and assisted. Except in the case of Dublin, the seat of the Anglo-Irish government, where the see was left vacant for many years from the absolute impossibility of any prelate residing there in safety, the successions of bishops in all the Irish sees appear to have been regularly maintained through all the period of persecution.

The cause of learning, to which the Irish Church had been ever devoted, could not but suffer in this prolonged conflict. Before the change of religion in England there had been some encouraging signs of progress in the reconciliation of the races through the influence of a common interest in intellectual pursuits. Among the distinguished Oxford students of the first thirty years of the sixteenth century, a considerable proportion were Irishmen,[1] and it is impossible to doubt that had peace and religious unity been preserved, this resort to the English universities would have gone on increasing until it bore its natural fruit in the establishment of a great university on Irish soil. The change of religion in England cut off the supply of Irish students; Catholicism became a persecuted creed; and the effect on learning—its professors, seats, implements, and productions—may be understood from the following vigorous passage. "From about the year 1530, in the reign of the English king Henry VIII., to the year 1793, the priests of Ireland were ever subject to persecution, suppression, dispersion, and expatriation, according to the English law; their churches, monasteries, convents, and private habitations were pillaged and wrested from them; and a Vandal warfare was kept up against all that was venerable and sacred of the remains of ancient literature and art which they possessed. When, therefore, we make search for the once extensive monuments of learning which the ecclesiastical libraries contained of old, we must remember that this shocking system continued for near 300 years; and that during all that long period the clergy—the natural repositories of all the documents which belonged to the history of the Church—were kept in a continual state of insecurity and transition, often compelled to resort to the Continent for education, often forced to quit their homes and churches at a moment's notice, and fly for their lives, in the first instance to the thorny depths of the nearest forest or the damp shelter of some dreary cavern, until such time, if ever it should come, as they could steal away to the hospitable shores of some Christian land on the Continent of Europe." [1]

Under James I. and Charles I., the Catholic clergy having been now stripped of all their property, and the laity of a considerable portion of theirs, some toleration was extended by the government to Catholic worship. The terrible rising of 1641 was the commencement of a war of eleven years, ending with the surrender of Galway in 1652. Innocent X. sent the Archbishop of Fermo (Rinuccini) as his nuncio to Ireland in the autumn of 1645, with considerable supplies of arms and money. Unfortunately dissension arose in the national ranks; a moderate section of the clergy, with most of the Catholic gentry and laity, were for aiding the King against the Parliament and not exacting from him very stringent conditions; but the bulk of the population, supported by the nuncio and the inferior clergy, were for turning the war into a struggle for complete religious freedom and national independence. Cromwell transported his victorious army to Ireland in 1649, and by several successful sieges, followed by bloody military executions, broke the strength of the resistance. The conquest of the island was completed by his lieutenants. The sufferings of the Irish clergy during, and still more after, the war were indescribable. Bishop O'Brien of Emly was executed by Ireton's order (1651) after the fall of Limerick. Bishop Egan of Ross was murdered by Ludlow's soldiers in 1650. In the same year Bishop McMahon of Clogher, being in command of a body of Irish troops, fell into the hands of the Puritans, and, though quarter had been promised, was hanged. A letter of Dr. Burgatt, afterwards Archbishop of Cashel, written in 1667, says that in the persecution begun by Cromwell "more than 300 [clergy] were put to death by the sword or on the scaffold . . .; more than 1000 were sent into exile, and among these all the surviving bishops," except the bishop

[1] See the list in Wood's *Athenae Oxon.* Wood does not go farther back than 1500.

[1] O'Curry's *Materials*, &c., p. 355.

of Kilmore, who was too old to move.[1] The Puritan soldiers put every priest to death whom they fell in with; and yet so close a tie of affection bound the clergy to their native land and their people that even in 1658, about the worst time of all, there were upwards of 150 priests in each province.[2] The regular clergy were no better off; the Acts of the General Chapter of the Dominican Order held at Rome in 1656 mention that out of 600 friars who were in the island in 1646 not a fourth part were left, and of forty-three convents of the order, not one remained standing.[3] All these horrors the Puritans pretended to justify, as done in retaliation for the massacre of Protestants in 1641. That a great number of persons were cruelly put to death at the time of that rising is undeniable; but, as Lingard points out,[4] the main object pursued was *not* the murder of Protestants, but the recovery of the confiscated lands. He significantly adds "That they [the Irish] suffered as much as they inflicted cannot be doubted."

The exiles, both priests and laity, were cast on the French coast in a state of such utter destitution that, but for prompt and ample relief, many must have perished. Happily, a saint was at hand to help them. St. Vincent of Paul, filled with compassion for these victims of war and fanaticism, collected money and clothing for them, and provided them all with homes and shelter; he even sent considerable supplies to Ireland.[5] Card. Moran also gives detailed proof of the unwearied solicitude of the Holy See, for many years after the Cromwellian invasion, in procuring succours of every kind for the Irish Catholics, and itself aiding them with money to the utmost of its power.[6]

The Act of Settlement (1660) legalized a great part of the Cromwellian spoliations; but the Catholic worship was tolerated all through the reign of Charles II. At the Revolution, the Irish espoused the cause of their king, who, whatever quarrel the English might have with him, had done Ireland no wrong. Neither the letter nor the spirit of the constitution enjoined that the Irish Parliament and people should change their king whenever it might suit the English people to change theirs. But, in the absence of effectual aid from abroad, the superior resources of the stronger nation crushed the resistance of the weaker; and a period commenced for the Irish Church and people sadder than any that had preceded it. The writings of Burke, and—among recent publications—Lecky's "History of the Eighteenth Century," paint in detail the picture of Ireland ruined and outraged by the penal laws. Whatever iniquitous law and crafty administration could devise to destroy the faith of the people was tried during the gloomy century which began at the Revolution, but all to no effect. The ill-success of the American war compelled the English government to propose the first relaxation of the penal laws in 1778. From that time the Irish Church has been step by step regaining portions and fragments of the rights of which she was deprived in the sixteenth century. Mainly through the efforts of the great Liberator, Daniel O'Connell, the chief remaining disabilities were removed by the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829).[1] The Protestant Church was disestablished in 1869. The last fifty years have seen the island covered with beautiful religious edifices—cathedrals, parish churches, convents, colleges &c. Of such a people it may be justly said "In much experience of tribulation they have had abundance of joy, and their very deep poverty hath abounded unto the riches of their simplicity."[2]

On February 12, 1915, Benedict XV. signed the introduction of the Cause of Beatification of two hundred and fifty-seven martyrs (including six women) during the penal times.

The following is a list of the Irish sees, of which four are metropolitan and twenty-four suffragan:—

Province of Armagh.	
Armagh	Meath
Derry	Clogher
Dromore	Raphoe
Down and Connor	Ardagh
Kilmore	
Province of Dublin.	
Dublin	Ossory
Kildare and Leighlin	Ferns
Province of Cashel.	
Cashel and Emly	Waterford and Lismore
Cork	Cloyne
Killaloe	Ross
Limerick	Kerry
Province of Tuam.	
Tuam	Galway
Achonry	Clonfert
Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora	Kilalla
Elphin	

Mitred Abbot: The Most Rev. the Abbot of Mount Melleray, Cappoquin.

(Lanigan, "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland," 1829; Plowden, "Historical Review of the State of Ireland," 1803; Malone, "Church History of Ireland," 3rd edition, 1880; [Moran, Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney], "Spicilegium Ossoriense"; "Essays on the Origin, Doctrine, and Discipline of the early Irish Church," 1864; "Historical Sketch of the Persecutions suffered by the Catholics of Ireland under Cromwell and the Puritans"[1]

[1] Moran, *Hist. Sketch of the Persecutions under Cromwell* (1862), p. 82.
[2] Moran, *op. cit.* p. 98.
[3] Moran, *op. cit.* p. 74.
[4] *Hist. of Engl.* vii. app. note D.
[5] Moran, *op. cit.* p. 52.
[6] About 1688, 72,000 francs a year were supplied by Rome for the support of the Irish secular clergy and laity. In 1699 the Pope sent to James II., at St. Germains, 58,000 francs for the Irish ecclesiastics exiled that year. From about 1750 to 1800 the Popes sent the Irish bishops a hundred Roman crowns a year in aid of Catholic poor schools.

[1] B. Ward, *Eve of Cath. Emancipation.*
[2] 2 Cor. viii. 2.

1862; W. Burke, "Irish Priests in the Penal Times," 1660-1760; D'Alton, "Hist. of Ireland" and "Cath. Enc."; Bellesheim, "Hist. of the Cath. Church in Ireland"; A. S. Green, "The Making of Ireland and its Undoing.")

IRISH COLLEGE (ROME). The munificent Pontiff to whom the English College owed its foundation—Gregory XIII.—contemplated a similar institution for Ireland; but on mature consideration he judged that whatever portion of the Papal revenues could be spared to aid that injured people would be better spent in sending them money and arms, at a time when they were engaged in a deadly struggle with their heretical oppressors, than in any other way. His original desire was, however, carried out by his nephew, Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, who in 1628 founded a college near the Piazza Barberini for Irish theological students, who were afterwards to return to their own land and do their best to keep alive the flame of religion among their persecuted countrymen. Eugene Callanan, archdeacon of Cashel, was the first rector, with Fr. Luke Wadding, the celebrated Irish Franciscan historian, as a sort of supervisor. The college opened with six students, and a donation of fifty scudi per month. Cardinal Ludovisi by his will bequeathed to it a large vineyard at Castel Gandolfo, and a thousand scudi of annual rent; he further directed that its management should be transferred to the hands of the Society of Jesus. A permanent site for the college was found near the convent of the Dominican nuns of the Annunziata. The students attended lectures at the Collegio Romano [ROMAN COLLEGE].

The college remained under Jesuit management till 1772, when it was removed from their control; from that time to the date of the French invasion—when it shared in the general ruin which fell on all Roman colleges—it was governed by an Irish rector, assisted by three or four secular priests of that nation. In 1826 it was restored by Leo XII., who placed it in a suitable building near the church of S. Lucia de' Ginnasi, with Mgr. Blake for its first rector. Soon afterwards it was arranged that the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda *pro tem.* should always be the protector of the college. Cardinal Cappellari, afterwards Gregory XVI., who thus became protector, conceived a singular affection for this Irish community and loaded it with favours. In 1836 he paid a formal visit to the college, while Paul Cullen, afterwards Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin, was rector; and in the same year he made over to it the monastery and church of S. Agata alla Suburra. As another proof of his regard, he granted to the students the privilege of carrying in the annual procession of Corpus Christi the staves of the baldacchino under which the Pope carries the Blessed Sacrament, from the end of the colonnade in the piazza of St. Peter's to the great gate of the Accoramboni palace. Among the famous students of the college (which was formerly known as "Seminarium Episcoporum") may be mentioned the martyrs Philip Cleary and Oliver Plunket; Peter Creagh, archbishop of Dublin, Hugh Mac Mahon, archbishop of Armagh; Dr. Lanigan, the historian; Francis Mahony ("Father Prout"); Archbishop Croke, and Cardinal Moran. Daniel O'Connell, as is well known, left his heart to Rome; it is now in the college chapel. (O'Riordan in "Cath. Enc."; "Archives of the Irish College, Rome.")

IRISH COLLEGES (CONTINENTAL). Besides the college in Rome there are or were many other Irish colleges in various European countries. It is not possible for us to give an account of more than a few of the best known.

1. The most important of all was the college in Paris, founded in 1605 by John Lee, and still existing in our own times. The original building proving too small for the numbers, the Collège des Lombards, then in a ruinous state, was assigned to the Irish students by Louis XIV. in 1677. It was rebuilt and extended, and in 1776 a second college for juniors was opened. The majority of the students were priests already ordained who attended the university lectures for the purpose of obtaining degrees in theology or canon law. In 1792 both of the colleges, together with all the other Irish colleges in France, were closed. During the Consulate the Paris college was restored, and to it were assigned the scanty remnants of the property of the other Irish colleges in France. In 1858 the government of the college was handed over to the Irish Vincentian Fathers. Massingham, author of the "Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum," the Abbé Mageoghegan, Sylvester O'Halloran, Martin Haverty, Miley, author of a "History of the Papal States," and Archbishop Croke were alumni of the college. Cardinal Logue was professor from 1866 to 1874. There were also Irish colleges at Douay, Lille, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Nantes, and Poitiers.

2. The college at Salamanca was founded by Philip II. in 1592, at the instigation of Fr. Thomas White, S.J. It remained under the management of the Jesuits until 1767, since when the rectors have been Irish secular priests nominated by the Irish bishops and confirmed by the King of Spain. The students formerly attended lectures at the famous university of Salamanca. Many eminent Irish bishops were alumni, among whom may be mentioned Dr. Curtis, of Armagh; Dr. Murray, of Dublin; Dr. Kelly, of Tuam; and Dr. Everard, of Cashel. Dr. Curtis may be said to have owed his appointment to the services which he rendered to Wellington during the Peninsular war.

There are at present about thirty students.

Other Irish colleges were established at Seville (1612), Madrid (1629), Alcalà (1590), Santiago de Compostela (1605), and Lisbon (1593).

3. Flanders, under the rule of Spain, had also its Irish colleges for the secular and regular clergy, the chief of which were at Louvain. It is calculated that during the two centuries of their existence these colleges gave to the Church in Ireland 32 bishops and 300 priests, of whom 200 were graduates of the university. (Guilday, "English Cath. Refugees," 28 *sqq.*)

Besides the continental colleges there were many Irish convents and monasteries in the different countries.

"At the present day the colleges in Ireland are sufficient to supply the needs of the Church in Ireland, but the colleges on the Continent are still useful as a witness of the past, and they serve to bring a large section of the clergy of Ireland into contact with the life and thought and work of the Church in the ancient Catholic nations and the Continent." (P. Boyle, in "Cath. Enc.," *Irish Colleges*, from which the present article has been condensed. The story of the fate of the funds paid by the French government in compensation for the property of the Irish colleges is told by B. Ward, "Eve of Catholic Emancipation," ii. 254 *sqq.* and iii. 128 *sqq.*)

IRREGULARITY is defined as a "canonical impediment, which prevents a person from entering the ranks of the clergy, from rising to a higher order, or from exercising the order which he has received" (Gury). The term "irregular," according to the eminent canonist Phillips, first occurs in the decretals of Innocent III. An "irregularis" is one who does not fulfil the "rules" imposed upon, or the requirements which the Church makes of, those who seek to be tonsured or ordained. The same Pope distinguishes between the "nota defectus" and the "nota delicti," and this is the basis of the division of irregularities which still prevails among canonists and theologians, viz. into such as proceed from defect ("ex defectu"), and from crime ("ex delicto"). This arrangement is a convenient one, but it is not strictly scientific. In reality irregularity is always "ex defectu." It is not a penalty, and so is quite distinct from censure, deposition, or degradation. It may arise, no doubt, from crime, but only indirectly—so far, that is to say, as crime constitutes a defect in the reputation which is desirable in a clergyman. Hence repentance, sacramental absolution, and amendment do not in themselves remove the irregularity "ex delicto." We observe before going further that, though the term "irregular" is of mediaeval origin, the idea is ancient. From early times "bigamy" (in a sense to be explained presently), bodily defects, ignorance, recent reception of baptism, military service, servile condition or entanglement in worldly business, and crimes which subjected a man to public penance, have been regarded as impediments to ordination.

I. *Irregularities ex Defectu.*

(1) *Ex Defectu Animi.*—Lunatics, &c., are irregular, so are persons without sufficient knowledge. Ignorance is mentioned as a bar to ordination by Popes Hilary (Ep. 2, Mansi, tom. vii. 928) and Gregory the Great (Ep. lib. ii. 37, PL, lxxvii, 575). The Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. De Ref. c. 4) requires for the tonsure ability to read and write, with elementary religious knowledge; for minor orders acquaintance with Latin; further instruction in letters and ability to fulfil their respective duties is exacted from those who desire to be subdeacons and deacons, while a priest must have proved himself on examination fit to instruct the people, administer the sacraments, &c. Provincial synods are to provide a careful form of examination and inquiry into the knowledge and other qualities of one who is to be consecrated bishop (sess. xxiv. De Ref. c. 1). Neophytes are excluded from ordination. This defect, called "defectus fidei confirmatae," is recognized by Pope Siricius (Mansi, iii. 669), and has its justification in 1 Tim. iii. 6.

(2) *Ex Defectu Corporis.*—Defect which may arise either from some horrible mutilation or the like, which might cause horror in the people, or else from the want of some sense, member, &c., necessary for the performance of clerical duty. Thus one who has lost his left eye, called the "eye of the canon," because chiefly used in reading the canon of the Mass, cannot receive the priesthood. Bodily mutilation is mentioned in this connection by Popes Hilary and Gregory (Ep. 2, Mansi, vii. 928) ("in qualibet corporis parte vitiatum," Ep. lib. ii. 37). The prescriptions of the old law seem to have weighed here.

(3) *Ex Defectu Natalium.*—Which excludes children born out of wedlock, unless their parents have subsequently married, or unless the illegitimate person has made his profession in a religious order. Otherwise the bishop may dispense for minor orders, the dispensation for Holy Orders being reserved to the Pope, and a fresh dispensation being needed in case of promotion to the episcopate. This impediment, Phillips says, was not distinctly recognized till the eleventh century. It arose partly because in the German nations illegitimate children were without civil rights, partly because the prevalence of clerical concubinage and the frequent promotion of priests' sons to their fathers' office threatened to bring the spirit of caste into the clerical ranks. As early, however, as A.D. 845 we find a Council of Meaux (Can. 64, Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 124) prohibiting the ordination of children born

before marriage to "raptores virginum aut viduarum."

(4) *Ex Defectu Aetatis.*—The older rule admitted very young people to the minor orders, of which then the sub-diaconate was one, but the diaconate was reserved for the thirtieth, the priesthood for the thirty-fifth, and the episcopate for the completion of the fortieth year. The decretals prescribe for the tonsure the seventh year complete, for the sub-diaconate the eighteenth year, for the diaconate the twentieth, for the priesthood the twenty-fifth year begun, for the episcopate the thirtieth year complete. The Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. De Ref. c. 12) has partially altered the rules, requiring for the sub-diaconate the twenty-third begun, and for the diaconate the twenty-fourth year similarly begun.

(5) *Ex Defectu Libertatis.*—Pope Leo I. (Ep. 4, PL, liv. 611) excludes slaves, and generally those under the power of others, and Innocent I. (Ep. 2, Mansi, iii. 1035)—"curiales vel quibuslibet functionibus publicis occupatos." These rules still subsist, and married persons are only excluded at least from Holy Orders, until they obtain their wife's consent, and she, if young, enters religion.

(6) *Ex Defectu Sacramenti.*—This irregularity affects those who have been married twice, or, having married once, were wedded to one who was not a virgin. The former part of the rule is found, as many think, in 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 6, and certainly obtained in the Church at a very early date (see, *e.g.*, Tertull. "De Monog." 12, PL, ii. 947). The second part of the rule was in force from the fourth century (see Ep. Siric., Mansi, iii. 670; Innocent I. Ep. 2, Mansi, iii. 1034; Hilary, Ep. 2, Mansi, iii. 928; Gregory, Ep. lib. ii. 37, lxxvii. 575). The canon law extends the prohibition to one who has continued to live with an adulterous wife, or has gone through the form of marriage after religious profession or the sub-diaconate. All such unions fail in the "sacramentum" or mystical resemblance to Christ's perfect union with His Church.

(7) *Ex Defectu Lenitatis.*—The early Church (see, *e.g.*, Council of Rome 387, Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 69) would not allow soldiers to be ordained, and the canons forbid the ordination of any who, although justly, have concurred "willingly, actively, efficaciously, and proximately" in the death or mutilation of another by an action tending in its own nature to that end.

(8) *Ex Defectu Famae.*—This applies to persons notoriously guilty of some enormous crime, to those who are well known to have committed a crime stigmatized as infamous by the law, and to those who have been sentenced in a public court, even if they are innocent. Infamy which simply comes of notorious crime, without any judicial sentence, may cease of itself without the need of any dispensation. When a court has passed sentence, the sentence may be reversed, and the consequent irregularity disappear.

II. *Ex Delicto.*—It was a constant principle of the ancient Church not to admit to orders persons who had been under or had become liable to public penance (see, *e.g.*, August. Ep. 185, § 45, PL, xxxiii. 811; the ancient collection known as "Concil. Carthag. IV.," Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 102; Greg. Magn. Ep. lib. ii. 37; Isidor. "Eccl. Offic." ii. 9). The modern law, after the disuse of the penitential system, limited irregularity *ex delicto* to the following cases: (1) The reception of baptism without necessity by an adult from a declared heretic; reiteration of baptism with solemn rite; receiving baptism in such circumstances; assistance thereat by a cleric. (2) Pretending solemnly to exercise a holy order never received; receiving orders in various unlawful ways—*e.g.* by stealth, from the bishop of another diocese without dimissorials, from a suspended, schismatical, simoniacal, or heretical bishop; receiving more than one holy order on the same day. (3) Solemnly exercising an order while bound by a censure. (4) Crime—*i.e.* the special crimes of public heresy and apostasy from the faith. The sons of heretics are also irregular. (5) Murder and mutilation.

III. *Dispensation.*—Certain irregularities—*e.g.* total blindness, hopeless lunacy, &c.—cannot be removed. Others—such as the defect of age and infamy (see above)—may cease of themselves. For the rest, the rule is that all irregularities which flow from any secret crime, except murder, may be removed by the bishop or by the prelates in a religious order. The Pope only and his delegates can remove those *ex defectu* or *ex homicidio*. The exceptions to these rules have been noted above. (Ferraris; Taunton.)

IRREMOVABILITY OF RECTORS. [See PARISH PRIEST.]

ITALA VETUS. [See VULGATE I.]

ITE, MISSA EST. The meaning of the word "Missa" is discussed under MASS. Here it may suffice to say, that after the Gospel the catechumens were dismissed by the deacon with the words "Ite, Missa est"; Go, you are dismissed—literally "a dismissal is made."[1] The same formula was repeated at the end of the whole Mass. In the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, we find the form "Let us go in the peace of Christ," the people answering "In the name of the Lord." "Benedicamus Domino" is substituted in Masses of ferias and Sundays in the penitential seasons, "Requiescant in pace" in Masses of the dead, because these Masses were

[1] But this is denied. The formula was rather: "Si quis non communicat, det locum" (St. Gregory *Dial.*, ii. 23, *PL*, lxvi. 178); or "Si quis catechumenus est, recedat" ("Ordo Rom." i. 38).

followed by penitential prayers, and by the absolution at the tomb, for which the people waited. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss."; Hefele, "Beiträge"; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 291.)

ITINERARIA. The mediaeval books of travel, chiefly of pilgrimages to the Holy Land, are generally known as Itineraries. The earliest of these is the "Itinerarium Burdigalense," the story of the "Pilgrim of Bordeaux," who visited the Holy Land in 333–4. His description of Jerusalem is of value for the study of the topography of the city. Of far greater value and interest is the "Peregrinatio Etheriae" (Silviae ?) about fifty years later (*q.v.*). Arculf, a French bishop, made the journey about 670, and was wrecked on the English coast on his return. St. Adamnan, of Iona, hospitably entertained him, and received from him the account of his travels, which the saint incorporated in his work "De Locis Sanctis." Passing over other itineraries, we come to the time of the Crusades when books of this kind naturally became numerous. (See the "Library of the Palestine Pilgrims Text Society"; "Early Travels in Palestine," ed. Wright; Geyer, "Itinera Hierosolymitana saec. iv.–viii.")

ITINERARY (*Itinerarium*). A form of prayer consisting of the canticle Benedictus, with an antiphon, "preces," and four collects, intended for the use of clerics when setting out on a journey, and placed for their convenience at the end of the Breviary. Two of these collects are found in the Gregorian Sacramentary. The itinerary is not inserted in the older Breviaries. But Gavantus refers to an ancient Pontifical which contains an itinerary for prelates rather longer than ours, but very similar. (Gavant. tom. 11, § 69, cap. 6.)

J

JACOBINS. The Dominicans had before the Revolution three convents in Paris, of which the chief was that of St. James (Lat. *Jacobus*), in the Rue St. Jacques. This was considered the principal house of their order in France, and from it French preaching friars were called Jacobins. The second of their houses in Paris was in the Rue St. Honoré, between the church of St. Roch and the Place Vendôme; before the Revolution it had a noviciate and a library of thirty-two thousand volumes. The Club Breton, containing the ablest and most dangerous men in the National Assembly, began to hold its sittings in the library of the convent in the Rue St. Honoré in 1789; hence their name was soon changed to Club Jacobin. Later on, the church (of which now only the tower remains) was used as a place of meeting, and many of the worst infamies and atrocities of the Revolution were there debated and decided on.

JACOBITE CHRISTIANS. A name given to the Monophysites in Mesopotamia, Syria, Kurdistan, and East India, who are subject to the heretical Patriarch of Antioch. They have never been more than a comparatively small, poor, and scattered sect.

They call themselves Surigani, or Syrian Christians; the name Jacobite, by which they are commonly known, is derived from Jacob or James, a monk of Phasilta near Nisibis, and a disciple of the Monophysite Severus of Antioch. This monk, who was zealous in resisting the authority of the Fourth General Council held at Chalcedon and in denying the two natures in Christ, was ordained Metropolitan of Edessa by heretical bishops, and with the consent of Severus. When Severus died, in 539(?), James consecrated his successor, and so the line of Monophysite Patriarchs of Antioch has been continued to this day. In 736 the Jacobites entered into communion with the Armenians, who also deny that there are two natures in Christ, but the peace between the two sects did not last long. On the other hand, the Jacobites, although a distinct and independent body, are in communion with the Monophysite Copts of Egypt. Though they are Monophysites in faith they are less rigid than other holders of that heresy. Their liturgy is the old rite of Jerusalem-Antioch, called the Liturgy of St. James in Syriac with Greek and Arabic additions.

The Jacobite clergy are divided into singers, readers, sub-deacons, deacons, archdeacons, priests, chorepiscopi, periodeutai, bishops, metropolitans, and patriarch; but of these the archdeacon, chorepiscopus, and periodeutes are merely nominated by the bishop without special ordination.

The Patriarch is chosen in the following manner. Three names are selected by the assembled bishops and placed in an urn beneath the altar. After Mass has been said, he whose name is first drawn is chosen Patriarch. He holds office for life, but may be deposed by the bishops if he falls away from the tenets of the Jacobite Church. He is enthroned with the title "Patriarch of the City of Antioch, and of the whole dominion of the Apostolic chair." He has the right to name and consecrate the other bishops and metropolitans, and the blessing of the chrism is reserved to him; but before he can exercise jurisdiction, his appointment must be confirmed by a firman of the Sultan. The ancient rule, observed down to 1222, forbade anyone already a bishop to be chosen Patri-

arch. Now, generally speaking, it is a bishop who is chosen, so that no further consecration is needed. Since 878 it has been the custom for the Patriarch to take a new name on election, and since 1293 that of Ignatius, the martyred Bishop of Antioch, has always been adopted. At first the Patriarch had no fixed residence; in 1166 Amida, the modern Diarbekir, became the patriarchal residence, and at the close of the fifteenth century it was transferred to the monastery of Zapharan or St. Ananias, near Mardin. The Patriarch is supported partly by the monastery, partly by a contribution of grain from all the Jacobite congregations.

Next comes the Maphrian,[1] a dignity which arose in the seventh century, when the Jacobites gave the title of Katholikos or Primate of the East, held since Justinian's time by the Metropolitan of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, to one of their own bishops. The first Maphrian, Maruthos, appointed in 629, had twelve bishops in Arabia and Persia subject to him, and over them he had quasi-patriarchal power, though he himself was nominated by the Patriarch. At present the dignity is merely titular.

The metropolitans are distinct in name only from the other bishops. The bishops, who are usually taken from the monks, are very ignorant, rarely preach, and, though they read, scarcely understand the Syriac of their ritual. The archdeacon, as syncellos, is the chief representative of the bishop in settling disputes between the clergy, &c. Formerly there were twenty metropolitans and 103 bishops. The number has fallen since to eight metropolitans and three bishops, the Metropolitan of Jerusalem being Maphrian.

The secular priests have to recite the prayers of their Beth-gaza or Breviary daily, and to administer the sacraments, but they support themselves in part by agriculture, trade, &c. They may be married men, but cannot contract a second marriage. The Jacobite monasteries, once exceedingly numerous, are now comparatively few. The rabban or abbot is chosen by the monks of his house, but the election must be confirmed by the bishop. The religious observe perpetual abstinence from meat, and, except in sickness, from wine. They keep four fasts besides Lent: viz. fifty days in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, fourteen days in honour of the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, twenty-five in honour of Christ's birth, and the Niniviticum, or fast of three days, at the beginning of the third week before Lent. In other respects their mode of life is most severe.

In a quarter of their own at Mardin, a curious community of about 100 families are loosely attached to the Jacobite Church. They are descendants of the Shemsiel, or worshippers of the sun, and in 1762 the pasha inquired about their religion, and told them no toleration was granted except to those who possessed divine books—*i.e.* to Mahometans, Jews, or Christians. Thereupon some embraced the faith of Islam, the rest were about to be executed, when the Jacobite bishop interceded for them, and afterwards induced them to join his church. They are baptized Christians and conform to the Jacobite rites, but they only intermarry among themselves and have customs and ceremonies of their own. (Assemani, "Bibliotheca Orient." tom. ii.; "Diss. de Monophys." no. i. iii. vi.; Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus," tom. ii. p. 1343 *seq.*; Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients," Landshut, 1865, pp. 253 *seq.*; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," ch. x.)

JAMES, ST., LITURGY OF. [See LITURGIES, p. 529]

JANSENISM. It is very difficult to define Jansenism, or even to describe it in general terms, and therefore still more difficult to give a compendious history of the movement. Properly speaking, it was a heresy which consisted in denying the freedom of the will and the possibility of resisting divine grace. But from the very beginning Jansenius and his followers had many objects in view, quite distinct from their opinions on the efficacy of grace. Perhaps the best description of Jansenism is that it was a professed attempt to restore the ancient doctrine and discipline of the Church. The Reformers professed to restore apostolic doctrine and discipline by making new churches; the Jansenists wished to remain in the Catholic Roman Church, and to reform it from within. The Reformers appealed to Scripture and made light of tradition. To the Jansenists the Fathers were all in all, though, practically, St. Augustine, and Western Fathers under his influence, were taken as the sole representatives of the Church's doctrinal tradition, and Jansenist contempt was reserved for the mediaeval Schoolmen. This position of the Jansenists within the Church occasions fresh difficulty in treating of their history. They called themselves Catholics, and treated the existence of a Jansenist sect as a mere phantom, invented to trouble consciences and calumniate pious Catholics. Nobody admitted he was a Jansenist, and the Jansenist tendency displayed itself in so many ways, in attempts to correct doctrines, devotions, discipline, more or less established, that it is often no easy matter to decide where the reproach of Jansenism was deserved. Undoubtedly, some Catholics were far too ready to narrow the limits of orthodoxy, and to charge their opponents with Jansenism. Thus the "Bibliothèque Janséniste," which appeared in 1722 and 1735, was placed on the Index in 1744, and, ten years later, the new edition, entitled

[1] "Mafryânâ means 'fructifier.' Maruthâ, the first Mafrian, made Tagrith a fruitful soil of Jacobitism. The name, first given to him as a compliment, became a regular title." (Fortescue, *Lesser Eastern Churches*, p. 340, *note* 2.)

"Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes," met with the same fate. This book, ascribed to the Jesuit Colonna, stigmatizes even the great Augustinian theologians, Noris and Berti, and others, as Jansenists. In this article we propose to trace the different manifestations of Jansenism in chronological order, paying special attention to the authoritative condemnations of the Church.

1. *Jansenius and his Book.*—Cornelius Jansen (Jansenius) was born in 1585, at Accoy, in the Dutch province of Leerdam; studied at Utrecht, Louvain, and Paris; became connected with several disciples of Baius (*e.g.* James Baius and James Jansen), and, from 1604, was the intimate friend of John du Verger de Hauranne, born in 1581, and better known as the Abbé de St. Cyran. Jansen, who taught for some time at Bayonne, till, in 1617, he became professor at Louvain, devoted himself to the study of St. Augustine, while his friend Hauranne, now Abbé of St. Cyran, near Poitiers, took on himself the task of depicting the ancient constitution of the Church. Jansen made several journeys to the Spanish Court, as representative of the Louvain University, was promoted to the see of Ypres in 1635, and died May 6, 1638. Two years after his death, Frommond published Jansen's posthumous work, "Augustinus, seu Doctrina S. Augustini de Humanae Naturae Sanitate, Aegritudine, Medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses," Lovanii, 1640, tom. 4. Jansen had studied St. Augustine for twenty years. He submitted the book to the Pope's judgment, though he could not believe that it contained doctrinal error, but this declaration was suppressed by the editor. The work falls into three great divisions, treating (1) of the history of the Pelagian heresy; (2) of reason and authority in theological matters, the grace of Adam and the angels, of fallen nature, of mere nature (*natura pura*); (3) of redeeming grace, and the errors of the Semipelagians and some moderns. The following is a sketch of the doctrinal system maintained in the book.

Since the Fall, man's will is entirely dominated by a double attraction, viz. the heavenly attraction, or pleasure (*delectatio*), which leads to good, the earthly attraction, which induces to evil, and the will necessarily follows the attraction which is stronger at the moment. Jansenius did not deny the freedom of the will in express terms, but he utterly rejected the Catholic notion of freedom, viz. the power to choose at the time good or evil (*libertas contradictionis*), and asserted merely the existence of freedom from external constraint (*libertas a coactione*). He also destroyed all belief in grace merely sufficient, as Catholic theologians understand it: *i.e.* there was, according to him, no grace which enabled a man to perform a good action, and which failed, or could fail, to produce its effect from defect in correspondence on the part of the agent. The grace which a man did not follow might have been sufficient in other circumstances, viz. if the impulse to evil had not been so strong; but it was insufficient relatively to the force on the other side. If grace, or the impulse to good, be represented by 6, the temptation, or impulse to evil, by 6½, the agent must needs sin; if the proportions were reversed, he necessarily did the good proposed to him. Hence even the just are not always able to fulfil God's commandments (see Prop. i. below); interior grace is irresistible (Prop. ii.); there is no freedom from interior necessity, but only from exterior compulsion (Prop. iii.). Further, he held that the error of the Semipelagians lay in making grace resistible (Prop. iv.), and in maintaining that Christ died for all.

2. *The History of Jansenism down to the Constitution of Innocent X. in* 1653.—The book excited great attention in the Low Countries and in France when a second edition was issued in 1641. In the same year it was condemned by the Roman Inquisition, and, in the year following, by Urban VIII., in general terms, as renewing the errors of Baius. The authenticity of Urban's bull was disputed; Flemish bishops, headed by Boonen, archbishop of Malines, and the University of Louvain, resisted its publication for a considerable time; and, although the French king and the Sorbonne ranged themselves on the side of authority, "the disciples of St. Augustine"—as the Jansenists styled themselves—were numerous and powerful. The learned Antoine Arnauld, born in 1612, and after Richelieu's death doctor of the Sorbonne, was especially active. He signalized himself in the early stage of the controversy by attacking Isaac Habert, a Sorbonniste and champion of the Catholic doctrine on grace.

In 1649 Nicolas Cornet submitted Five Propositions from the "Augustinus" to the Sorbonne, and a commission was nominated to examine them. Friends of the Jansenist doctrine, among whom Louis de St. Amour was most prominent, appealed to the Parliament, of which body also many favoured Jansenism. The Parliament prohibited the Sorbonne from taking any further step, and committed the inquiry to the assembly of the clergy. On April 12, 1651, eighty-five bishops wrote to Innocent X., begging him to pronounce judgment on the Five Propositions, although eleven bishops protested against this immediate appeal to Rome, as subversive of the Gallican liberties. The Pope appointed five cardinals and thirteen theologians to decide the question, and after two years had been occupied in this task, during which the Jansenists were heard at length in their own defence, a bull appeared (May 19, 1653), in which a definite sentence was given. Prop. I.—"Some commandments of God are impossible to just men, wishing and

striving (to observe them) according to the strength which they have at the time; moreover they lack grace, which would make them (the commandments) possible." Prop. II. — "No resistance in the state of fallen nature is ever made to interior grace." Prop. III.—"For merit and demerit in the state of fallen nature, man does not need freedom from necessity, but only freedom from compulsion." Prop. IV. — "The Semipelagians admitted the need of interior prevenient grace for each act, even for the beginning of faith; and they were heretical on this account, viz. because they held that grace to be such that the human will could resist or correspond to it"—were condemned as heretical. Prop. V.—"It is Semipelagian to say that Christ died, or shed His blood for all men together," as false, rash, &c., and, if meant in the sense that Christ died only for the elect, as heretical. Shortly after it was issued, an edict of the French king commanded the reception of this bull; the French bishops, assembled at Paris, thanked the Pope for it, and it was registered by the Sorbonne and the Louvain University. The famous Franciscan Wadding, formerly an advocate of the Five Propositions, submitted to the judgment of the Church.

Meanwhile the Jansenist spirit had been active in other directions. St. Cyran ("Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles," Paris, 1645), recurring, as he said, to the primitive practice, held it inadvisable to confess venial sins, or the number and circumstances altering the species of mortal sins, while he required the utmost perfection and purity of conscience for communion, or even for assisting at Mass. Under his direction, some of the nuns belonging to the Convent of Port Royal, near Paris, actually died without the sacraments. St. Cyran also published a "Brief Explanation of the Mysteries of Faith," and an edition of "St. Augustine on Virginity," with notes inimical to vows. He was imprisoned by Richelieu on suspicion of false teaching, was liberated on that statesman's death, and died, revered as a martyr by his followers, in 1643. A large number had come under his influence —Singlin, his successor in the direction of Port Royal, Antoine Arnauld, his no less gifted sister Angélique, &c. Of these, Antoine Arnauld published his famous book "De la fréquente Communion" (Paris, 1643) in the year that St. Cyran died. The object of the book was to mend the relaxed discipline of the Church. It urged the duty of imposing public penance for mortal sins, even if secret, and of preparing sinners for absolution and communion by a long course of rigorous discipline. It was approved by sixteen bishops and twenty doctors of the Sorbonne, who, however, had not read the preface with which it appeared, and which gave special offence. Some ecclesiastics, *e.g.* Du Hamel, in the diocese of Sens, ventured to reduce the Jansenist theology to practice, and restored public penance.

3. *Jansenism from the Bull of Innocent X. in* 1653 *to the Death of Arnauld in* 1694.—The condemnation of the Five Propositions by the Pope necessitated a change in Jansenist tactics, for the Jansenists resolved to remain in external communion with the Church. Some appealed to a general council, but Arnauld was now the real leader of the party, and he hit upon a device which became the main point of contention for many years. He was willing to reject the Five Propositions, but he denied that they were to be found in Jansenius, or, if so found, that they bore the sense imputed to them in the Papal Constitution. Bishops and theologians disproved Arnauld's assertion, and the Pope reprobated it September 29, 1654. This only led Arnauld to develop his views more thoroughly. The Duke of Liancourt was refused absolution in the parish of St. Sulpice, because of his connection with the Jansenists, and Arnauld addressed two letters to the peer. In his second letter ("Seconde Lettre de M. Arnauld, docteur de Sorbonne, à un Duc et Pair de France, pour servir de réponse à plusieurs écrits qui ont été publiés contre la première lettre sur ce qui est arrivé à un seigneur de la cour dans une paroisse de Paris." Paris, 1655) he distinguished between the question of law (*question de droit*) and that of fact (*question de fait*); in other words, between the question whether the Five Propositions as condemned by the Church were erroneous, and the question whether the book of Jansenius contained them in the sense condemned. On the former question he admitted the Church's infallibility and the duty of entire submission; the latter, he said, was a question of historical fact on which the Church might err, and it was enough if the faithful received her decision upon it with "respectful silence." We may remark in passing that nobody claims infallibility for the Church in facts merely historical, but here was a question intimately, nay, indissolubly, connected with doctrine. Of what avail would the Church's infallibility be if she were liable to error in interpreting the natural sense of books and propositions submitted to her, and so of mistaking truth for error, error for truth? We say the natural sense, for again it must not be supposed that the Church professes to read the heart of an author. He may have used words in a non-natural sense, he may have suffered from some mental confusion or aberration, and on all this the judgment belongs to God alone, to God who searches the heart. But the Church can judge of the natural and obvious sense which words bear in a book, nor could she execute her divine commission to feed the flock of Christ if she had no power to distinguish between wholesome and poisonous pasture.

Generally speaking, the Jansenists accepted

the means of escape which Arnauld had suggested. The nuns of Port Royal, however, did so with difficulty, and only when over-persuaded by the Abbess Angélique Arnauld. Among the distinguished men of the party who took up their abode in the Convent of Port Royal des Champs after the nuns had moved to Port Royal de Paris, Pascal utterly refused to accept the compromise. This did not hinder him, however, from accomplishing a mighty work in the Jansenist interest. In his "Provincial Letters" (Paris, 1656), published under the pseudonym Louis Montalte, he attacked the Jesuits for relaxed morals and defended the Jansenist doctrine of grace with a refinement of style and delicacy of wit which have never been surpassed in any literature. There were many members of the party more learned than Pascal, but he had no equal in genius. Nothing can be more amazing than the interest with which he invests the dry controversies on grace, and although no doubt he was often unfair to the casuists whom he held up to scorn and detestation, and although many of his charges were rebutted—*e.g.* by the Jesuit Father Daniel—the charm of his book led his readers captive, and the answers were read by few. No one who has read the "Provincial Letters" is likely to lose the impression which they make; it may be said without exaggeration that they touch every chord of the human heart, and the sudden transitions from logic and wit to sublime and pathetic eloquence produce an effect which can neither be resisted nor effaced. Pascal's "Pensées, Fragments, et Lettres" are a lasting monument of deep and subtle thought, and have done good work for religion, though even these are marred here and there by Jansenist tendencies. Pascal died young, in 1662. His friend Nicole, also one of the solitaries of Port Royal, wrote chiefly on moral subjects in French which is still esteemed as a model of correct writing. It must be remembered that the work of the Jansenist writers was very far from being wholly evil. Arnauld and his friends defended many Catholic doctrines against the Calvinists, and the elaborate work "Perpétuité de la Foi," by Arnauld and Nicole, is perhaps the very best, as it certainly is the most learned and exhaustive, defence of the Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist. Everyone knows what important contributions the Port Royal Jansenists made to the sciences of logic, grammar, and philosophy, nor is it the least among their many titles to enduring fame that the great historian Tillemont was their pupil.

The Jansenists were not left long in peace. Arnauld's thesis on the distinction between the "question de droit" and the "question de fait" was condemned by the Sorbonne, and he, with sixty other doctors, was expelled from that society. "To-day," he writes to his beloved sister Angélique, "they are erasing my name from the list of doctors, but I hope our Lord will not erase it from the number of His servants." In a Constitution of October 16, 1656, Alexander VII. declared that the Five Propositions were condemned "in the sense of the author," and in 1665 imposed on all ecclesiastical persons the subscription of a "formulary" consisting of a solemn profession so to accept the Papal condemnation. Four bishops,—those of Alet, Angers, Beauvais, and Pamiers—refused to sign except with the evasive distinction between "droit" and "fait." After nearly two years of strife and much intrigue, Clement IX., early in 1669, restored the bishops to his favour, and this step, known as "the peace of Clement," was hailed by the Jansenists as a triumph for themselves and a revocation of past censures. In reality the Pope was led to believe that the bishops had made an unqualified submission. The Jansenists were jubilant again when Innocent XI. in 1679 censured a large number of propositions extracted from the lax casuists. Nobody certainly who reads them will wonder at the scandal and the reaction which lax theology created. What, *e.g.*, is to be said of a writer professedly Christian who held that "frequent confession and communion, even in those who live like heathen, is a mark of predestination" (Prop. 56)?

But the peace of which the Jansenists dreamed did not last. The Flemish bishops, in their zeal against error, had required the "formulary" to be signed with additions of their own. These additions, as well as vague accusations of Jansenism, the Pope forbade in a brief of 1694, but at the same time he did strictly require subscription to the original "formulary," and the condemnation of the Five Propositions "in the obvious sense which they bear." A few months later "the great Arnauld," as his disciples loved to call him, died in the Low Countries, and his friend Nicole followed him the year after. Arnauld's sister Angélique was gone more than thirty years before; the Society of Port Royal des Champs had been scattered, while the nuns had been forbidden to take novices and ordered to dismiss their pupils. It was during our next period, in 1709, that the nuns were all expelled; the convent itself was utterly destroyed in 1710.

4. *Jansenism under Quesnel, down to the publication of the Bull Unigenitus in* 1713.—Pasquier Quesnel was born at Paris in 1634, and ordained priest in 1659. At an early age he had entered the Oratory founded by Cardinal Bérulle, in which Jansenist principles had become dominant, and devoted himself to learned pursuits. In 1671 he published "Moral Reflexions on the Gospels," and in 1675 a learned edition of St. Leo, which was censured by Clement X. On account of his refusal to sign the formulary he was first banished to Orleans, then in

1684 expelled from the Oratory, and finally fled to Brussels, whither Arnauld had gone in 1679. Here he extended his "Moral Reflexions on the Gospels" to Reflexions on the whole of the New Testament. This enlarged work appeared in two editions more and more Jansenist than those of 1687 and 1692. It was in Quesnel's arms that Arnauld died, and to him he entrusted the care of the party. Gerberon, a Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Maur, was Quesnel's companion in prison and exile, and laboured long and zealously in the same cause.

Clement XI. (Pope from 1700 to 1721) issued two bulls against Jansenism, each of which marks an epoch in the controversy. The former of these, the "Vineam Domini," was occasioned by the "Cas de Conscience." In 1701 a Jansenist consulted the Sorbonne on the lawfulness of absolving a dying ecclesiastic who was not convinced that the Five Propositions as condemned by the Church were to be found in the book of Jansenius. Forty doctors, among whom were Dupin and Natalis Alexander, signed a document affirming that absolution should be given. Bossuet's influence led nearly all these doctors (not, however, Dupin) to retract their opinion, and Noailles, archbishop of Paris, ranged himself, after some wavering, on Bossuet's side. Dupin was banished; Quesnel, who had addressed a violent letter to Noailles, was imprisoned by the Archbishop of Malines, but escaped to Amsterdam. In 1705 the Pope, at the instance of the French Court, gave a fresh decision on the matter. In the "Vineam Domini" he renewed the Constitutions of Innocent X. and Alexander VII. and the Briefs of Clement IX. and Innocent XII., and again insisted that Catholics were bound to give full and undoubting assent to the Church's decision on the matter of fact, a "respectful silence" being by no *means* sufficient. In 1711, after difficulties and delays occasioned chiefly by Colbert, archbishop of Rouen, the Pope was satisfied that the French episcopate had accepted the decree.

Worse troubles were in store. Quesnel's "Moral Reflexions" had been proscribed by the Pope in 1708, but the Parliament of Paris objected to any prohibition of French books except by their own authority, and Noailles the weak-minded Archbishop of Paris was swayed by the Jansenist Renaudot (now remembered chiefly for his admirable translation and edition of the Oriental Liturgies, still the classical work on the subject), De la Tour, general of the Oratory, Le Noir, Boileau, and Duguet. The king, however, and many French bishops were waiting anxiously for the Pope to speak out more fully. Fénelon informed him of the way Jansenism spread in France and in neighbouring States. In 1713 the expected answer came from Rome. The bull "Unigenitus" condemned 101 propositions from the later editions of Quesnel's book, and furnished a more complete exhibition of the Church's mind on the controversy than any which had hitherto appeared. Forty-three of the condemned propositions concern grace and predestination; twenty-eight treat of the theological virtues; thirty deal with the Church, with discipline, and with the sacraments. The errors of the first class need not detain us here. As regards those of the second, Quesnel was condemned for holding that all love except the supernatural love of God was evil, that without this love there could be no true hope, observance of the law or religion, that every prayer made by a sinner was sinful. The errors of the third class consisted in Quesnel's assertion that the Church was made up of the elect alone, and that the chief pastors must not excommunicate except with the consent of the whole body; that all without exception should read the Bible; that the faithful at Mass should join their voice to that of the priest;[1] that sinners should not hear Mass at all; that absolution should be deferred till penance had been done. No note was affixed to the particular propositions, some of which plainly are not positively heretical, while others, apart from their context and the spirit by which they are animated, are capable of a good sense. But they are condemned in mass (*in globo*). as respectively false, captious, ill-sounding, scandalous, impious, &c., and even as heretical.

5. *The last Struggles of the Jansenists.*—Quesnel was a very old man when the "Unigenitus" appeared, and he died but a few years later, in 1719. With him the significance of Jansenism as a great theological and literary movement came to an end, for no intellectual leader arose to replace the great men who had passed away. Partly, no doubt, Jansenism lost its youthful vigour by the same law of decay which seems to affect all religious and political parties. Enthusiasm dies out, and with it, to a certain extent, self-sacrifice: men of genius leave no successors. But, besides, it had become very hard for a man of sense to join the Jansenist ranks. It had grown clearer and clearer that the whole teaching authority of the Church had uttered itself against the Jansenist doctrine. Those who had already committed themselves might be content with the evasions to which the later Jansenists had recourse; they might agree that Papal decisions were worthless because a few bishops had not assented to them, or because the vast majority of the episcopate which had assented were deficient in learning, were corrupted by their belief in Papal infallibility, had forgotten to consult the clergy of the second

[1] This seems to be the sense of Prop. 86. Quesnel in this proposition was rather girding at the use of a liturgy "not understanded of the people," and at the recital of "secret" prayers by the priest.

order, &c., &c. They might require an absolute unanimity on the part of the episcopate, or make the Church's infallibility depend on an assent of the laity which could not possibly be ascertained. Scarcely anyone, we say, could accept these evasions except under stress of circumstances, and more logical minds were sure to reason more boldly and consistently, and to reject the Church's authority altogether. Jansenism in its sincere form ended in fanatical superstition. Miracles were supposed to be worked at the tomb of a Jansenist deacon, François de Paris, who died in 1727, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Médard. Accounts of his life and miracles were printed at Utrecht, Brussels, Paris, and Cologne. Crowds made pilgrimages to his grave, and many fell into ridiculous ecstasies and horrible convulsions which gained for the Jansenists the name of "Convulsionnaires." Louis XV. closed the cemetery in 1732. A melancholy end, surely, for the party of Pascal and Arnauld.

But we have been anticipating. Louis XIV., always a determined foe of Jansenism, died in 1715; his great-grandson, Louis XV., was a child of five, and under the Regency freer rein was given to the opponents of the Roman decisions. In 1717 the Bishops of Mirepoix, Montpellier, Boulogne, and Séez notified to the Sorbonne their appeal against the "Unigenitus" to a future council. The "Appellants," as they were called, were supported by the Universities of Rheims and Nantes, by the Sorbonne, although it had previously accepted the Papal bull, by the bishops of Verdun and Pamiers, by Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and practically by the Regent. In 1721 the Bishops of Séez, Boulogne, Montpellier, Pamiers, Macon, Auxerre, Tournay, addressed a letter to the new Pope, Innocent XIII., which he condemned in the following year as schismatical and full of the heretical spirit. In 1723 the assembly of the French clergy besought the king to declare the two bulls, "Vineam Domini" and "Unigenitus," binding laws of Church and State; and in 1727 Soanen, bishop of Séez, was suspended with the Pope's sanction by the provincial council of Embrun and banished. But confusion and strife still prevailed in the French Church. Twelve bishops, headed by Noailles, protested against the sentence of Embrun. However, the beginning of the end was now near, so far as episcopal opposition to the bull went. Noailles recanted in 1728, shortly before his death, and the next year the Sorbonne again accepted the "Unigenitus." These steps were followed in 1730 by a vigorous declaration on the part of the king against the Jansenists.

Here we may close the history of Jansenism as a theological system, for an account is given in separate articles of the Jansenist Church in Holland, and of the council of Pistoia. Unhappily, the spirit of opposition to the Church which Jansenism had aroused was powerful for evil long after Jansenism itself had ceased to be dangerous. From 1731 down to about 1757, the Parliaments inflicted a long series of persecutions on the clergy who, faithful to their duty, refused the sacraments to the Appellants. De Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, was banished from his see because he would not abandon Catholic principles on this point. And even at the beginning of the Revolution which swept the ancient Church and Monarchy of France away, the Jansenist Camus undertook the thankless task of justifying the notorious "Civil Constitution of the Clergy" on theological principles.

(The dogmatic theologians deal with Jansenism in their treatises *De Deo Creante et Elevante* and *De Gratia*. On the subject generally see De Becdelièvre in DAp. (good bibliography) and Forget in "Cath. Enc." The facts in this article are taken from Cardinal Hergenröther's "Church History," vol. iii., which contains a very full account of the enormous literature on the Jansenist controversies.)

JANSENIST CHURCH OF HOLLAND. The revolt of the Dutch Provinces from Spanish rule led to measures of repression against the Dutch Catholics. The Church property was confiscated and the hierarchy overthrown. The first and last Archbishop of Utrecht died in 1580, just before even the public worship of the Catholic religion was forbidden by William of Orange; two successors nominated by Spain could not reach their sees, and, except at Utrecht and Haarlem, the members of the ancient chapters were nearly all dead. Accordingly, in 1583, Gregory XIII. appointed a Vicar Apostolic for the Dutch mission, and in 1597 this dignitary, who of course possessed only a delegated authority, which could be withdrawn at the mere will of the Pope, was subjected to the supervision of the nuncio at Brussels. A step which afterwards led to important results was taken by Philip Roven van Ardensal, Vicar Apostolic of Holland and Archbishop of Philippi *in partibus*. In 1631 he formed the remaining canons of Utrecht, along with certain parish priests and other ecclesiastics, into a collegiate body. We shall speak of this body for the sake of brevity as the Utrecht Chapter, but it must be remembered it had no just claim to the rights and privileges of a cathedral chapter. Later on in the same century, French Jansenists fled to Holland and imbued many of the Dutch Catholics with their principles. Even a Vicar Apostolic, Peter Kodde, consecrated at Brussels in 1689, supported the Jansenist cause, and was suspended by Clement XI. in 1702. Jansenist intrigues led to the banishment of Van Kock, whom the Pope had named Pro-Vicar, from Holland.

Kodde organized a schism, and, when

Rome deposed him altogether, declared that he had been elected Archbishop of Utrecht by the chapter of that see. He refused to sign the formulary of Alexander VII., and died without recantation in 1710. Fifty-two missions and eighty priests fell from Catholic communion, while Quesnel, Gerberon, Petitpied, and other French Jansenists were allowed to labour in the interests of their party by the Protestant government. The Chapter of Utrecht refused obedience to successive Vicars Apostolic, and joined the French Appellants in their resistance to the "Unigenitus." They were able to keep up a supply of schismatical priests by sending their candidates with dimissorials to French Appellant bishops.

In 1723 the Chapter of Utrecht chose Steenhoven, formerly Vicar General, Archbishop of Utrecht, and he was consecrated by Varlet, suspended Bishop of Babylon *in partibus*. Two years later the Pope excommunicated all who took part in this act, and the great canonist Van Espen, who defended its legality, had to leave Louvain in consequence. Altogether, Varlet consecrated no fewer than four Archbishops of Utrecht, all of them excommunicated by Rome, and when he himself died, Meindarts, the last archbishop whom he consecrated, established the schismatical bishopric of Haarlem in 1742, and that of Deventer in 1752. In 1763 Meindarts held a synod at Utrecht and sent the acts to Rome, where of course they were rejected. Meindarts' successor was consecrated by the schismatical Bishop of Haarlem, and so the succession of bishops and priests has been maintained down to our own day. But the schismatics have been constantly diminishing, and the Bishop of Deventer is obliged to officiate as a parish priest, not having any Jansenists in his diocese. The Dutch Jansenists, who call themselves "Old Roman Catholics of Holland," now number about 8000 souls. They protested against the definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and the Papal Infallibility in 1870, and they attracted some notice when Loos, so-called Archbishop of Utrecht, consecrated Dr. Reinkens bishop for the German "Old Catholics." They are completely overshadowed by the great and flourishing Catholic Church of Holland. Since 1851, when Pius IX. restored the Dutch hierarchy, there has been a real Archbishop of Utrecht, with Bishops of Haarlem, Hertogenbosch, Breda, and Roermond.

The Dutch Jansenists are in many ways an interesting body. Unlike most other sects, they remain just where they were on their separation from Rome. They have retained valid orders, the celibacy of the clergy, the Mass and other services in Latin. They are known in Holland as old-Roman (oud-Roomsch), for they profess to be not only Catholics but Roman Catholics, and they acknowledge the Pope as the visible head of the Church, out of which there is no salvation, and one of their synods condemned the doctrine that the schismatic Greeks are part of the Church of Christ. The Blessed Sacrament is reserved in their churches. The writer of this article has carefully read recent editions of their prayer-book, corresponding to our "Garden of the Soul," their popular catechism and their hymn-book, procured for him by the kindness of a friend, and has found them to be exactly, or almost exactly, like English Catholic books of the same sort, or, to speak more accurately, like what our English Catholic books were some fifty years ago, before many modern devotions were introduced. Thus, in a short summary of belief appended to a sort of layman's Missal, published at Utrecht in 1879, the unity of the Church under the Pope, the seven Sacraments, the duty of prayer for the souls in Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and especially of the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God and of all Christians, are taught just in the language familiar to us. The "Hail Mary" occurs in the morning and evening devotion, and two hymns are addressed to the Blessed Virgin in the hymn-book. The Ordinary of the Mass is given in Dutch, though of course the priest recites it in Latin. We have been unable to discover any trace of heresy in these books. The Jansenists, we believe, as a rule, practise their religion by hearing Mass, going to confession, &c., and are under strict discipline, absolution being sometimes deferred for a very long time. The friend already referred to was told by the Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht that conversions of Jansenists to Catholicism are very rare. He himself had known of only one instance at Utrecht during a ministry of nearly fifty years in that city. (See Allmang, "L'Église Janséniste d'Utrecht"; Malet "L'Église Vieille-Catholique d'Utrecht"; Van Aken, "Le Schisme Janséniste de Hollande.")

JANUARIUS, ST., MIRACLE OF. Januarius, Bishop of Benevento, was beheaded for the faith near Puteoli (Pozzuoli) in the persecution of Diocletian, and his relics after a time were removed to Naples. In the great church there are preserved his head and some of his blood, which, as his Acts relate, was gathered up from the ground by a poor woman at the time of the martyrdom, and enclosed in two small glass phials (*ampullae*) of peculiar construction. On several occasions it is recorded that his relics were carried in procession during eruptions of Vesuvius, and that danger was averted from the city. The celebrated standing miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius consists in this: that when the dried-up, congealed blood in the phials, which is ordinarily hard and solid and in several pieces, is brought near to the head (the phials, or one of them, being placed on the altar, and prayer being made to God), the

blood, after a longer or shorter interval, is usually seen to become liquid and flow, and bubbles to arise on its surface. Among many other eye-witnesses, the learned and gifted Picus of Mirandola says: "I saw that blood with my own eyes ... when the head was brought near to it, grow red, melt, and bubble up as if it had been newly shed from the veins." (See the "Commentarius Praevius" in the Acta SS., vol. vi., of September, where the whole question is fully discussed; "Catholic Magazine," July, 1831; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Cavène in DAp. and "Le Célèbre Miracle de S. Janvier à Naples et à Pozzoles.")

JAPANESE CHURCH. [See MISSIONS.]

JERONYMITES (HIERONYMITAE). The example of St. Jerome, who spent four years in the Syrian desert, wrestling with the powers of evil and his own irregular thoughts, was followed by great numbers of holy men in the Middle Ages, who passed under the general name of Hermits of St. Jerome or Jeronymites. Hélyot, the historian of the Monastic Orders, distinguishes four Congregations of Jeronymites, of which the firstw as incomparably more important than the others. These are—

1. The Hermits of Spain. Disciples of the Blessed Thomas of Siena, a brother of the third order of St. Francis, passing into Spain about the middle of the fourteenth century, lived at first like hermits, but, afterwards deciding for the coenobitic life, were approved in 1374 by Gregory XI., who gave them the rule of St. Austin. Ferdinand de Guadalajara was their first prior; his convent at St. Bartholomew de Lupiana in Castile was always regarded as the principal house of the order. Another division of these hermits from Italy settled in Valencia, adopted the life in common about the same time as their brethren in Castile, and in the course of time founded several convents, the fame of which spread through Europe. These were (1) Our Lady of Guadalupe in Estremadura (of which we shall speak presently); (2) that commonly called St. Just, but more accurately the convent of St Jerome at Yuste, near Placencia, to which Charles V. retired after his abdication; (3) St. Laurence of the Escorial, near Madrid, built and adorned on a majestic plan by Philip II.; and (4) Belem, near Lisbon, the burial-place of the royal family of Portugal. Of the magnificent convent of Our Lady of Guadalupe, famous for its wonder-working image, Hélyot, writing early in the eighteenth century, says: "The house is so large and spacious that when Philip II. passed by it in 1560 on his way to the war of Granada with the Archduke Rodolph, afterwards Emperor ... these princes resided there for twenty days with all their court, without causing the least inconvenience to the monks, who are a hundred and twenty in number ... The alms received are very considerable, and serve for some portion of the maintenance of the large number of religious, of a seminary of forty clerical students, who are here taught the humanities and the exercises of a clerical life, of two hospitals for men and women adjoining the monastery, and of a great number of servants and workmen in all kinds of trades. The hospital for men is served by more than forty attendants, and that for women by an equal number of Oblates; and without counting the pilgrims, of whom as many as two thousand sometimes arrive in a day, and who are entertained during three days in the convent, the establishment feeds more than seven hundred persons daily."

In 1415, when the first chapter general was held, there were twenty-five houses of Jeronymites in Spain and Portugal.

2. The Hermits of the Observance, or of Lombardy. This branch of the Jeronymites was founded by the prior Lope de Olmedo, who, not being able to persuade his monks at Guadalajara to give up certain relaxations, went to Rome (1424), and, being cordially received by Martin V., ultimately established in Lombardy and other parts of Italy a flourishing congregation of Jeronymites, whose chief house was at Ospitaletto, near Lodi. In Hélyot's time this Congregation had seventeen houses in Italy. It still exists, and in 1910 had eight houses, of which the chief is S. Onofrio, near St. Peter's in Rome. (See the "Annuario," and other official catalogues of religious.)

3. The Hermits of the Blessed Peter of Pisa. Pietro Gambacorti, born in 1355 of a noble Pisan family, quitted the world about 1377, and lived as a hermit at Montebello in Umbria. Many joined him; he made his followers practise a very austere rule, and formed them into a congregation under the patronage of St. Jerome. When Hélyot wrote, there were forty houses of this order in Italy, besides a few in Tyrol and Bavaria.

4. The Hermits of Fiesole. The founder of this branch, Carlo di Montegraneli, was born about 1340. They were suppressed by Clement IX. in 1668, along with the Jesuats.

(Hélyot, "Hist. des Ordres Monastiques.")

JERUSALEM. [See HOLY PLACES.]

JERUSALEM, LITURGY OF. [See LITURGIES, p. 529.]

JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF. The first bishop of Jerusalem was James the Less, who was appointed by the Apostles (Euseb. "H.E." ii. 23). After his death the Apostles and disciples of Christ chose Simeon, son of Clopas, a relation of our Lord, to fill the vacant see (Euseb. "H.E." iii. 11). It is a natural inference from the words of Hegesippus (Euseb. "H.E." iii. 32) that Jerusalem at that time had a prominence over all the churches in Palestine, which were, like the church of Jerusalem itself,

mostly composed of Jewish Christians. Things were entirely altered when Hadrian punished the Jewish revolt by the destruction of the holy city, and replaced it (A.D. 130) by Aelia Capitolina. The old Judaeo-Christian community was scattered; Hadrian made it an offence for a Jew to enter the new city built on the site, or rather part of the site, of Jerusalem, so that there was no hope of fresh converts from Judaism, and a series of gentile bishops began, of whom Mark was the first (Euseb. "H.E." v. 12). The church of Aelia Capitolina was subjected to that of Caesarea, partly because of the civil prominence which belonged to the latter, partly because it could claim a connection with the Apostles (there St. Peter had baptized Cornelius) and an antiquity to which the new church of Aelia Capitolina could not pretend. The very name of Jerusalem fell out of use till after the Nicene Council.

Still it was impossible to ignore entirely the associations connected with Jerusalem. Towards the end of the second century Eusebius ("H.E." v. 23) tells us that the bishop of Aelia presided along with (and no doubt as second in rank to) the bishop of Caesarea at Palestinian synods, and we can see how near the two sees stood in rank from the fact that Eusebius, in giving a list of bishops, mentions the bishop of Aelia once before ("H.E." v. 25) and once after (*ib.* 22) the bishop of Caesarea. The letter of the Synod of Antioch in 269 is subscribed first by Helenus of Tarsus, next by Hymenaeus of Jerusalem, while the name of Theotecnus of Caesarea holds only the fourth place. (Euseb. "H.E." vii. 30; cf. 22.)

The interpretation of the seventh Nicene canon, which treats of the ecclesiastical rank of Jerusalem, has given rise to much discussion, and it is impossible to be certain about its meaning. These are its words: "Since a custom has prevailed and an ancient tradition that the bishop in Aelia should be honoured, let him have the next place of honour (*τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς*), its proper dignity being secured to the metropolitan church (*τῇ μητροπόλει*)."[1]

There can, we think, be no reasonable doubt, though a question has been raised on the point, that the metropolitan church is that of Caesarea. But what are we to understand by the words *ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς*? The "next place," De Marca replies, after the three great sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, mentioned in the previous canon, the precedence, however, being one of honour merely, and the bishop of Aelia remaining subject in actual jurisdiction to the metropolitan of Caesarea. Beveridge, on the other hand, will not hear of an honorary patriarch subject to a metropolitan, and supposes the meaning to be that the bishop of Aelia is to rank next the metropolitan of Caesarea. He is to be the first of his suffragan bishops, just as in the Anglican Church the bishop of London holds the first rank as dean of the province after his metropolitan of Canterbury.

Beveridge is probably right, and his theory is confirmed by the fact that for some time afterwards the two bishops struggled for pre-eminence with alternate success. Soon after the Nicene Council Maximus of Jerusalem held a Palestinian synod in favour of Athanasius, without reference to the authority of Caesarea, though he was blamed for this assumption of power (Socrat. ii. 24). At the Second General Council Cyril of Jerusalem signs before Thalassius of Caesarea. On the other hand, Eulogius of Caesarea presided in 415 at the Synod of Diospolis, although John of Jerusalem was present. Moreover, although Juvenal of Jerusalem took a very prominent part at Ephesus in 431, and signed immediately after the bishop of Alexandria (the bishop of Caesarea was absent), still Cyril resisted Juvenal's attempt to obtain conciliar recognition of his authority over Palestine, and begged the Pope to interfere (Leo, Ep. 62). At the seventh session of Chalcedon (October 26, 451) Maximus of Antioch declared that after long strife with Juvenal he had at last consented to cede the three Palestinian provinces to Jerusalem—an arrangement which was approved by the council and the Papal legates.

The patriarchate of Jerusalem was severed like the other Eastern patriarchates from the unity of the Church by the Greek schism. The city was rescued from the Mahometans by the Crusaders in 1099; a Latin ecclesiastic—Dagobert, archbishop of Pisa—was appointed patriarch, and the hierarchy was reorganized. After the Christian defeat at Gaza in 1244, and the consequent capture of Jerusalem by the Sultan of Egypt, the Latin patriarchate became little more than a nominal dignity, and Nicolas de Anapis, a Dominican and Roman penitentiary, appointed by Pope Nicolas IV. in 1288, was the last Latin patriarch down to our day who resided in Palestine (Fleury, livr. lxxxviii. c. 49). In the Decree of Union (Florence, 1439), the Greek patriarchate of Jerusalem was again united to the Church and recognized as holding the fifth place after Rome, but the union only lasted a few years. Pius IX. gave Jerusalem a resident Latin patriarch, Joseph Valerga (1847–1872). The present patriarch is Mgr. Camassei. There is no Greek Catholic patriarch of Jerusalem. The United Greeks or Melchite Catholics of this patriarchate are subject to the patriarch of Antioch. He is represented by a vicar who is a bishop *in partibus* and resides at Jaffa.[1] (Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus,"

[1] Silbernagl, *Kirchen des Orients*,

tom. 3; Hefele-Leclercq, vol. i. p. 569, on the 7th canon of Nicaea, and vol. ii. p. 735, on Chalcedon; Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," pp. 25-28, 288-290.)

JESUATS. A congregation founded by St. John Colombini, and confirmed by Urban V. in 1367. Colombini was a native of Siena, and had held the highest offices in that republic; but being converted entirely to God by accidentally reading the Life of St. Mary of Egypt, he, with his wife's consent, embraced a life of continence, turned his house into a hospital, preached frequently, and delighted to humble himself to the condition of the poorest and most miserable. He soon had a ring of fervent disciples around him. Proceeding to meet Urban V., who was coming from Avignon to Rome, in 1367, the new society is said to have been called the "Gesuati" by children, who noticed how, as they walked, they continually repeated "Viva Gesù!" Alexander VI. obliged them to add to the name Jesuats, "of St. Jerome." Urban V. confirmed them in 1367, and gave them a white habit and hood, with a large brown mantle, and wooden shoes. For more than two centuries it was a strictly lay order, but Paul V. (1606) permitted them to receive Holy Orders. In many of their houses they practised pharmacy and distillation, and sold the alcoholic liquor which they manufactured; hence they came to be known as the "Aquavitae Fathers." For this and other reasons Clement IX., in 1668, deemed it advisable to suppress the order. (Hélyot.)

JESUITESSES. Isabel Rosella, a pious lady of Barcelona, assisted St. Ignatius greatly with her alms when he was studying at that city in preparation for a university career. She, with two companions, came to Rome, where the saint then was, in 1545, and entreated him to take the direction of them, and allow them to live by the Jesuit rule. St. Ignatius thought himself bound, in gratitude for her former kindness, not to refuse her request; but he soon found that the direction of these three women took up an unduly large proportion of his time, and he obtained from Paul III., in 1547, an order that the Company should not undertake the direction of nuns. "When certain women in Flanders and Piedmont afterwards assembled in houses under vows [1] and this rule, and called themselves Jesuitesses, their institute was abolished by Urban VIII., in 1633, the end and exercises of this society not suiting that sex." (Alban Butler, July 31.) (See INSTITUTE OF THE B.V. MARY.)

JESUITS. The annals of this great order, and the life of its founder, have been so frequently written that the general outlines of both are familiar to most persons. St. Ignatius Loyola, born in 1491, of a noble family in Biscay, and trained to the military profession, received a severe wound in the leg while defending Pampeluna against the French in 1521. During his slow recovery he called for books to amuse him; romances were brought, and also a volume of "Lives of the Saints." Reading this last, at first carelessly, but afterwards with ever-increasing interest, Ignatius recognized the heroism of the true servants of God, and saw how much their glory, being founded on the abasement of the Cross, transcended what till then he had been accustomed to call so. When he had sufficiently recovered, he broke with his former life, embraced poverty and mendicancy, confessed himself to a Benedictine of Montserrat, and passed a novitiate of sublime but terrible trial in the cave of Manresa. Gradually the thought of founding an order, which should support the Chair of Peter, menaced by the German heretics, sustain, by example, preaching, and education, the cause of the Gospel and Catholic truth, and carry the light of Christ to the heathen, rose into clearness in his mind. But to carry out all this he must become a priest; the soldier must turn himself into a clerk. With unfailing patience he laboured to obtain the necessary knowledge. After being driven from two Spanish universities, because his efforts to influence the students caused him to be esteemed a mischievous fanatic, he went to the University of Paris, and there completed his studies. Here it was that he made the acquaintance of a number of remarkable men, chiefly Spaniards, with whom being made one in heart and spirit, he understood that it was now possible to carry out the project which he had long cherished. He conducted them first through the "Spiritual Exercises," which he had composed at Manresa. [See EXERCISES.] On the feast of the Assumption, in 1534, in the church of Montmartre at Paris, Ignatius and his companions,[1] after they had all received Communion from Peter Faber, who was then the only priest among them, pronounced the vow which constituted the order. Its tenor was, "to renounce the world, to go to preach the gospel in Palestine, or, if they could not go thither within a year after they had finished their studies, to offer themselves to his Holiness to be employed in the service of God in what manner he should judge best."[2] Ignatius then passed into Spain, partly on medical advice, to recruit his wasted health by breathing the air of his native hills, partly to transact some necessary business for those of his companions who were Spaniards. It was agreed that they should all meet at Venice in January 1537. Before that time

[1] Vows self-imposed, according to Hélyot.

[1] Their names were: Francis Xavier, James Laynez, Alphonsus Salmeron, Nicholas Bobadilla—Spaniards; Simon Rodriguez, a Portuguese; and Peter Faber, a Savoyard.

[2] Alban Butler, July 31.

three others had joined the society—Claude le Jay of Savoy, Codure of Dauphiné, and Pasquier Brouet of Picardy. His followers travelled on foot from Paris, in the winter of 1536, and through much danger and hardship made their way to Venice at the appointed time; Ignatius had come from Barcelona by sea. While at Venice, they occupied themselves in preaching and serving in the hospitals. In the summer, after sending the others to preach and labour in various towns of North Italy, Ignatius, taking with him Faber and Laynez, set out for Rome. At La Storta, not far from the Eternal City, while praying in a wayside chapel, he fell into an ecstasy; he seemed to see the Almighty Father, who commended him to His Son; Christ at the same time said to him "I will be favourable to you at Rome."[1] Before the parting he had told his followers that, if asked to what congregation they belonged, they should say that they were of the Company of Jesus. The Pope (Paul III.) gave Ignatius a cordial reception and commissioned Faber and Laynez to lecture on divinity at the Sapienza, the Roman University. The Holy Father doubtless felt the full significance of the adhesion of such a band at such a crisis. The huge fabric of the German empire was in wild confusion; the king of England, saluted by his predecessor, not twenty years before, as "defensor fidei," had just destroyed six hundred monasteries, and stopped all intercourse between his kingdom and Rome; France was unquiet; Sweden lost. At this moment a company of devout combatants, disciplined alike in mind and will, serving under a leader every lineament of whose face bespoke force and majesty, but all under the strictest control, offered themselves to the Pope, to do service of whatever kind and against whatever adversary he might appoint. The encouragement which he received led Ignatius to set earnestly to work at framing the constitution of the new order. As might be expected from the man and the times, a military and monarchical spirit pervaded them. He resolved to establish in his order "a general whom all, by their vow, should be bound to obey, who should be perpetual, and his authority absolute, subject entirely to the Pope, but not liable to be restrained by chapters."[2] He also determined to prescribe a fourth vow—that of going, without question or delay, wherever the Pope might think fit to send them for the salvation of souls. As to property, he resolved that the professed fathers of the society should possess no real estates or revenues, either individually or in common, but that colleges might enjoy revenues and rents, for the maintenance of students of the order and the advancement of learning. He summoned all his followers to Rome, and at last, in 1540, was able to lay the programme and constitutions of the new order before the Pope, who, after the opposition raised by some of the cardinals had been overcome, solemnly confirmed them by the bull (dated Sept. 27, 1540) "Regimini militantis ecclesiae." The bull recites and approves the "form of life" which had been devised by the founder for those who should join his institute. Preaching, spiritual exercises, works of charity, teaching the catechism, and hearing confessions were to be their employments. The general or prelate to be chosen was to decide on the work to be done by each individual member, and to frame any new constitutions that might be needed, with the consent of his associates. Before admission, all were to undergo a long probation.

The Society being thus confirmed, the members met for the election of a general, and Ignatius was unanimously nominated. He refused at first, but afterwards yielded, and entered upon the office in April 1541. The constitutions, which were wholly composed by the saint, and in his native tongue, were translated into Latin by Polanco, his secretary, and first published in 1558. In them his aims and ideas, and the chief methods by which he hoped to realize them, are clearly set forth. He desired to "stand on the ancient ways," to teach men that they could not safely do otherwise, and thus prevent new defections. Novelty, curiosity, ambition, and self-indulgence were all on the side of Protestantism; if they were to be resisted effectually, it could only be by using the same weapons of which the temper had been tried against the Caesarism of the Romans, and the idolatry of the barbarians. This weapon was the personal sanctification of the defenders of Catholic truth. The holiness of St. Anthony and the hermits won the battle for Christ in the third century. When St. Aidan began to convert the Angles of Northumbria, he established himself and his monks in a remote island, so that monastic piety might not be interrupted in its daily duties and sanctifying discipline, never relax its hold on those who were preaching Christ to the heathen. Similarly St. Ignatius, instead of writing a great book, settles a round of spiritual exercises which he and his followers are to go through before attempting anything serious. His aim is to sanctify the soldiers, that by them he may sanctify the world. The rules which he prescribes are partly drawn from the contemplative life (*e.g.* mental prayer, examination of conscience, pious reading, frequentation of the sacraments, retreats), partly suited to form men of action. He gives no particular habit to his followers, because he designs them to live in the world and to be continually mixing with it, that they may overcome its evil, while remaining

[1] "Ego vobis Romae propitius ero."
[2] Alban Butler, July 31.

interiorly separate from it. None are to be received who have worn the habit of another order. The postulant must renounce his own will, his family, and all that men hold most dear on earth. The vows could not be taken before the age of thirty-three. A Jesuit must canvass for no office, and take no ecclesiastical dignity unless constrained by the Pope on pain of mortal sin. Six grades of membership are described: (1) novices, (2) formed temporal coadjutors, (3) approved scholastics, (4) formed spiritual coadjutors, (5) the professed of the three vows, (6) the professed of the four vows. These distinctions are observed to this day, but the professed of the four vows form only a small class; the professed of both grades and the spiritual coadjutors form not quite one half of those whom the world calls "Jesuits."

It should be observed that the name by which they are commonly known was given to them by their enemies, or by the people, not assumed by themselves. Till 1600 they never called themselves anything else but the "Company of Jesus."

Among the generals there have been Spaniards, Italians, Germans, Poles, and Belgians, but never a Frenchman.

Already in 1563 the usefulness of the new society must have been signally manifest, for the Council of Trent in that year, while laying down general rules about novices, declares that it intends not to make any change which should prevent "the religion of the clerks of the Society of Jesus from being able to serve the Lord and His Church according to their pious institute approved by the holy Apostolic See." [1]

St. Ignatius, after having founded the German College at Rome, and assisted in founding the great "Collegio Romano," having lived to see the fruit of his labours—his order being solidly established in many countries of Europe, and engaged in successful missions among the heathen in Asia, Africa, and America—passed to his reward in 1556. The following brief sketch of the subsequent history of the Society arranges events under the names of the generals down to the death of Aquaviva; and, from that point to the suppression of the Society, under the principal countries and missions in which its influence was exerted. Some of the more prominent successes and reverses which it has experienced since 1814 are all that our limits will allow us to give of its history subsequent to the re-establishment.

1. Father James Laynez, who had assisted as a theologian at the deliberations of the Tridentine Council, succeeded St. Ignatius in 1558. The chief event of his rule was his visit to Paris in 1561, on which occasion he confronted the representatives of the Huguenots at the Conference of Poissy, and did much to overcome the opposition which the Paris parliament had hitherto made to the admission of the Society. The parliament did in fact ratify in 1562 the royal edicts of Henry II. and Francis II., granting permission to the Company to erect a college in Paris. During this and the two following generalates the progress of heresy in Germany was stopped, and much lost ground recovered, by the labours of the Jesuits, among whom the Blessed Peter Canisius was pre-eminent. This great man won the affection of the powerful archbishop of Augsburg, Otto Truchsess, who made over to the Society the University of Dillingen. They had already, in 1556, obtained a firm footing in the Bavarian university of Ingolstadt, whence they extended their efforts to other parts of Germany. The favourite calumny of the German Protestants, that the Catholic Church was hostile to learning, received an effectual practical refutation through the Jesuit colleges, in which all subjects—humanities, philosophy, the sciences, &c.—were taught according to the newest methods, and more skilfully and energetically than elsewhere.

Meantime missions to the heathen were carried on with much success. The first Jesuit mission in India had been founded by St. Francis Xavier, who landed at Goa in 1542, and by his preaching and miracles converted great numbers of the inhabitants of Travancore, the Fishery Coast, and Madura. Afterwards he carried the Gospel to Celebes and the Spice Islands, and (1549) established a flourishing church in Japan. The saint died on the island of Sancian, near Macao, in 1552, while endeavouring to penetrate into China. The field of the missions was tilled by many different orders, among which the Company certainly was not the least zealous. Father de Nobrega had been sent to Brazil by St. Ignatius himself, and had made a good commencement; we shall presently see by what a strong and holy hand the work was continued. By 1560 the Society had extended its activity in every direction; Melanchthon, as he lay on his deathbed in that year, is reported to have said "Alas! What is this? I see the whole world being filled with Jesuits." Laynez died in 1565.

Under the rule of St. Francis Borgia, the third general, a relation of the Emperor Charles V. (1565–1573), the advance of the Society was uninterrupted. St. Pius V. was dissatisfied with the exemption from the obligation of saying the office in choir which the order possessed under the constitutions, and was inclined to insist on a change. But the fathers presented a memorial in which it was shown that the existing regulation was the result of profound meditation on the end and means of his institute on the part of the founder; St. Francis himself, with a respectful firmness, supported this view,

[1] Sess. xxv. c. 16, De Reg. et Mon.

and the Pope gave way. Affairs prospered in Germany; Austria and Bavaria, where heresy had nearly got the upper hand, remained on the whole true to the ancient faith. Canisius founded colleges at Würzburg, Olmütz, and Wilna. The Duke of Bavaria, in the decree founding a Jesuit college at Landshut, declared that "certainly it was to this Society that Bavaria owed the re-establishment of the faith of her ancestors, that had been shaken by the calamities of the times." The present church of the Gesù at Rome was begun in 1567. St. Charles Borromeo warmly befriended the Society in his archdiocese of Milan, founding (1572) a novitiate for them at Arona at his own expense. How dangerous the order was felt to be to the progress of Protestantism was shown by a terrible event in 1570. A Portuguese ship bound for Brazil, in which were F. Azevedo, of the Society, and thirty-nine companions, mostly novices, was attacked by a French privateer commanded by the Calvinist Jacques Sourie, of Dieppe. After a brave resistance the Portuguese vessel was overpowered; the sailors who were left alive were spared, but the Calvinists put all but one of the Jesuits to death. A somewhat similar incident happened the next year, and resulted in the murder of twelve Jesuits, of whom the chief was F. Francis de Castro, by the Huguenot captain, Capdeville, and his crew.

Under the fourth general, F. Mercurian, a Belgian (1573–1580), the genius of the great Bellarmine began to show itself; he was engaged for several years before 1577 in combating the errors of Baius, a doctor of Louvain. The members of the Society, who in 1565 had numbered 3500, distributed among 130 houses, in eighteen provinces, amounted in 1580 to upwards of 5000, divided among twenty-one provinces.

Under the prudent but energetic rule of Aquaviva (1581–1615) the prosperity and reputation of the Society were at their height. Enterprises formerly begun developed themselves now with great rapidity and brilliancy, and new undertakings, the fame of which still resounds through the world, were commenced. The Roman College, which in 1555 had but 200 students, in 1584 had grown into a flourishing university, with more than 2000 students, in which all the faculties but those of law and medicine were worthily represented. The ideas of St. Ignatius on the methods of instruction were worked out by Aquaviva into a systematic *ratio studiorum*, of which the chief feature was the thorough mastery which it aimed at giving to all their scholars over the Latin language. In the mission field, we find that extraordinary progress was made in Japan, where the Christians, who numbered but 200,000 in 1588, were 750,000 in 1612, most of these being Jesuit converts. In Brazil the work of F. de Nobrega was carried on for forty-four years by the Ven. Joseph Anchieta, of the Society, who instituted native settlements much resembling the later and more celebrated Paraguayan "reductions," and has been called the Apostle of Brazil. The Jesuit missions in India, which had languished or been retarded for a time, passed into a new phase on the arrival of F. Robert de' Nobili, in 1605. Nobili thought [MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN] that ideas of caste, being grounded in the very structure of Hindoo society, should be temporarily complied with, so far as was lawful, by the ambassadors of Christ. Accordingly he assumed the dress and manners of a Brahmin, and kept aloof from the inferior castes, making after a time many conversions. He died many years later (1656), and his tomb, near Madura, is still an object of popular veneration. A breach was made about this time in the heathenism of China by the success of F. Ricci and his followers. Ricci was a sound mathematician, and skilled in mechanics; and when, after twenty years' residence in China, he succeeded (1601) in making himself known to the emperor at Pekin, he soon obtained his confidence, and made the favour extended to him on account of his scientific acquirements contribute more or less to the spread and protection of Christianity. Ricci died in 1610, but was succeeded by missioners not less able and zealous—Schall, Verbiest, Gerbillon, and Bouvet. Of the differences which arose between the Jesuit and Dominican missionaries in China, something will be said in the next section. F. Valdivia carried the gospel to the Indians of Chili in 1593; a harbour, a city, and a peak of the Andes immortalise the name of the intrepid missionary. The first Paraguayan "reduction" was made in 1610, but of this great civilising enterprise a connected view must be reserved for the article on MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN.

In Europe generally the progress of the order was maintained in peace; but complications arose at three principal points. The Venetian oligarchy, enraged against the fathers because they observed the interdict laid by Pope Paul V. upon the republic in 1606, banished them from Venice; and, although the rupture with the Holy See was repaired soon afterwards, would not readmit the order for fifty years. In France, where the Parliament of Paris was always hostile to the Society, the members of the latter, being charged with complicity in the attempt of Châtel to assassinate the king, Henry IV., were expelled from Paris in 1595. Henry, however, recalled them in 1601, and on that occasion administered a telling reproof to the officials of the Parliament, who had, under the influence of the jealousy which has too commonly actuated French lawyers in regard to ecclesiastics, laid before him a paper full of

ridiculous calumnies against the Company. In England, where Jesuits first arrived in 1580, their pastoral work was attended by greater danger than even in Japan. The Protestant government put to death, under Elizabeth, Fathers Campion, Briant, Southwell, Walpole &c.; and, under James, Father Oldcorne, the two Garnets, and F. Page. These martyrdoms, though unable to produce their full natural effect on account of the terrorism practised by the Government, undoubtedly led to numerous conversions, sustained the wavering faith of many, and powerfully contributed to keep alive the flame of Catholicism in the breasts of a down-trodden but unconquerable minority.

The Company numbered in its ranks at this time some of the finest and strongest minds in Europe: such were Cardinal Bellarmine, Emanuel Sa, Maldonatus, Suarez, Clavius, and Canisius. The saintly life of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, who died in 1591 at the age of twenty-three, reflects a yet purer lustre on their annals. The series of "Lettres Édifiantes et Curieuses," sent by the Jesuit missioners to Europe, commences from this period.

II. 1615–1773. In this section—after a brief survey of the Jesuit missions—the history of the order in Europe, the circumstances which led to its expulsion from various kingdoms and its suppression by Clement XIV. will be related.

In India, De' Nobili, whose method of extending the gospel was approved by a bull of Gregory XV. in 1623, was succeeded by Fathers Fernandez, De Andrada, Blessed John de Britto, Beschi, Bouchet, &c. De Britto was beheaded by the king of Marava in 1693. The question of the Malabar Rites (*q.v.*), which arose about the beginning of the eighteenth century, caused an agitation unfavourable to the progress of the missions. Still, f Southern India and Ceylon are to a great extent Christian countries, it is to these unwearied labours of the Society that the result is chiefly due. The last provincial, Father Anthony Douarte, after the suppression of the order, did not desert his converts, but, dying at a great age in 1788, bequeathed to them a box of papers relating to the mission, which he charged them to give to the future Provincial of the Jesuits in India.

In China, the establishment of the Tartar dynasty at Pekin in 1644 threatened to injure the missions, but the new rulers were at first not unfriendly. The Dominicans had come to China in 1633; they found that the Jesuits tolerated in their converts the continued adherence to certain customs and ceremonies which appeared to savour of idolatry; a protracted controversy arose, which spread from China to Europe. [For an account of these ceremonies see CHINESE RITES.] Clement XI. sent out De Tournon, the patriarch of Antioch, in 1703, to India and China as his legate. Soon after his landing at Goa, De Tournon issued a pastoral in which he unconditionally condemned the Malabar rites. The Jesuits, fearing the effect of the prohibition on the native mind, resolved on appealing to the Holy See, and De Tournon gave his verbal consent to their doing so. From India the legate passed to China, and in 1706 condemned the ceremonies as unfit for Christians to use. The emperor Kang Hi, who had always maintained that they had only a civil meaning, was extremely angry, and gave up De Tournon into the hands of the Portuguese at Macao, by whom he was imprisoned and ill-treated, dying in consequence in 1710. A brief of Clement XI. in 1710, followed by the bull "Ex illa die" in 1715, confirmed the legate's condemnation, first of some, then of all the obnoxious ceremonies. The indignation of Kang Hi was extreme, and the new legate, Cardinal Mezzabarba, perceiving the great difficulty of the case, authorized the Jesuit fathers to make a fresh application to Rome and in the meantime to suspend their obedience to the briefs. The application was vain; Clement XII. confirmed the bull "Ex illa die," and Benedict XIV., by his bull in 1742 (before which the Jesuits are said to have submitted unreservedly), confirmed the decisions of his predecessors, and finally settled the question.

Kang Hi, after a reign of sixty years, died in 1722, and was succeeded by Yung Tchin, who immediately ordered a persecution of the Christians. His son, Khianloung, was a man of singular character; political and personal motives prevented him from embracing Christianity, but he respected and loved the Jesuit fathers, whom he drew to his Court at Pekin, and was especially gratified by the skill with which they ministered to his scientific and artistic tastes. Father Benoist constructed a fountain to please him; other Jesuits made wonderful clocks and automata, or prepared charts, or painted the halls of his palace. Yet he was afraid of allowing Christianity to become powerful in the empire, lest it should open the door to an ascendency on the part of some European nation, similar to what was taking place before his eyes in India. While, therefore, the Jesuits at Pekin were safe and honoured, the Christian communities in many provinces were cruelly persecuted. Eight Jesuits were strangled at Nankin in 1748. The decree of suspension became known at Pekin in 1774. The fathers Amiot, Cibot, Dollières, and others, though wounded to the heart by the ruin of their beloved Society, remained at their posts and there died, Amiot not till 1794. The benevolent dispositions of the emperor towards them were never changed.

In Japan, where the prospects of Christianity had been so bright, all was suddenly overclouded. Taicosama, who seized the supreme power in 1583, commenced a persecution of the Christians, but with no great

malignity or fixity of purpose. Hence, at his death in 1598, the native church was more flourishing than ever. Daifusama, who succeeded him as regent, reigned till 1615. In 1612 an English merchant captain, named Adams, is said to have made the regent believe that the real designs of the Jesuits were political, and that his only safety lay in exterminating them. A terrible persecution was then begun, which Xogun, the son of Daifusama, carried on with demoniacal cruelty and persistency. Before 1640, after scores of thousands of Japanese Christians had suffered martyrdom, and great numbers had apostatized, all public profession of Christianity was stopped, and the Jesuit mission—the missioners having been killed or banished—came to an end. From that time Europeans could only land their goods at one port in Japan, and then after trampling on the cross.

The missions of the Society in North America have been described by an American Protestant,[1] in a tone generally fair and almost sympathetic. Samuel de Champlain, a French naval officer, founded Quebec in 1608; in 1625 Jesuit missionaries arrived there, and, after providing for the spiritual wants of the colonists, began to preach to the Red Indians. The Huron nation proved to be the most tractable: most of them became Christians, and showed considerable aptitude for agriculture and other civilizing employment under the guidance of the fathers. The Iroquois from the south, instigated by the settlers in the British colonies, made war on the Hurons and nearly annihilated them. Fathers Lallemand, Daniel, and Brebeuf were put to death with every species of torture in 1649. The Abenakis, a tribe living on the Kennebec river between Canada and New England, asked for and received baptism in a body. The remnant of the Hurons was gathered round Montreal and Quebec. The treaty which in 1760 transferred the French possessions in North America to Great Britain provided for the maintenance of the Catholic religion in the ceded provinces; hence it is that the Indian and half-caste population of British America, among whose ancestors the Jesuits laboured and suffered, are to this day mainly Catholic. In the early part of the eighteenth century, the Abenakis were in the care of Father Rasles; a body of armed colonists from New England (1724) attacked their settlements on the Kennebec, dispersed the Indians, and butchered the unresisting missionary.[2] In 1673 the Jesuit Father Marquette, making his way to the south-west from Lake Michigan, discovered the Mississippi, which Frenchmen soon descended, and founded the colony of Louisiana at its mouth. The French nation, which first opened the valleys of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, long ago wrested from them by their rivals, realized to the full—history can show no more striking instance—the bitter truth of the adage, *Sic vos non vobis*.

Jesuits assisted Sir George Calvert in founding the Catholic colony of Maryland in 1633.

St. Peter Claver († 1654), a Spanish Jesuit, called the Apostle of the Negroes, spent more than forty years in New Granada, assisting corporally and spiritually the poor Africans whom the Spaniards were bringing over in great numbers at that time to work on the plantations.

Of the Jesuit mission in Paraguay—the most remarkable example of a whole people transformed and exalted through Christianity that has been known since the Middle Ages—an account will be found under MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN. The first "Reduction," or colony, was founded in 1610; in 1717 the Christian Indians in all the Reductions numbered 120,000. A transaction between Spain and Portugal in 1758 caused the transfer of the territory on which the Reductions stood to the latter power; Pombal dispersed the Jesuit teachers; the white settlers, with their selfish greed and indifference to native rights, had everything their own way, and the fair experiment was ruined.

Returning now to Europe, we find that the history of the Society in Italy and Spain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was marked by few striking events. In Germany the fathers devoted themselves with great ardour to the mitigation of the miseries caused by the Thirty Years' War. The Emperor Ferdinand III., and also his general, Count Tilly, had received their education in Jesuit colleges; both of them loved and valued the Society. In Poland an ex-Jesuit ascended the throne in 1648 in the person of John Casimir. In Belgium arose in the seventeenth century the great modern school of hagiographers [BOLLANDISTS], Bollandus publishing the first volume of the 'Acta Sanctorum" at Antwerp in 1643. He and all his coadjutors, Henschen, Papebroch, &c., were Jesuits, and the resumed work is still in the hands of the Society.

In England the penal laws forbade any freedom of action to Jesuits even more than to seculars; yet in 1634 two hundred and fifty members of the Company are said to have been in the kingdom. Father Arrowsmith suffered in Lancashire in 1628; under Charles II. five Jesuits were executed during the panic at the time of the Popish plot. The favour of James II. inspired them with false hope, and led to an extension of operations; colleges began to rise, but these buds were nipped by the "killing frost" of the Revolution. Yet, the laws being now more mildly executed, the fathers in England in 1700 numbered 131; and this number probably

[1] Samuel Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*. See also the able work of the Jesuit Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*.

[2] Henrion, *Hist. Gén. des Missions*, iii. ch. 36.

did not vary much down to the suppression.

In Ireland, the barbarous tyranny of the government under Elizabeth and James I. was replaced in the next reign by a somewhat easier state of things. The Jesuits on the mission, who had before 1620 been attached to the houses of the Catholic nobility, after that date were able to live in a more regular way, and in a short time they had eight colleges and residences. But, as the Vandal heretics extinguished civilization in Roman Africa, so the renascent well-being and culture of Ireland were uprooted by the Puritan invaders under Cromwell. Amidst an infinite number of other calamities which then fell on the country, the Jesuit colleges were destroyed and the mission broken up. In 1713 there were but eleven Jesuits in all Ireland, with Father Knowles as their superior; and these could only exercise their ministry in secret. A few continued to labour there till 1773.

The fortunes of the order in France, Spain, and Portugal have still to be noticed. In France the success of the fathers in education was remarkable. The Collège de Clermont, founded in 1562, changed its name to "Collège de Louis le Grand," and towards the end of the seventeenth century numbered 2500 scholars. In the confessional, the fathers were charged with letting off too easily such of their penitents as desired to conciliate the claims of the world and the flesh with those of the Gospel. They were said to be lax casuists; and on this ground Pascal attacked them (1656) in his celebrated "Lettres Provinciales." On the struggle between them and the Jansenists and on the Quesnel controversy see the article JANSENISM. With the declaration of the French clergy in 1682 [GALLICANISM] the French Jesuits had nothing to do; but they incurred the displeasure of Innocent XI. by refusing or neglecting to publish the bull against Louis XIV. on the question of the Regalia, and the Pope forbade them to receive novices. The great preacher Bourdaloue († 1704), and F. de la Colombière, the director of Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, flourished at this time. In the middle of the eighteenth century, a league of many parties and persons was formed for the destruction of the order. The Marquise de Pompadour hated them because they would not countenance in any shape the immoral relations subsisting between her and the king, Louis XV. Voltaire, himself one of their pupils, and not averse to doing them justice on occasion, as many passages in his works prove, desired their extinction as the defenders of revealed religion and the upholders of the purity of private morals. The whole party of the Encyclopaedists and freethinkers were naturally their enemies; the remains of the Jansenist party longed to be revenged on them; the Parliament and university were hostile to them, as they had ever been. Lastly, the Minister, the Duc de Choiseul—who by his blundering had just lost Canada for France—being in sympathy with the freethinkers, was disposed to yield to the clamour which the many ill-wishers of the Company raised, and to induce the king also to yield. In April and August 1762 edicts of the Parliament of Paris closed the Jesuit colleges and declared their order to be inadmissible in any civilized State. The archbishop of Paris, Christopher de Beaumont, put himself courageously on their side, and the secular clergy generally took the same line. Nevertheless, Louis XV. confirmed (November 1764) the edict of the Parliament, and about four thousand Jesuits, their colleges having been closed and their property plundered, were compelled to depart from France.

The fall of the order in Spain was a mysterious event. It was the work of the irresponsible despotism which ruled the country, and which, as it had been swift and stern for ages in repressing whatever was against the Church, so now, being itself perverted, dealt sudden blows that none could parry on the great Company—the creation of Spanish genius—which existed only for the Church's defence and glory. D'Aranda, the Minister of Charles III., is said to have induced him to believe that the Jesuit general, Ricci, had boasted of possessing documents showing that the king was an illegitimate child. The wrathful Charles immediately caused a despatch to be written to all the government authorities in Spain and the colonies, requiring that all the Jesuit fathers should be forthwith conducted to the nearest port, and compelled to take ship for some foreign country. Six thousand Spanish Jesuits were ruined and exiled at a blow, by what can only be regarded as the act of a lunatic.

Previously to this, the order had been despoiled and banished from Portugal by the famous Carvalho, Count de Pombal. Pombal was a man of iron determination, and unscrupulous in the choice of means. In 1750 he had been made Secretary of State to Joseph I., and set himself actively and ably to work to revive the languishing trade and industry of Portugal. He had been Portuguese minister in England for several years from 1739. A mind so observant must have been struck by the docility of the Anglican clergy, and the ease with which, being isolated from the rest of Christendom, they were managed by the Government of the day, and it was probably this experience which led him to form plans for a similar national church in Portugal, separated from the Holy See and the hierarchy. The Jesuits, the sworn defenders of Papal rights, stood in his way; they must therefore be suppressed. Into the intricate history of the plot to assassinate the king, and the manner in which Pombal used it against the Jesuits, besides attacking them in other

ways, it is impossible here to enter. In the end, their property was sequestrated, the University of Coimbra taken out of their hands, and the fathers themselves (1759), to the number of two hundred and fifty-five, banished from Portugal. Clement XIII. vainly pleaded that they might be treated with ordinary justice. On the death of Joseph I. in 1777 Pombal was disgraced, declared a criminal, and forbidden to live within twenty leagues of Lisbon. A new inquiry being ordered into the alleged conspiracy of 1758, those who by Pombal's management had been condemned to death or imprisonment were exonerated from all criminality. From some of these had been extorted by torture the statement that the Jesuits were concerned in the plot; this statement, of course, if the revising tribunal may be trusted, falls to the ground.

The order had been expelled from France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples, but it was still protected in Austria by Maria Theresa. Her son, afterwards Joseph II., used all his influence against them; he was said to covet their estates. Diplomatic pressure was used by all the Courts which had expelled the order to induce Clement XIII. to decree their suppression, but the aged Pope stood firm. On his death in 1769, the Bourbon sovereigns used every effort to secure the election of a Pontiff who would comply with their views. Cardinal Ganganelli was elected and took the name of Clement XIV. He hesitated long before taking the decisive step to which he was urged. At length (1773) he signed the constitution "Dominus ac Redemptor noster," by which, on the ground of the numerous complaints and accusations of which the Society was the object, without declaring them to be either guilty or innocent, he suppressed the order in every part of the world, and directed that those of its members who were priests should fall into the ranks of the secular clergy.

In 1626 the Society had possessed 15,000 members. At the time of the suppression the total number was about 20,000.

Lalande, the astronomer, said of the suppression, "Carvalho and Choiseul have irretrievably destroyed the finest work of man, unrivalled by any human institution. . . . The human race has lost that wonderful and invaluable assembly of 20,000 men, disinterestedly and unceasingly occupied with functions most important and most useful to man."

III. Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, refused to have anything to do with the suppression; he retained the Jesuits in his dominions, and desired them to exercise their teaching and other functions, so far as was possible, as if nothing had happened. Catherine II., Empress of Russia, supported them with so much zeal that the Pope ultimately exempted Russia from the operation of the bull of suppression; novices were received in that country without interruption during the interregnum. Other attempts were made to keep the order alive. [See BACCANARISTS.] In 1814 Pius VII., by the constitution "Solicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum," derogated from the brief of suppression, and appointed Francis Karen, who was then provincial in Russia, general of the whole order. Since the restoration the fortunes of the Society have varied with the varying strength of the infidel and revolutionary forces which from time to time have been opposed to it. In France, where their colleges had been brilliantly successful, an envious agitation was set on foot against them by the University, to which the government of Charles X. weakly yielded and closed their colleges (1828). Under the Second Empire they enjoyed freedom; the Republican Government again (1880) closed their colleges, and denied them the right of corporate and regular existence. They still continued to live and work precariously till the wholesale expulsion of all religious in 1901. In Switzerland they had a noble university at Fribourg, and their influence was great in the Forest Cantons and the Valais. The anarchic and infidel elements in Swiss society, combining with the Protestants and encouraged by Lord Palmerston, raised in 1846 the war of the Sonderbund; the Catholic cantons were crushed by superior numbers, and the Jesuits banished from the Confederacy.

At the present day the total number of members of the Society is believed to be about seventeen thousand. During the course of the Revolution in Italy 1860–1870 they were successively expelled from the various parts of that country until the fall of the Papal States left them no houses in the peninsula. They manage, however, to carry on many works, though they are formally suppressed and forbidden to keep schools. In Rome itself they have charge of the Gregorian University, the Biblical Institute, and the German and Latin-American colleges. In like manner, though they were driven out of Germany during Bismarck's "Kulturkampf" (1872), the German Jesuits have increased in numbers, and have laboured in many lands. Persecution has only served to extend the field of their labours. The Portuguese Republic has followed the example of these greater countries (1910), but with much violence and cruelty.

(It would not be possible in our limits to mention even a tithe of the works on the Society of Jesus. Many are referred to in the following books: Crétineau Joly, "Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus," 1846; "The Jesuits, their Foundation and History," by B. N. (a useful compilation); Ferraris, *Jesu Societas*; Hélyot;

Henrion, "Histoire Générale des Missions"; Bouchot, "Histoire du Portugal"; Duhr, "Jesuitenfabeln"; Brou, "Jésuites de la Légende"; Pollen in "Cath. Enc.")

JESUS (Ἰησοῦς, יֵשׁוּעַ). *Name and Feast of the Name.*—The name means, not, as is often said, "Saviour" or "God the Saviour," but "the Lord [*i.e.* Jehovah] is help or salvation." It is simply a shortened form of Jehoshua (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ), which in the LXX appears as "Jesus," and, according to Delitzsch ("History of Redemption," p. 182), was a common name in post-exilic times. In our Lord's case it had, however, a pre-eminent fitness, because in Him, through the perfect example of His life and through His death, the salvation of God came to the children of men. This name was announced to the Blessed Virgin by the angel, Lk. i, 31, ii. 21, and actually imposed on our Lord at His circumcision. It was His personal, whereas "Christ" was His official, name.

In all ages of course Christians have spoken with devotion of this holy name, and St. Paul's words in the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 9 *sqq.*) will occur to everyone. The devotion received a new impulse and took a tangible form in the fifteenth century. The Franciscan friar St. Bernardine of Siena (d. 1440) used to exhibit before the people to whom he preached a board with the holy name painted on it in the midst of rays, and he persuaded a poor man who used to paint cards and had been ruined by the saint's sermons against gambling to make a living in another way—viz. by painting the holy name. The new devotion was examined before Martin V., prohibited for a time, defended by St. John Capistran, and finally approved by the Holy See. A third Franciscan, Bernardine de Bustis, composed an office of the Holy Name, which he offered for approval to Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII., but without success. At last Clement VII. approved the office for use in the Franciscan order; permission to use it was extended by subsequent Popes to other churches, and at last Innocent XIII., yielding to the prayers of the Emperor Charles VI., on November 29, 1721, ordered the feast to be celebrated throughout the Church on the second Sunday after Epiphany. According to the new calendar it is now kept on the Sunday after the Circumcision. (Bourasse, "Summa Aurea," *Festum nominis Jesu.*)

JEWS, CHURCH LAWS RESPECTING. When Christianity became supreme, we find Constantine publishing restrictive edicts against the Jews, in which it was declared penal for them to insult or injure converts to Christianity, and the adoption of Judaism by those not born to it was forbidden. The Theodosian Code brands the desertion of Christianity for Judaism as apostasy, and the blending together the rites and doctrines of the two as heresy. In Spain, where Jews were numerous, a long series of canons regulating the relations between them and Christians may be quoted from the Acts of the early councils. These were severe in their tenor, for, indeed, the Talmudic Jew, with his intense pride of race, and scorn and hatred of other nations, was a difficult person to deal with. The Fourth Council of Toledo (633), over which St. Isidore of Seville presided, ordered that Jews should be no longer coerced to become Christians, but that those who had been so coerced in the reign of King Sisebut should not, since they had received Christian sacraments, be allowed to return to Judaism. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 274.) This council also ordered that the children of Jews should be separated from them and placed in monasteries, or in pious Christian families, to be instructed in Christianity. This sweeping measure can only have been partially carried out; for at the Eighth Council of Toledo (653) we find the king undertaking to protect the Catholic faith against Jews and heretics, and it is ordered that the decrees of the fourth council respecting Jews should be observed (*ib.* 291). Again, a canon of the ninth council (655) directs that baptized Jews be obliged to repair to the cities on the principal festivals, in order that the bishops might be able to judge of the sincerity of their conversion (*ib.* 294). The Jews in Spain, being through Talmudic influences more in sympathy with Islam than the religion of Christ, assisted the Moors in the eighth century to master the country and destroy the kingdom of the Visigoths.

The Third Council of Orleans (538) made some important canons. It allowed that Christians should be in servitude to Jewish masters; if, however, a Christian slave took sanctuary because his master was tampering with his religion, he was not to be returned to bondage but redeemed at a fair valuation. Jews were not to appear in the streets nor to hold intercourse with Christians on the last three days of Holy Week and Easter Sunday (*ib.* ii. 1159).

In the later legislation, a constitution of Clement XI. ("Propagandae per universum"), another of Benedict XIV. ("Postremo mense"), and an epistle of the last-named Pontiff, are prominently cited. By the first it is provided that, if a Jew become a Christian, the portion of his father's goods falling to him shall not be withheld by the family on account of his conversion. But he is not allowed to disinherit his other brothers, as in the case of that infamous law of the Irish Parliament, according to which, if the younger son of a Catholic landowner became a Protestant, he could take the whole estate, and reduce the rest of the family to poverty.

The following were some of the pre-

scriptions of the ancient law. The Jews in Rome were bound to observe Church holidays so far as their public occupations were concerned. They were required to live together in a particular quarter (the Ghetto). Some distinction of dress, sufficient to show that they were not Christians, was required from both sexes. The word of God was to be preached to them once a week by a master in theology—if possible, one who was versed in Hebrew. The tribunals of the Inquisition were allowed to proceed against Jews only in case of their having made themselves amenable to their jurisdiction by certain definite overt acts. It was lawful for Christian princes to tolerate Jews, their rites and synagogues, within their dominions; and having been once so received and assured of protection, they could not, except for some just and weighty cause, be expelled.

The children of Jews, not having the use of free-will, ought not to be baptized against the will of their parents. A Jewish boy who asks to be baptized, not having attained to the use of reason, is to be given back to his parents, but not otherwise. Infant children of Jews, baptized validly, though illicitly, by a nurse or some other person, must be educated by Christians, and when they have come to the use of reason must be compelled to perseverance in the Catholic faith. Under the operation of this rule arose the celebrated Mortara case, about fifty years ago. Copies of the Talmud are to be searched for and burnt. In justification of this and other severities the canonists are wont to make copious extracts from that extraordinary compilation, which, with much that is grave and noble, contains also so many puerilities, immoral precepts, and anti-social maxims that Christian courts may well have deemed it right to resort to stringent measures to prevent Christians from being seduced into adhesion to a system so preposterous. For illustrations—not to speak of those given by Ferraris,[1] which may not be entirely trustworthy—the reader is referred to the Abbé Chiarini's translation,[2] and to a recent work by Oort.[3] It must not be supposed that the modern Jews are free to reject any part of the Talmud that may displease them. If the Old Testament is the written, the Talmud contains the oral, law of Jehovah; a consistent Jew believes that God speaks to him through the Rabbins as much as through the prophets.[1] Even the legendary part, the "Haggadah," according to the Jewish editor of "Selections from the Talmud" published in the "Chandos Classics," does not stagger them. "The majority of the [Jewish] people," he says, "clung to it, and regarded the Talmud as a complete whole worthy of their reverence."

"The Talmud," says the Abbé Chiarini,[2] "explains the written law by the oral in the name of the Eternal," and the Jews, he declares, have ever valued it highly as "a wall raised between Jews and non-Jews always and everywhere." ("The Jewish Encyclopaedia," in 12 vols.; Gigot in "Cath. Enc."; Kreutzwald in "Kirchenlex."; Ferraris, *Hebraeus.*)

JOAN, POPE. [See ANTIPOPE, p. 37.]

JOHN OF GOD, ST., ORDER OF. St. John of God established his Order of Charity for serving the sick at Granada in 1540. Before the Jacobins had shut the doors of its hospitals in France, and the "Liberals" in Spain, the two generalates of Spain and Italy, into which the order was divided, numbered 2914 religious, with 281 hospitals under their care, in which there were more than 10,000 beds, and an average of 85,000 patients were received and attended to yearly. The brothers of this order are said to have been the first to establish the rule in hospitals that every patient should have a bed to himself. From a minute statement of their system of hospital management, printed by the continuator of Hélyot, it would appear that they practised all the regulations which the *régime* of the best modern hospitals prescribes for the comfort and medical treatment of their patients, and in addition were tenderly solicitous for their souls, urging those to confession who had long discontinued or were disinclined to it, and facilitating the return to God of all the sufferers who passed through their hands. There is a house of the order at Scorton, near Darlington. Pope Leo XIII. made St. John of God patron of hospitals and the dying. (Hélyot, continuation [Migne], iv. 612.)

JOHN OF JERUSALEM, ST., ORDER OF. [See HOSPITALLERS.]

JOSEPH, ST. St. Joseph occupies a place of his own in the devotion of modern Catholics, such as is given to no other saint.

[1] Art. "Hebraeus."

[2] *Le Talmud*, Leipzig, 1831.

[3] *Evangelie en Talmud*, Leiden, 1881.—Oort has been answered by the Dutch Rabbi Tal, *Een blik in Talmoed en Evangelie.* See also the learned works of Martini ("Pugio Fidei"), Amsterdam, 1881. The Catholic work of Rohling, *Der Talmudjude* (1877), is severely handled by Delitzsch, *Rohling's Talmudjude beleuchtet* (1881). A really scientific account of Jewish theology will be found in Weber's excellent work *System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1880). Wagenseil (*Tela ignea Satanae*, 1681) and Eisenmenger (*Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1777) are marred by controversial bias. From them anti-Semitic writers draw their "facts."

[1] The post-Talmudic treatise Sopherim compares the Bible to water, the Mishna to wine, the Gemara to spiced wine. But it would be quite wrong to judge the more educated Jews by the Talmud. A reform was inaugurated by Moses Mendelssohn (d. 1786). A reformed synagogue was founded at Berlin in 1814, in London about 1840, at New York in 1843. The Reformed Jews who reject the divine authority of the Talmud, though they differ much among themselves, many of them being mere Deists, are very numerous in Germany and America. Moreover, the Reform has had great influence on educated Jews who have not openly abandoned the orthodox synagogues. For a history of the Reform, see *The Jews, their Customs and Ceremonies*, by the American Rabbi Myers (New York, 1877). A recent work, *Liberal Judaism*, by Claude G. Montefiore (1903), is full of interest.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 59.

This, and the fact that the history of the devotion is peculiarly instructive on the one hand, and especially liable to misunderstanding on the other, are the reasons for inserting this article in a work which does not profess to give Lives of the Saints. The devotion to St. Joseph is a striking instance of Catholic usage, modern in itself, and yet based on most ancient and Scriptural principles.

The facts of the gospel history concerning St. Joseph need not be repeated except so far as they exhibit his dignity. He was the true husband of Mary, and as such her head. Moreover, Christ Himself (Lk. ii. 51) was "subject" to him. In consequence of his authority and his provident care, he is honoured with the title of the "Father" of Christ (Lk. ii. 48), although of course Christ had no man for His father in the proper sense of the word. To have been chosen by God Himself as the husband of the Virgin Mother and the foster-father of our Lord—these surely are solid grounds for a singular devotion to St. Joseph. We may notice here that, as he is never mentioned after our Lord's public life began, he is supposed to have died before our Blessed Lord, and is therefore reckoned among Old Testament saints.

At the same time, it was long before there was any general manifestation of this devotion. The Monophysite Christians of Egypt are said first to have assigned a festival to St. Joseph, viz. on July 20, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic almanac: "The rest of the holy old man, the just Joseph, the carpenter, husband of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who merited to be called the Father of Christ" (quoted in Smith's "Bible Dictionary" *sub voc.*). In Western martyrologies of the ninth century the name of Joseph is found, and from the same time the Greeks commemorated him along with the other saints of the Old Testament on the Sunday before Christmas, and along with Mary, David, and James the Less on the Sunday in the octave of Christmas (Bolland, Acta Sanct. 19 Martii, in "Comment. praev. ad S. Joseph." § 2). In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries several orders in the West celebrated the feast of St. Joseph on March 19. Still "the feast of St. Joseph," Thomassin says ("Traité des Festes," p. 439), was still unknown (*i.e.* as a feast of the whole Church) in the time of Gerson, who wrote several letters to cause it to be celebrated—one to the Duke of Berry in 1413, another to the cantor of the church of Chartres, another to all the churches. Gemecius, who has written the life of Cardinal Ximenes, testifies that that cardinal "instituted in his church the feast of St. Joseph." St. Theresa and St. Francis of Sales in modern times were zealous in propagating the devotion, and Gregory XV., in 1621, as well as Urban VIII., in 1642, made St. Joseph's day (*i.e.* March 19) a holiday of obligation. Benedict XIII., in 1726, ordered his name to be inserted in the Litany of the Saints and in the Litany used in the "Commendation of the Soul," after that of St. John the Baptist (Gavant. tom. ii. p. 310). In 1871 Pius IX., confirming a decree of the Congregation of Rites, put the whole Church under the patronage of St. Joseph, chose him as the Church's protector, and made his feast a double of the first class. It was fitting that Christians should appeal to him who once protected the human life of our Saviour, and ask his intercession in behalf of Christ's mystical body. The same Pope had in September 1847 extended the feast and office of St. Joseph's Patronage to the whole Church. The Pope required it to be celebrated on the third Sunday after Easter as a double of the second class ("Manuale Decret. S. Rit. Cong." No. 2168). Pius X. afterwards raised the feast to the rank of a double of the first class. According to the new Calendar, the feast of St. Joseph is a double of the second class, and the feast of the Patronage is no longer kept on the third Sunday after Easter. The "Solemnity of St. Joseph," a double of the first class, with an octave, is kept on the second Wednesday after Easter. In other ways the Church has marked her approval of the growing devotion to St. Joseph. The Creed is now said in the Mass of both his feasts; his name is inserted after that of the Blessed Virgin in the prayer "A cunctis"; he is commemorated after her in the Suffrages of the Saints; and his name comes before that of any other patron except the Angels and St. John Baptist. ("Manuale," 3709; Thomson, "Life and Glories of St. Joseph"; Suarez, "Disp. de S. Joseph B.V. Sponso"; Kellner, "Heortology.")

JOSEPH, ST., ORDERS OF. 1. *Josephites.* Two communities bear, or have borne, this name. The first was founded by Jacques Cretenet at Lyons about 1640, with the designation of "Priests of the Mission of St. Joseph"; it was governed by a director-general; its members did not take vows; and it devoted itself chiefly to the foreign missions. At the Revolution it was suppressed. The second is a teaching institute, founded in 1817 at Grammont in Belgium by the Canon Van Crombrugghe, for giving a good education to the sons of persons in the commercial and upper classes. Several houses of the institute have since been founded at various places in Belgium. In England there is a flourishing college at Weybridge.

2. *Lay Hospitallers, Daughters of St. Joseph.* This society, the chief employment of which was the education of orphan girls, was founded at Bordeaux in 1638, under the auspices of the archbishop Henri de Sourdis, by Marie Delpech, who afterwards established

a great house of her order at Paris, called "De la Providence." These daughters of St. Joseph were introduced into many large towns in France, but Hélyot's continuator does not mention whether they survived the Revolution.

3. *Nuns Hospitallers of St. Joseph.* Founded in 1643 at La Flèche, in Anjou, by Mademoiselle de la Ferre. Besides the three vows of religion, these nuns took a fourth vow, to serve the poor. Before the Revolution they had five or six houses, one of which was at Montreal, in Canada.

4. *Nuns of St. Joseph of the Good Shepherd.* This congregation was founded by the bishop of Puy, Henri de Maupas, at the suggestion of the Jesuit Father Médaille, in 1650. Though dispersed at the Revolution, the religious retained the spirit and the love of their institute, and in 1811 they were reorganized under an imperial decree, the mother house being settled at Clermont, in Auvergne. They are noted for their Magdalen asylums, orphanages, and schools. They shared the fate of the other religious institutions when the Associations law decreed their expulsion (1901). Before that date, however, they had long been established in other countries, notably in the United States and Canada, where they have many flourishing houses.

5. *Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph.* This community, which devotes itself principally to teaching, was founded at Mount St. Mary, in the State of Maryland (N. America), in 1807, and had the well-known Mother Seton, a convert, for its first superior.

6. *Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny.* The first efforts of this community, founded by Anne Marie Javouhey, may be traced back to 1807, but it was first formally authorized in 1819, being then established at Autun. The Reverend Mother Javouhey was superior till her death in 1851. She visited all the French colonies in Asia, Africa, and America, besides several of those belonging to England, and resided for a considerable time in some of them. She established her sisters in nearly all the French colonies; they never spared themselves when teaching, or nursing, or any other good work was required of them, and they have happily paved the way for the eventual reception of Christianity by many an African nation and American tribe. The congregation was confirmed by the Holy See in 1854. The sisters now number about 4000, and are widely spread over the world.

7. *Sisters of St. Joseph of Bourg.* This institute, founded in 1828 by Mgr. Devie, bishop of Belley, in concert with the Reverend Mother Saint Benoît at Bourg in the department of Ain, and devoting itself to teaching and works of charity, has spread itself in many parts of France, Switzerland, and America.

8. *Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition.* This congregation, founded in the south of France by Mme. deVialard in 1830, for teaching and for nursing the sick, was approved by the Holy See in 1862. It has more than 100 houses in various parts of the world, with 1000 sisters.

9. *Sisters or Daughters of St. Joseph.* This offshoot of the nuns of the Good Shepherd (No. 4) was established by Bishop Charbonnel at Toronto (Upper Canada) in 1850. They have since prospered and multiplied in the colony, and have ceased to have any connection with the mother house in France.

10. *Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace,* founded at Nottingham by Bishop Bagshawe in 1884, for the training of girls of the working class for their domestic and industrial duties. The sisters are also employed in teaching and nursing the sick and afflicted. They have houses in England, the United States, and Canada. (See F. M. Steele, "Convents of Great Britain.")

JOSEPH'S, ST., SOCIETY FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS. Founded by Cardinal Vaughan, in 1866, at Mill Hill, near London, for the conversion of heathens in foreign countries. About 170 of the missionaries are engaged in this work in various parts of the world. To the society was added a female branch of Sisters of St. Joseph's Society for Foreign Missions. Their founder (Cardinal Vaughan) intended that they should stand in the same relation to the fathers of the society as the Sisters of Charity to the Lazarists.

JUBILEE. The year of jubilee (שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל) was an institution of the Levitical Law (Levit. xxv. 8 *ad fin.*). The Jews were to number seven sabbaths of years—*i.e.* forty-nine years, and the fiftieth (not the forty-ninth, as Petavius and many others have maintained against the plain words of the text, ver 10, and Jewish tradition attested by Philo, Josephus, and the Talmud) was the year of jubilee. The blast of the trumpet proclaimed the jubilee throughout the land on the tenth day of the seventh month—*i.e.* on the day of atonement. The land was to rest, as in sabbatical years; land and houses in the open country, or in villages without walls, reverted to their original owners, or their heirs: all Hebrew slaves were to go free. The law as a whole has no parallel in any other code, and it had a distinctly theocratic character. The Hebrews were the servants of God, and could not, therefore, be the servants of men; the land belonged to God, and was only lent to the Hebrew tribes and families, who could not, therefore, be driven out by any human arrangement. The original position of affairs was to be restored after the sacred sabbatical period of years and on the day of atonement, when Israel's sins were purged and his communion with God renewed. Various explanations are given of the word "jubilee," which is the English form of יוֹבֵל. Some (*e.g.* Gesenius and Knobel) suppose that the word means

"joyful sound" (from יָבַל); others make it refer to the lengthened blast of the trumpet or the streaming crowds of people (from יוֹבֵל to flow. See Hitzig on Jer. xxxiv. 8). Probably it is an old word for a horn or trumpet (Ewald, "Alterthüm." pp. 417 *seq.*; Dillmann on Levit., p. 609; *cf.* Exod. xix. 13, Jos. vi. 4–13). Most likely the "year of setting free," Ezek. xlvi. 16–18, is the year of jubilee. (So Dillmann, against Kuenen; Wellhausen, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," i. pp. 122 *seq.*; Smend on Ezek., pp. 382 *sqq.*, who take it to mean the sabbatical year.)

The Church of Christ has adopted the term "jubilee" from the Jewish Church, and proclaims from time to time "a year of remission"—from the penal consequences of sin: she offers to her children, if they repent and make their peace with God and perform certain pious works, a plenary indulgence, and during this year she empowers even ordinary confessors to absolve from many reserved cases and censures, from vows, &c., &c. An ordinary jubilee occurs at Rome every twenty-fifth year, lasts from Christmas to Christmas, and is extended in the following year to the rest of the Church. An extraordinary jubilee is granted at any time, either to the whole Church or to particular countries or cities, and not necessarily, or even usually, for a whole year. If the jubilee, whether ordinary or extraordinary, be granted to the faithful generally, the conditions for gaining it usually are to fast for three days—viz. on a Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday; to visit certain churches, and pray according to the intention of the Pope, to give alms, to confess and communicate.

It was in 1300 that the first jubilee was given An impression prevailed at that time that a great indulgence was granted in Rome at the beginning of each century, and with this belief many pilgrims flocked to the city. No document in the Papal archives was found to confirm the tradition, but Boniface VIII. granted on February 22, "and for each hundredth year to come, not only a full and more ample, but rather a most full pardon of all sins" to those who repented and confessed, and visited the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul thirty times if Romans, fifteen times if strangers. The contemporary historian Giovanni Villani reckons the number of pilgrims to Rome that year at 200,000. Clement VI., in a bull of 1343, made the jubilee recur every fiftieth year, adding to the previous conditions a visit to the Lateran church. Accordingly the jubilee was kept in 1350, and the number of pilgrims is said to have reached a million. Urban VI., in 1389, reduced the cycle of the jubilee to thirty-three; Paul II., in 1470, to twenty-five years. (Zaccaria, "Dell' Anno Santo"; Thurston, "The Holy Year of Jubilee"; Cadène, "De Jubilaeo Conspectus Historicus"; Hefele-Leclercq, vi. 388 *sqq.*)

JUDGMENT, GENERAL. The fact that Christ will judge all men and angels together at the last day is taught with such clearness and iteration in the New Testament and in all the Creeds that we need not set about proving it here. It will be more to the purpose if we attempt to give a summary of the common theological teaching and popular belief on the matter, endeavouring to distinguish what is doubtful from that which is certain. We may remark by way of preface that the general judgment is intended to manifest before all intelligent creatures the justice of God, to exhibit Christ in His majesty before their eyes, to glorify the just, and to put the wicked to open shame.

1. *The Circumstances of the Judgment.* "As to the way in which that judgment will take place, and in which men are to be assembled, much cannot be known for certain." So St. Thomas writes ("Suppl." lxxxviii. 4), and no sober-minded person will hesitate to agree with him. But he goes on to say that there is a probability in the inference from Scripture that as Christ ascended from Mount Olivet to heaven, so He will descend upon it to judge the world.[1] At the sound "of a trumpet"—*i.e.*, according to St. Thomas ("Suppl." lxxvi. 2), either the voice or the mere apparition of Christ—the dead will wake. "The sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven" (Mt. xxiv. 30). There is nothing in the context to indicate the precise nature of this sign, but as the previous verse speaks of the darkening of the heavenly bodies, the "sign" seems to consist in some luminous appearance following the darkness and ushering in the Messianic glory. The common opinion of the Fathers since Cyril of Jerusalem ("Cat." 15, PG, xxxiii. 899), and of the Schoolmen, is that the "sign" is the sign of the cross, conspicuous in the sky, and this opinion developed in the minds of some into the notion that the fragments of the wooden cross on which Christ died would be united miraculously and exhibited in the sky. Scripture tells us that Christ will appear in His majesty "in the clouds" (Mt. xxvi. 64), "with the angels of his might, in a flame of fire" (1 Cor. iii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 7)—fire which, according to Suarez ("In III. P." disp. 57, quoted by Jungmann), "will precede the Judge on His way to judgment, in order to strike the damned with instant terror and to be the beginning of their torment." Christ will take His seat on His throne, and the just will be placed on the right, the wicked on the left, of Christ (Mt. xxv. 31–33). It is impossible to say how far these expressions are to be taken strictly, and great Catholic authorities have leant, some to a literal, some to a metaphorical explanation (see, *e.g.*, the authors quoted by Maldonatus on the

[1] See Lk. xxiv. 50.

passage in Matthew). Lastly, it has been a popular belief among Christians, as well as among Jews and Moslems, that the judgment will take place in the valley of Jehoshaphat (Josaphat), which has been identified with the narrow ravine of the Kidron on the eastern side of Jerusalem. This belief arose from the words of Joel (iii. 2; *cf.* 12): "For behold in those days, and in that time, when I will turn again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will gather together all the nations and bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will contend with them there because of my people and my inheritance Israel." It is very doubtful whether the valley of Jehoshaphat was a real place at all; in verse 14 it is called the "valley of decision," and the name Jehoshaphat means "the Lord has judged." If the prophet had a real place in view he may possibly have had the valley in the wilderness of Tekoa (2 Paralip. xx.), where Jehoshaphat won a signal victory over three heathen nations. Anyhow, no valley of Jehoshaphat near Jerusalem is mentioned in the Scriptures or in Josephus, or in any document older than the "Onomasticon" of Eusebius. Remigius, on the strength of Joel's words, asserted, in the middle of the ninth century, that the wicked would be placed for trial in the valley of Jehoshaphat, while the just were caught up in the air to meet their Judge. This, says Merx, in his commentary on Joel (p. 199), is the earliest place in a Christian commentary on Joel "where the final judgment is fixed geographically and topographically at Jerusalem in the valley of Jehoshaphat." In the commentary to which we have just referred an elaborate account of Christian and Jewish opinion on the matter will be found.

2. "The man Christ is the judge, but [He exercises this office] with a power and authority which are not human, but divine" (Petav. "De Incarnat." xii. 16). The saints (1 Cor. vi. 2) act with Him in His judicial functions; though probably this only means that they approve the justice of the sentence. It seems plain from Mt. xix. 28 that the Apostles are to judge the world in a stricter sense, though it is hard to imagine what this sense can be. St. Thomas conjectures ("Suppl." q. 89, a. 1) that the Apostles and "perfect" men will notify the sentence to others.

3. It is certain that all men will be judged (see the Athanasian Creed), and it is commonly held that the word "all" is to be taken quite literally, so as to include unbaptized infants, while it is at least the more approved opinion among theologians that angels also will then be tried. The books will be opened (Apoc. xx. 12)—the books, perhaps, of conscience and of God's remembrance. The examination made will consist in this, that God will enlighten the mind of each concerning his own thoughts, words, and deeds, and those of all others. Nearly all theologians hold (though the Master of the Sentences was of a different mind) that the sins even of the just will be openly declared, in order that the judgment may be complete, and that God's justice and mercy may shine forth.

4. In each individual case sentence will be pronounced. St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 88, a. 2) deems it more likely that no oral words will be used in the sentence. Many, however, who are at one with him in thinking that no oral words will be used to individuals, still believe that the words in Mt. xxv., "Come, ye blessed of my Father," &c., "Depart, ye cursed," &c., will be orally addressed to the multitude of the saved and of the lost. (St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 59 "Suppl." qq. 88-90, and "Contra Gentiles," iv. 96; Suarez, "In III. Part." dispp. 52, 53, 57; Petavius, "De Incarnatione," xii. 16; Atzberger, "Geschichte der Christl. Eschatologie"; Billot, "De Novissimis," 168; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 541; Jungmann, "De Novissimis.")

JUDGMENT, PARTICULAR. The doctrine of the Church on this point is clearly explained in the following words of the Roman Catechism (P. I. a. 7 of the Creed). There are "two occasions on which each and every man must appear before God, and render an account of every thought, action, and word, undergoing finally the immediate sentence of the Judge. Of these occasions the first happens when a man departs this life; for straightway he is set before the judgment seat of God, and there a most just inquiry is made into all that he has ever done, said, or thought, this being called the private" (or, as we usually say in English, the particular) "judgment." The essence of the doctrine lies in the belief that the eternal lot of the soul is determined by the judgment of God immediately after its separation from th body, and so much as this must be considered an article of faith, although there has been no formal and explicit definition on the point. The doctrine, however, is clearly implied in the statement of the Council of Florence, that souls which quit their bodies in a state of grace, but in need of purification, are cleansed in purgatory, whereas souls which are perfectly pure "are at once (*mox*) received into heaven," and those which depart "in actual mortal, or merely with original, sin," "at once descend into hell"[1] ("Decretum Unionis"). The Fathers of Florence follow in this part of their decree the constitution "Benedictus Deus," issued by Benedict XII. in the year 1336.

It cannot be said that many testimonies can be produced from Scripture to prove the doctrine as it has just been propounded. Nor need we wonder at this. The books of the Hebrew Bible for the most part speak obscurely of the life beyond the grave, while those of the New Testament are

[1] "Infernum." Hell must be taken here in a large sense to include the Limbo of infants.

chiefly occupied with the great truths that Christ had risen and that He would come again to judge the world. Still at least one passage from the Gospel of St. Luke, xvi. 29 *seq.*, justifies the belief of the Church and excludes reasonable doubt on the matter. Our Lord represents Lazarus and Dives as receiving their respective rewards immediately after death. The former goes to the "bosom of Abraham"; the latter lifts up "his eyes in Hades, being in torments." He must of course have been sentenced before the general judgment, because the rich man's brethren are spoken of as still alive. It is true that we cannot draw dogmatic inferences from all the details of this or any other parable, and it is often hard to determine how much belongs to the clothing of the narrative, how much is meant to teach a moral or doctrinal lesson. Still we may confidently regard the truth, that judgment follows hard on death, as part of the main teaching which the story conveys, and so, as we shall presently see, St. Augustine understood the passage.

Several other places of Scripture are quoted in proof, but some, as we cannot help thinking, are irrelevant, none cogent. Eccli. xi. 27 *seq.* may refer to the judgment which God brings on the wicked by the very act of cutting them off in the midst of their prosperity. Eccles. xi. 9, xii. 1, is far too vague to serve the purpose for which it is alleged. Our English Catechism urges the verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 27), "It is appointed unto all men once to die, and after that the judgment." The whole passage scarcely encourages us to understand the judgment as the particular one. "As it is appointed unto all men once to die, and after this the judgment, so also Christ, being once offered to bear away the sins of many, will be manifested a second time without sin to those who wait for Him unto salvation." The natural meaning seems to be that as men have to die once only and afterwards to be judged, so Christ had to die once only and afterwards will come, no longer laden with the sins of the world, to judge mankind. At all events, St. Thomas and Estius both think that the writer of the Epistle had the general, not the particular, judgment in his mind.[1]

The tradition of the Church on the particular judgment was for a long time obscured by the Millennarian errors which were held in early times even by many Catholics, otherwise orthodox, and by the uncertainty which long prevailed on the state of souls in the period between death and the general resurrection. St. Augustine, however, speaks clearly and emphatically, and that not for himself only, but for the Church of his time. He is speaking of books on the soul written by Vincentius Victor, and he insists that there is nothing in them except what is vain or erroneous, or else mere commonplace familiar to all Catholics. As an instance of the last, he gives Victor's teaching on the meaning of the parable from St. Luke about which we have already spoken. "For with respect to that," says St. Augustine ("De Anima et ejus Origine," lib. ii. n. 8, PL, xliv. 498), "which he [Victor] most rightly and very soundly believes, viz. that souls are judged when they quit the body, before they come to that judgment which must be passed upon them when reunited to the body, and are tormented or glorified in that very flesh which they inhabited here—was this, then, a matter of which you were actually unaware? Who is there with a mind so encrusted with obstinacy against the Gospel as not to hear, or hearing not to believe, these things, in the story of the poor man, taken after his death to Abraham's bosom, and of the rich man, whose torment in hell is set before us?"

Theologians adduce various arguments to show the reasonableness of belief in the particular judgment. "The time," says Suarez, "for merit and demerit ends with death; that, therefore, is the most suitable time for judging each man's acts, no reason existing for further delay" (Suarez, "In III. P." disp. 52, § 2, quoted by Jungmann, "De Noviss." cap. i. art. 2). St. Thomas meets the obvious objection that there is no need of two judgments, by pointing out that it befits each to be judged both as an individual and as a member of the whole human race; that God's justice must be publicly as well as privately manifested; and that the sentence passed in the particular judgment cannot be completely executed till the body is reunited to the soul ("Suppl." q. 88, a. 1).

The common opinion is that souls are judged at the moment and in the place of death. God manifests to the soul by some interior illumination its state and its future lot, whereupon the soul, to borrow the illustration of St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 69, a. 2), finds the place which belongs to it in heaven, or purgatory, or hell, just as bodies find their place according to the law of gravity. Popular representations which describe the soul as borne by angels before the tribunal of God, there to be accused by devils and defended by the guardian angels, are innocent in themselves, and are, indeed, sanctioned by Scripture. Still they are popular representations, after all, not intended as accurate statements of the literal truth. (Theologians generally treat of the Particular Judgment in connection with the General Judgment. See above.)

[1] Protestant commentators are also divided on the meaning of the word "judgment." See Lünemann, *ad loc.* Lünem. himself considers that the μετὰ τοῦτο leaves the time at which the judgment is to follow quite indefinite.

JUDICA PSALM. Ps. xlii. (Heb. 43) is said—preceded and followed by the versicle "Introibo" ("I will enter to the altar of God," &c.) —at the beginning of all Masses except those for the dead and those said during the time of the Passion. On these occasions the psalm is omitted because of its joyful character. St. Ambrose (? "De Sacram." iv. 2, PL, xvi. 437) tells us the verse of the psalm already referred to, "I will enter to the altar of God: of God who maketh glad my youth," was recited by the neophytes as they walked after Baptism and Confirmation from the font to the altar in order to receive Communion. The psalm was originally the priest's private Introit, recited by him while on his way to the altar. Other prayers were also recited alternatively. The missal of St. Pius V. finally fixed the priest's preparatory prayers as we now have them. (Le Brun, "Expl. de la Messe," i. 111; Fortescue, "The Mass," 225; Martène, "De Antiq. Eccl. Rit." l. i., c. iv., a. 2.)

JUDICATUM. [See THREE CHAPTERS.]

JUDICES SYNODALES. The judges to whom the Roman Curia commits the trial of causes in different countries are so called. They must hold some dignity in a cathedral church, and must be nominated by the bishop in the diocesan synod. There should be not less than four for each diocese. If a *judex synodalis* die in the interval between two synods, the bishop nominates some one to take his place until the next synod meets. All nominations, whether in or out of synod, must be reported to the Pontifical Secretary of Petitions (*supplicum libellorum*). (Ferraris, *Judex*, § 66; Taunton, *Synodal Judges.*)

JUDICIUM DEI (*ordalia, ordeal, jugement de Dieu*). The proof of facts by testimony being attended with many difficulties in an unsettled state of society, it has been commonly believed in many countries that for the protection of innocence and the detection of guilt, the case being doubtful, if the divine justice were solemnly appealed to, the necessary proof would be supplied by a direct exhibition of divine power.[1] All the early barbarian codes, the Salic, Ripuarian, Burgundian laws, &c., allow the appeal to the "judgment of God." The modes were various: among them were walking over red-hot ploughshares or live coals, handling red-hot iron, eating blessed bread [EULOGIAE], the trial by hot water, and the trial by cold water. It was believed that a perjurer could not swallow blessed bread. In the trial by hot water the person whose innocence was in question had to plunge his arm into a caldron of boiling water. In that by cold water, he was bound hand and foot and thrown into a pond, a cord being fastened to him; if he floated, it was held that the water rejected him and that he was guilty; if he sank, that he was innocent. Lastly, there was the trial by combat; it being devoutly believed that the man whose cause was just would not be permitted by heaven to be vanquished by his adversary. To give a few instances—the Empress Cunegunde (about A.D. 1010) is said to have walked unhurt over red-hot ploughshares, when she appealed to the judgment of God in disproof of her alleged unchastity; the champion of the Empress Theutburga (860) passed victoriously through the trial of hot water; a monk, Petrus Igneus, in the eleventh century, to establish the truth of his testimony against the Bishop of Florence, walked between two great fires placed close together, and was not scorched. See the curious article by Kober in "Kirchenlex." (*Gottesurtheile*) in which the view is taken that the Church permitted these ordeals, the issue of paganism, but without approving of them, and gradually, through the decisions of Popes and the treatises of doctors, assisted to put them down. Most of the ordeals were abandoned in the course of the twelfth century. The trial by combat was abolished by St. Louis (about 1250) within his own dominions; in England it was nominally legal down to 1818: "We find the canon law very early declaring against trial by ordeal, or *vulgaris purgatio*, as being the fabric of the devil, *cum sit contra praeceptum Domini, non tentabis Dominum Deum tuum.* Upon this authority, it was thought proper to disuse and abolish this trial entirely in our courts of justice by an act of parliament in the third year of Henry III." (Stephen, "Commentaries on the Laws of England," bk. vi. ch. xxvii.)

(Phillips, "Ueber die Ordalien bei den Germanen"; Vacandard, "L'Eglise et les Ordalies." Hefele-Leclercq give in the third and fourth volumes various regulations made by local councils regarding ordeals; and the fourth Lateran Council promulgated a general decree against them (v. 1318).

JURISDICTION. (*Jus dicere*, to administer justice, was one of the "tria verba" which denoted the functions of a Roman praetor.) Jurisdiction is defined as "the power of anyone who has public authority and pre-eminence over others for their rule and government."

Jurisdiction is first divided into ecclesiastical and civil. The former is that which is concerned with causes relating to the worship of God and the spiritual salvation of souls; it is exercised either in the *forum externum* or in the *forum internum.* Civil or political jurisdiction is conversant with secular causes, and has in view the temporal government of the commonwealth. It is exercised only in the *forum externum.*

Jurisdiction is again divided into voluntary and contentious. The first is exercised over persons who voluntarily submit themselves to its operation, as in the case of manumissions and adoptions in the civil order, and ordinations, benedictions, absolutions,

[1] Cp. Sophocles, *Ant.* 264, Virgil, *Aen.* xi. 787.

&c., in the ecclesiastical order. It must not be supposed that the validity of such acts depends upon the willingness of the parties interested to submit to them; as when a club empowers a president whom it has elected to frame by-laws for them, the validity of which depends upon the voluntary accession of the members. The acts are valid, firstly and chiefly, because done by a power which had the right to do them—*i.e.* which had jurisdiction. Contentious jurisdiction is that which is exercised over persons even against their will; it implies a dispute, contending parties, and a tribunal.

Thirdly, jurisdiction may be either ordinary or delegated. Ordinary jurisdiction is that which belongs to anyone of his own right, or by reason of his office, in virtue of some law, canon, or custom. Delegated jurisdiction is that which a man has, not of his own right, but by the commission of another, in whose place he officiates. [DELEGATION.]

Ordinary jurisdiction may be acquired in three ways: (1) by commission from the supreme ruler, conceded either to the dignity or to the individual; (2) by law or canon; (3) by custom or prescription. Thus, by the Supreme Pontiff are constituted as ordinary judges, legates, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, the officials of the Curia, &c. By the supreme lay power are constituted, in the civil order, viceroys, governors, prefects, magistrates, &c., who all enjoy ordinary jurisdiction. By law or canon those are constituted ordinary judges who are elected to office by public bodies according to the statutes of their foundation, and by public functionaries according to law. This is the case with the rectors of universities, the superiors of convents, the provosts of chapters, and the vicars-general of bishops. The third way is by custom; a jurisdiction which has been exercised without challenge for forty years is held to be validated by prescription, and is considered ordinary.

All the Apostles received their jurisdiction, which (except in the case of St. Peter) was personal and extraordinary, immediately from Christ. This jurisdiction they did not transmit; the bishops and their successors receive their jurisdiction from Christ, but through Peter. Such at least is the view now generally held; but even if the bishops be deemed to derive their jurisdiction immediately from Christ, all Catholics agree that it is in such manner subject to the supreme pastorate of the Pope that "it can be restrained by his authority and sovereignty, and, for a lawful cause, altogether taken away."[1]

Confessors belonging to the regular orders have jurisdiction from the Pope over the faithful generally in the tribunal of penance, but must obtain the approbation of the bishop.

[1] Benedict XIV., quoted by Ferraris, § 25.

Every confessor must have jurisdiction *in foro interno*, otherwise he cannot validly absolve. An absolution given by a priest without jurisdiction is void. Nevertheless, if the penitent be *in articulo mortis*, or sincerely believed to be so, he may be validly absolved, not only from sins, venial and mortal, but from all ecclesiastical censures, even in reserved cases, by any simple priest, even though the latter be degraded, or an apostate, or irregular [IRREGULARITY], or a heretic.

The jurisdiction of the priest is of ecclesiastical right, so far as its bestowal, enlargement, and restriction are concerned, for it is the Church which confers it, and in such a manner as she deems to be expedient in the Lord; but it is of divine right, inasmuch as the faculty of remitting sin, for the sake of which it exists, is "conferred on the priest in ordination through the power of the Holy Ghost."[1] (Ferraris, *Jurisdictio.*)

JUS SPOLII (lit. "right of spoil"). By "spolium" is meant the property belonging to a beneficed ecclesiastic at the time of his death which he could not legally dispose of by will. According to the canons a bishop or other ecclesiastic has only a right to such a portion of the diocesan revenues as is sufficient to maintain him and enable him to discharge his functions efficiently. Whatever exceeds this is the property of the Church. If therefore an ecclesiastic at his death be found to be possessed of property, the result of savings from his share of Church emoluments, that property ought to return to the Church; his natural heirs have no right to it. It is recorded of a great number of saints that, penetrated by this feeling, they took care to dispose of their ecclesiastical revenues to the last farthing in almsdeeds and other good works, so that, when death came, they might depart naked out of this world as they had come naked into it. St. Thomas of Villanova on his deathbed, "having commanded all the money then in his possession (which amounted to four thousand ducats) to be distributed among the poor in all the parishes of the city, then ordered all his goods to be given to the rector of his college except the bed on which he lay. Being desirous to go naked out of the world, he gave his bed also to the jailer for the use of prisoners, but borrowed it of him till such time as he should expire."[2] Warham, the last Catholic archbishop of Canterbury, rejoiced to hear as he was dying that only thirty pounds were left in his coffers. St. Francis stripped himself of the very clothes that he wore and gave them back to his father, that neither he nor the world might henceforth have any claim upon one another. Such examples might be indefinitely multiplied. A dim feeling in the popular mind, that such was the more

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. xiv. 7.
[2] Alban Butler, Sept. 18.

perfect way for the ministers of Christ, may have had something to do with the rise of this singular *jus spolii* (or, as it was also called, *rapite capite*, "seize and take"), in virtue of which, in the rude ages following the fall of the Western Empire, anyone who was present when a beneficed ecclesiastic expired thought himself at liberty to seize and carry off whatever property belonging to the deceased he could lay his hands on. Naturally the bulk of this spoil fell to laymen, who were more rapacious and less scrupulous than clerks. The scandalous abuses to which the custom led may be conceived; for ages councils denounced them and legislated against them, but in vain. If, however, we consider the extreme opposite to the *jus spolii*—what we may call the *jus haereditatis et legationis*—the right claimed by beneficiaries in non-Catholic communions to transmit and bequeath the savings of their ecclesiastical revenues to their children, we must admit that, while preserving the outward semblance of decorum, this practice is intrinsically far more scandalous than its opposite.

As the power of sovereigns increased in Europe, they began to restrain the indiscriminate plunder just described, and in the case of bishops, to draw the *jus spolii* to themselves. Innocent III. complained (1207) that the servants of Philip II. had stripped the house and lands of a deceased bishop of Auxerre of property of every description, leaving only the bare walls. The inferior feudal lords claimed the same right over the property of deceased ecclesiastics on their domains. The incessant efforts of councils gradually obtained the renunciation of the right on the part of sovereigns and lay lords. In the thirteenth century it began to be claimed, in a modified form, by the Church herself; and many Constitutions of later Popes confirmed and defined the claim. Thus it came to be a principle of law that the "spoils" of beneficiaries dying without the faculty of devising, or in a foreign country, or which were acquired by illicit trading, belonged of right to the Camera Apostolica or Papal treasury. This right, admitted in Italy for all orders of clergy, and in Castile in the case of bishops, was not allowed in France, Germany, Belgium, or Portugal.

It need hardly be said that this *jus spolii* does not extend to the patrimonial property of ecclesiastics, nor to personal gifts and other acquisitions lawfully derived to them during life from non-ecclesiastical sources. The law lays down various rules for distinguishing as equitably as possible between the two classes of property, if an ecclesiastic has died possessed of both. From the end of the 16th century the right of spoil was compromised in the kingdom of Naples for an annual payment to the Camera. (Ferraris, *Spolium*; Sägmüller, in "Kirchenlex." *Spolienrecht.*)

JUSTICE, in the widest sense, the sense which concerns us here, is not a special virtue, because it includes all the supernatural virtues. According to St. Thomas ($1^a\ 2^{ae}$, q.113, a. 1), it "implies a certain rectitude of order," even in the interior disposition of a man, inasmuch, namely, as the highest part of man is subjected to God, and the inferior powers of the soul are subjected to that which is supreme, viz. to reason." Justice in this sense involves subjection to God and therefore the absence of mortal sin, which is rebellion against Him; while perfect justice is identical with the perfection of every virtue. Scripture constantly uses justice צְדָקָה, δικαιοσύνη in this large acceptation—*e.g.* "Abraham believed God, and he reckoned it to him as justice" (Gen. xv. 6; cf. Galat. iii. 6, James ii. 23, and innumerable other passages). The "authorised version" renders the Greek and Hebrew words in these cases "righteousness," and this has become the familiar name among English Protestants. The change of word does not seem to mark any difference of principle, though, of course, the older Protestants held that the justice of Christ is imputed to us—*i.e.* reckoned to our account—whereas the Catholic doctrine is that justice or righteousness does indeed come from the grace of God, but that it inheres in the soul and consists in a real change of the moral character. "He who doeth justice is just" (Jn. 1 Ep. iii. 7).

It is this general sense of the word "justice" which is important in theology, and the plan of this Dictionary does not require that we should treat at length of justice as a particular virtue. As such, it is commonly defined in words adopted by theologians from Ulpian as the "firm and abiding resolve (*voluntas*) to give each his own right." It is subdivided into legal justice—which orders a man's actions to the common good, in which, of course, he himself shares—and particular justice, which orders the duties of man to man. This latter again is subdivided into distributive justice—which inclines superiors to a just distribution of burdens and advantages among their subjects—and commutative justice, which consists in giving to each his strict rights—*e.g.* paying debts, taxes, &c. Commutative, unlike legal, justice lies solely in the performance of duties to others, whereas the agent's own good is part of the common good; unlike distributive justice, it deals only with strict rights, and is for these reasons justice in the most proper sense of the word. (St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 57–122; De Lugo, "De Justitia et Jure.")

JUSTIFICATION. The difference of belief on the way by which sinners are justified before God formed the main subject of contention between Catholics and Protestants at the time of the Reformation. "If this doctrine" (*i.e.* the doctrine of justification by faith alone) "falls," says Luther in his

"Table Talk," "it is all over with us." On this account the Council of Trent was at pains to define most clearly and explicitly the Catholic tradition on the matter, placing it in sharp opposition to the contrary tenets of the Reformers. We confine ourselves here to the process by which adults are elevated from a state of death and sin to the favour and friendship of God; for with regard to infants the Church of course teaches that they are justified in baptism without any act of their own.

Justification, then, according to the council (sess. vi. 5, 6), begins with the grace of God which touches a sinner's heart and calls him to repentance. This grace cannot be merited; it proceeds solely from the love and mercy of God. It is, however, in man's power to reject or to receive the inspiration from above; it is in his power to turn to God and to virtue or to persevere in sin. And grace does not constrain but assist the free-will of the creature. So assisted, the sinner is disposed or prepared and adapted for justification; he believes in the revelation and promises of God, especially in the truth "that a sinner is justified by God's grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus"; he fears the justice, hopes in the mercy, of God, trusts that God will be merciful to him for Christ's sake, begins "to love God as the fountain of all justice, hates and detests his sins." "The disposition or preparation is followed by justification itself, which justification consists, not in the mere remission of sins, but in the sanctification and renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of [God's] grace and gifts, whence a man becomes just instead of unjust, a friend instead of a foe, and so an heir according to hope of eternal life." ... "By the merit of the most holy Passion, through the Holy Spirit, the charity of God is shed abroad in the hearts of those who are justified," &c.

We may turn to the views of Lutherans and Calvinists, as they are to be found in their authoritative Confessions. They are at one with Catholics in attributing the beginning of justification to the mere grace of God, and in excluding all merit or title on the part of the sinner. But Lutherans maintained that man "could contribute absolutely nothing to his own conversion," that "faith in Christ, regeneration, renewal," are to be ascribed "solely to the working of God and to the Holy Spirit" ("Solid. Declar. de Lib. Arbitr." § 20, p. 635, quoted in Möhler's "Symbolism," i. p. 125 ed. Robertson). Here the Lutherans follow their master, who compared man under the action of grace to "a trunk or a stone" ("In Gen." xix.; Möhler, p. 124). The Calvinists, on the other hand, did admit that man was active as well as passive under the influence of grace ("Confess. Helvet." cap. ix. p. 21; Möhler, p. 136); but as they held grace to be irresistible they could not, of course, allow the Tridentine doctrine that man is free to accept or reject the invitation of God. Both the Lutheran and Calvinist errors with regard to human co-operation are excluded and condemned (sess. vi. De Justif. can. 4, 5, 6). Secondly, whereas Catholics understand by justification the renewal of man's moral nature by divine grace, the reformers took it to mean "the remission of sins and the imputation of the justice of Christ" (Calvin, "Instit." cap. xi. § 2; Möhler, p. 155; and so "Solid. Declar." iii. De Fid. Justif. § 11; Möhler, p. 155), faith being the condition on which these benefits are given. Here is the hinge on which the whole controversy turns. Catholics regard justification as an act by which a man is really made just; Protestants, as one in which he is merely declared and reputed just, the merits of another—viz. Christ—being made over to his account. With Catholics justification is effected by grace inherent in the soul; with Protestants it is something external to the soul altogether—a sentence which is pronounced by the divine judge. True (and we are bound in fairness to lay great stress on this), Protestants hold that real and interior sanctification follows upon justification, so that change in heart and life is the sure and only test that a man really has been justified by faith, or, in other words, that the merits of Christ have been imputed to him. Still a very important difference between the Catholic and Protestant views remains. To the Catholic, sanctification and justification are the same thing, or at most two aspects of the same thing—viz. of the act by which God makes a soul just and holy in his sight. To the Lutheran or Calvinist, they are distinct, both in themselves and in the order of time at which they take place. For it was the contention of Protestant theologians that a soul is first justified—*i.e.* accepted as just for the merits of Christ apprehended through faith, and then, as a necessary consequence, sanctified—*i.e.* really made holy. Lastly, as Protestants believed that concupiscence—*i.e.* the mere interior temptation to sin, unaccompanied by wilful consent—constituted sin in the strict sense, and since all are liable to such temptations, they held very inadequate notions of sanctification. "God," Calvin writes, "begins this work of interior renewal in his elect, and proceeds with it throughout the whole course of their lives, and that sometimes slowly, so that they always remain subject to the sentence of death before his tribunal" ("Instit." iii. 11; Möhler, p. 165). Very different is the Catholic belief, according to which justification excludes all mortal sin from the soul and makes the love of God and and man sovereign within it, so that the just man is in no way liable to the sentence of death at God's judgment seat. Sin, no doubt remains, more in some, less in others, but it is venial sin, which does not incur the sentence

of eternal woe or forfeit God's friendship.

The Protestant doctrine has only an apparent foundation in Scripture. Undoubtedly, the Hebrew word הִצְדִּיק, the Greek δικαιόω in the Sept. and N.T., often mean, not to make, but to pronounce just by a legal sentence. The judge may in this sense "justify" a man because his cause is good, or from corrupt motives although his cause is bad. Thus, in Deut. xxv. 1, the judges are directed to justify (וְהִצְדִּיקוּ LXX δικαιώσωσι) the just (*i.e.* to pronounce him just) and to make the wicked wicked—*i.e.* to pronounce him to be so. Here the Vulgate has "justitiae palmam dabunt," but in Prov. xvii. 15, "he who justifies the wicked and condemns" (lit. "makes wicked," or as we might say "makes out to be wicked") "the just—an abomination to the Lord are both the one and the other," it represents הִצְדִּיק by "justifico." We do not therefore, for a moment, dream of bringing any philological objection to the Protestant view, nor do we deny that the Scriptural idea of justification does imply legal acquittal. But why does God pronounce the sinner just? Not because he comes to trial with clean hands, for by the hypothesis he comes laden with guilt. Not because, being actually unjust, he is pronounced just on the round of a legal fiction by which the merits of another are made over to his account, for such a procedure would be unworthy of a human, much more of divine, justice. The true answer surely is that God purifies the soul by turning it from love of self to divine love, and that thus He at the same moment renders and pronounces the sinner just.

Scripture abundantly confirms the reasonableness of the inference. It describes God as "destroying" and taking away iniquity; it speaks of the blood of Christ, which "cleanses us from all sin." If in Ps. xxxi. (Heb. 32) we read that the man is blessed "whose iniquity is taken away, whose sin is covered, to whom the Lord doth not reckon or impute sin," the blessedness does not consist in mere forgiveness, for the verse ends, "in whose spirit there is no guile." Two passages in St. Paul show that he knew nothing of the spurious distinction between justification and sanctification. After telling the Corinthians that great sinners, thieves, profligates, slanderers, &c., will not inherit the "kingdom of God," he continues "And such were some of you, but you washed yourselves" (Vulg., "you were washed"), "but you were sanctified, but you were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus," &c. (1 Cor. vi. 11). Here sanctification is put before justification, and if the Protestant theory were correct the whole matter would have been thrown into obscurity and confusion. Again in Ephes. iv. 24, "Put on the new man, who has been created according to God in justice and holiness of truth." (The dogmatic theologians treat of Justification when dealing with Grace: St. Thom. 1ª 2æ, q. 110, and the commentaries thereon; Bellarmine, "De Justif." i.; Suarez, "De Gratia," lib. viii.; Stapleton, "De Univ. Justif." Op. tom. ii.; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 246).

K

KINGS AND QUEENS, EMPERORS, ETC., PRAYERS FOR. St. Paul (1 Tim. ii. 1) commands prayers to be made for kings and all in authority, and there is abundance of proof that the early Christians faithfully observed this duty, even if their rulers were heathen or heretical. Two instances out of many will suffice. "We sacrifice," says Tertullian ("Ad Scap." 2, PL, i. 700), "for the health of the Emperor, but to our God and his." So Athanasius prayed publicly for the heretical Emperor Constantius, as we know from his own words ("Apol. ad Constant." c. 10, PG, xxv. 607): "I did but say 'Let us pray for the most pious Emperor (Αὐγούστου) Constantius,' and straightway all the people shouted with one voice 'Christ, help Constantius!' and kept on praying thus." At a later date, however, the names of emperors who formally separated themselves from the Church were left out in the diptychs.

When the diptychs fell out of use the name of the king or emperor was put in the Canon of the Mass, and it is wanting in very few mediaeval missals. Not only did our ancient English liturgies put the names of our sovereigns in the Canon, but many editions of the Sarum Missal have a votive Mass "pro Rege" (Maskell, "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," p. 275). The name of the sovereign, however, is left out of the Canon in the modern Roman Missal, and Gavantus ("Thesaur." p. ii. tit. viii.) says that it cannot be added except in virtue of an Apostolic privilege such as that granted to Philip II. of Spain by Pius V.[1] Meratus, in his note, modifies the statement so far as to allow that the name of the sovereign may be inserted by "old and lawful custom," such as prevailed in France and Venice, when the names of the King and the Doge were inserted. The Roman missal, however, contains a Prayer, Secret, and Post-Communion "Pro Rege" to be said as a commemoration in which the name of the sovereign has to be expressed. At present, in English Catholic churches, it is usual to sing

[1] This has been disputed by Binterim.

a prayer after solemn Mass for our King and the Royal Family. (Le Brun, tom. ii.; Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. i. pp. 299 *seq.*)

KISS. (*A*) *Kiss of Peace.*—Among Jews (Gen. xxxiii. 4, 2 Kings xiv. 33, Job xxxi. 27) and heathen the kiss was used much more frequently than among ourselves as a mere sign of good will and charity. Among the Romans, indeed, the use of the *osculum* was regulated by custom and law. The custom was naturally adopted and raised to a higher significance among Christians. Thus St. Paul tells those to whom he wrote that they are to salute each other in "a holy kiss" (*ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ*, Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 26), while St. Peter (1 Ep. v. 14) speaks of a "kiss of charity" (*ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης*). *Φίλημα ἅγιον, φίλημα ἀγάπης, ἀσπασμὸς, φίλημα μυστικὸν*—and in liturgical language *εἰρήνη*—are the Greek words most used by Christian writers for the holy kiss; the Latins employ *osculum sanctum, osculum pacis, pacem dare, offerre*, &c. Tertullian ("De Orat." 18, PL, i. 1176) speaks of the "kiss of peace which is the seal of prayer," and Clement of Alexandria ("Paedagog." iii. 11, p. 301, ed. Potter) says the kiss "should be mystical," and enlarges on the purity of intention with which it should be given.

(*a*) *At Mass.*—The kiss of peace was given at Mass from the earliest times, as appears from Justin, "Apol." i. 65. To avoid the dangers of abuse to which Athenagoras ("Legat." 32, quoting apparently an earlier writer) refers, the "Apostolic Constitutions" (viii. 11) order a rigid separation of the sexes.

In two striking ways the Roman practice with regard to the kiss of peace at Mass differs from that of other Churches. In all the Eastern, as well as in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian liturgies, the kiss is given before the offertory and consecration. This is the order recognized by Justin (*loc. cit.*), and probably arises partly from a desire to begin the sacred action in peace, partly because the exhortation of the Apostle, at the close of some of his epistles, led Christians to salute each other at the end of the lections, which came in the Mass of the Catechumens (*i.e.* in the earlier part of the service). In the Roman Mass, on the other hand, the kiss of peace follows the consecration, and is closely connected with the Communion; an order which Innocent I. defends in his celebrated letter to Decentius, on the ground that the kiss of peace is set as a "seal" on the whole of the sacred action. Again, among the Orientals (see Concil. Laodic. can. 19) the priests gave the kiss of peace to the bishop, then the laity to each other; and so, *e.g.* in the liturgy of St. James, and in that of St. Chrysostom as used at this day in the Greek Church, the celebrant simply wishes "peace to all," whereupon the deacon says "Let us kiss each other (*ἀγαπήσωμεν ἀλλήλους*) that we may agree in oneness of mind." In the Roman Mass the kiss of peace, as it were, passes down from the bishop to the priests.

It is plain from the decrees of the Councils of Frankfort (794, can. 50) and Mayence (813, can. 44) that the kiss of peace long continued to be given in the West. It was only at the end of the thirteenth century that it gave way to the use of the "osculatorium"—called also "instrumentum" or "tabella pacis," "pax," "pacificale," "freda" (from *Friede*), &c.—a plate with a figure of Christ on the cross stamped upon it, kissed first by the priest, then by the clerics and congregation [see PAX]. It was introduced into England by Archbishop Walter of York in 1250. Usually now the Pax is not given at all in low Masses, and in high Mass an embrace is substituted for the old kiss and given only to those in the sanctuary. The Pax is not given on the last three days of Holy Week. (Cf. Tertull. "De Orat." 18, PL, i. 1178.)

(*β*) *At other Sacraments.*—The kiss of peace was also given after the Confirmation of the neophyte, which followed immediately upon the Baptism. A relic of this custom is preserved in the words addressed by the bishop to each candidate at Confirmation (Cyprian, Ep. 64, § 4, "Ad Fidum," ed. Hartel, 719); and at absolution of penitents (see Euseb. "H.E." iii. 23, and Martène, "Ord." 13). The kiss given by the other bishops present to a bishop just consecrated is mentioned "Constit. Apost." viii. 5. This custom is still prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. So, too, is another ancient rite, according to which the bishop gives the kiss of peace to a priest at his ordination. In the Greek Ordinal (Goar, "Euchol." p. 298) it is the new priest who kisses the bishop and other priests.

(*γ*) The kiss at *betrothal*, in the Roman law, gave the betrothed woman certain rights of inheritance and made her a quasi-uxor. This rite is mentioned by Tertullian ("De Veland. Virg." 6 and 11) and by Greek canonists.

(*δ*) The habit of giving Communion and the kiss of peace *to the dead* was forbidden by the Council of Auxerre (anno 585, *alias* 578), canon 12, but the Greeks still give the kiss to the dead.

(*B*) *The Kiss as a Mark of Honour.*—The "woman who was a sinner" kissed (*κατεφίλει*) Christ's feet (Lk. vii. 38), and the same mark of affectionate reverence is common use among Catholics.

(*a*) In early times the Christians u kiss the altar as a mark of reverenc place on which the Eucharist is offe priest still does so repeatedly in Mass, out of reverence for the the relics of saints enclosed celebrant at Mass signifies teaching of Christ by This practice is also anc

in the first of the Roman Ordines. Jonas, bishop of Orleans, in the ninth century recognizes the antiquity of the custom. (Le Brun, i. p. 231; and see under GOSPEL.)

(β) *The Pope's feet are kissed* as a mark of homage immediately after he has accepted office: by cardinals newly created; by those to whom audiences are granted; &c., &c. The kiss is given on the golden cross of the sandal which the Pope wears on his right foot.

It must be remembered that this mark of honour was not originally reserved to the Pope. It was given, as Oriental customs spread throughout the empire, to the emperors, as well as to patriarchs and bishops. "In the Liturgy," says Kraus (art. *Fusskuss*, in "Real-Encykl."), "the ritual ascribed to Gelasius directs the deacon before reading the Gospel to kiss the Pope's feet. The same mark of honour was given occasionally to the Popes even by the highest personages on earth—*e.g.* by the emperors Justin and Justinian, by the kings Luitprand, Pepin, by Charlemagne, &c.; but it is also to be observed that the Popes, on the other side, also gave the act of adoration to the emperors. Only late in the Middle Ages the adoration by kissing the feet of sovereigns and bishops fell more and more into disuse, and was confined to the Vicar of Christ, and then a cross was worked on the slipper to show that this honour was done not to the mortal, but to the Son of God." Charles V. is said to have been the last royal personage who did obeisance in this way, for although Benedict XIV. received it from the King of Naples, this is explained by the peculiar relations of the Neapolitan crown to the Pope.

According to present custom, the Pope immediately after his election is divested of his cardinal's dress, puts on the house-dress of the Pope and is led to the altar, whereupon the cardinals kiss his foot and right hand, receiving the kiss of peace in return. Next, when the Pope's name has been proclaimed to the people, his foot is kissed by the Governatore of Rome and by all the "Conclavists" who have accompanied the cardinals. Both of these "adorations" take place in the conclave itself. The third "adoration" is made by the cardinals in the Sixtine chapel, on the altar of which the Pope is placed in Pontifical vestments. The Pope is then carried on a litter to St. Peter's, placed on the high altar, and again receives solemn "adoration." Each newly-created cardinal kisses the Pope's foot and then his hand. Patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops kiss the Pope's foot and right knee. Other ecclesiastics and laymen (except sovereigns) merely kiss the foot.

(A full account of the literature on the "kiss of peace" will be found in Kraus, art. *Friedenskuss*; Thurston, in "Cath. Enc."; Cabrol, in DACL, *Baiser*. On the kissing of the Pope's foot there are treatises by Valentini, "De Osculatione Pedum Romani Pontificis," Romae, 1588; by Pougard, "Del Bacio de' Piedi de' Sommi Pontefici," Roma, 1807.)

KNIGHTS. [See CHIVALRY.]

KYRIE ELEISON, CHRISTE ELEISON, &c. Greek words, meaning "Lord, have mercy," "Christ, have mercy," &c., retained by the Latin Church, and used in the Breviary offices, the prayers of the Rituale, the Litany of the Saints, &c., and in the Mass. Immediately after the introit, the celebrating priest and the server say alternately "Kyrie Eleison" three times, "Christe Eleison" three times, and then once more "Kyrie Eleison" three times. Martène ("De Antiq. Eccles. Rit.") and Mabillon (in "Ord. Rom.") show that the number of Kyries to be sung by the choir used to be left to the discretion of the celebrant, and also that the Kyrie was left out altogether in Masses which were to be followed by the Litanies. St. Thomas (3ª, q. 83, a. 4) supposes that the first triplet (Kyrie Eleison, &c.) is addressed to the Father, the second (Christe Eleison, &c.) to the Son; the third (Kyrie Eleison, &c.) to the Holy Ghost.

"Kyrie Eleison" is a formula universal in the Church. The variation "Christe Eleison" is peculiar to the Roman rite. It is unknown in the East, nor does it occur in the Ambrosian rite, as similarly it was wanting in the Mozarabic, Gallican, and other ancient liturgies. It is noteworthy that their insistence on saying "Christe Eleison," as well as "Kyrie Eleison," was made a ground of complaint against some of the old Keltic Saints.

The use of the words at Mass is undoubtedly very ancient. Κύριε ἐλέησον occurs in the Clementine liturgy as part of the prayer for Catechumens ("Constit. Apost." viii. 6), and also as a part of the Mass of Catechumens in the ancient liturgy of St. James. It is certain also that these Greek words have been kept from ancient times in the Latin liturgy. The Second Council of Vaison, in the province of Arles, which met in 529, ordered the Kyrie Eleison to be said at Mass and other services, appealing to the custom of the "Apostolic See, and of all the Italian and Eastern provinces." (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1113; Le Brun, "Explication de la Messe," tom. ii; Benedict XIV. "De Missa"; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," p. 164; Fortescue, in "Cath. Enc.")

L

LABARUM (derivation uncertain). The banner of the cross, used by Constantine in his campaign. It was an adaptation of the cavalry standard of the Roman army, with Christian symbols instead of pagan emblems. Eusebius, a contemporary writer, in his "Life of Constantine," gives the following account of it: "He [Constantine] kept invoking God in his prayers, beseeching and imploring that He would declare Himself to him, who He was, and stretch forth His right hand over events. While the king was thus praying and perseveringly entreating, a most extraordinary sign from heaven appears to him, which perhaps it were not easy to receive on the report of anyone else, but since the victorious king himself, a long time afterwards, when we were honoured with his acquaintance and friendly intercourse, repeated the story to us who are compiling the record, and confirmed it with an oath, who would hesitate to believe the recital? especially as the ensuing period furnished unerring testimony to the tale. About midday, when the day was now on the turn, he said that he saw with his own eyes in the sky, above the sun, the trophy-like figure of a cross (*σταυροῦ τρόπαιον*) composed of light, and that a writing was attached to it, which said 'By this conquer'; that astonishment at the sight seized upon both himself and all the troops whom he was then leading on some expedition, and who became spectators of the portent." That same night, Constantine went on to say, "the Christ of God" appeared to him in a dream with the same sign which he had seen in the sky, and bade him have an imitation of it made, and use it in war. Constantine sent for goldworkers and jewellers, and had a costly banner made [see BANNER], surmounted by a crown, on which was the monogram formed of the first two letters of the name of Christ (☧). With this borne at the head of his army, he crossed into Italy, defeated Maxentius in several battles, and became master of Rome. Fifty men of his guards were selected to have charge of the Labarum, and victory was the unfailing attendant of its display.[1] (Kraus, "Real-Encykl."; Venables in "Dict. Chr. Antiq.")

LACTICINIA. A late Latin word meaning milk, or food made of milk. St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 147, a. 8) distinguishes *lacticinia* from flesh and from eggs. The Greek Church (Council in Trullo, can. 56) forbade the use of eggs and *lacticinia* on all fast days, even at the one permitted meal. The Latin Church forbade their use on the fasting days of Lent, and Alexander VII. condemned the proposition that the obligation of abstaining from eggs and *lacticinia* in Lent was doubtful. With regard to other fasts, St. Thomas (*loc. cit.*) says the obligation of abstaining from eggs and *lacticinia* varies in different places, and that individuals are bound to conform to the custom of the country. St. Alphonsus ("Theol. Moral." iv. 1009) lays down the same principle. Even in Lent the use of eggs and *lacticinia* has been allowed, especially in Northern countries, by Papal dispensation, or else by custom, which the Popes have tolerated till in course of time it became a perpetual privilege. Moreover, the bishops in their quinquennial faculties receive power to dispense on this point. In England, as in other countries, the extent to which *lacticinia* may be used in Lent is determined by the indult published in each year. A recent Papal dispensation made it lawful to take *lacticinia* on most fasting days, even at collation. [See FAST.]

LADY-DAY. The feast of the ANNUNCIATION (*q.v.*).

LAETARE SUNDAY. The fourth Sunday in Lent, so called from the first word in the antiphon of the introit, "Rejoice, O Jerusalem, and gather together, all ye who love her," &c. (Is. lxvi. 10). This day is also known as Mid-Lent or Refreshment Sunday. On that one Sunday in Lent the altar is decked with flowers, the organ is played, and at the principal Mass rose-coloured vestments are worn instead of violet ones.

LAMENTATIONS. Parts of the five elegiac poems at the end of the prophecies of Jeremiah (the four Lamentations and the Prayer) occur in the first nocturn of Matins (*Tenebrae*) of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in Holy Week. [See HOLY WEEK.]

LAMMAS-DAY. [See PETER'S CHAINS.]

LAMPS have been from very early times used in Christian churches, and have had a sacred character attributed to them (Acts xx. 8). Thus the fourth Apostolic Canon forbids anything to be offered at the altar except "oil for the lamp, and incense at the time of the holy oblation." The controversy of Jerome with Vigilantius, who objected to the practice, shows that lamps were not only used to give light, but were burned before the tombs of the martyrs in their honour. Again, Cyril of Jerusalem (referred to in "Kirchenlex." *Licht*) notices the practice which still continues among us, of relighting the lamps on Holy Saturday in token of joy. The "Caerimoniale Episcoporum" favours

[1] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* i. 28–37, ii. 7–9.

(*suadet*) the practice of burning a lamp before each altar, several before the high altar. (Gavant. par. i. tit. xx.)

Universal custom requires that a lamp should be kept burning before the Blessed Sacrament, wherever it is reserved. The oil in the lamp must be made of olives, or, if it cannot be had, the bishop may permit the use of other oils, not, however, of mineral oils, except in case of absolute necessity (Decret. S.R.C. 9 Julii, 1864). Authors speak of the practice of burning a perpetual light before the tabernacle as very ancient, but do not, so far as we can find, furnish early evidence of it. [See CANDLES AND LIGHTS.] (Leclercq, "Man. d'Arch. Chr." ii. 509 *sqq.*; 557 *sqq.*)

LANCE, THE HOLY. St. John tells us (xix. 34) that after our Lord had given up the ghost "one of the soldiers with a spear (λόγχη, *lancea*) opened his side." In 1492 the sultan Bajazet presented Pope Innocent VIII. with a lance-head purporting to be the very weapon with which our Lord was pierced. The relic has since been preserved in St. Peter's at Rome. (Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," tr., v. 316.)

In the middle of the sixth century, both Cassiodorus (in Ps. lxxvi., PL, lxx. 621) and Gregory of Tours (PL, lxxi. 712) assure us that the Holy Lance was preserved at Jerusalem. When the city was taken by the Persians in 615, the relics of the Passion fell into their hands. The point of the lance was broken off and taken to Constantinople, and afterwards given to St. Louis. This portion was lost during the Revolution. The larger portion, which is said to be that now in Rome, can be traced back to Mandeville, who saw it at Constantinople in 1357; and further to various earlier pilgrims. It would seem to have been brought there some time before the tenth century. It was seen at Jerusalem by Arculphus about 670. Benedict XIV. has shown that the two portions mutually completed each other ("De Canoniz." lib. ii. p. ii. cap. 31).

Doubt was cast upon the genuineness of the Turkish relic from the fact that another "Holy Lance" was already venerated at Nuremberg. This is probably the so-called lance of Constantine, into which a portion of the Holy Lance or Nails was worked.

A feast of the Lance and Nails was until recently kept on the Friday after the first Sunday in Lent. Originally granted to the Passionists, it was extended to various dioceses by Gregory XVI., but has been withdrawn in the recent reform of the Roman Breviary. As long ago as 1353 Innocent VI. granted to Germany and Bohemia a feast of the Lance and Nails, to be kept on the Friday after the octave of Easter. The Pope's decree is in the second nocturn of the office. (De Mely, in "Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae," vol. iii.; Rohault de Fleury, "Mémoire sur les instruments de la Passion"; Thurston, in "Cath. Enc."; Schrod. in "Kirchenlex.")

LANCE (ἁγία λόγχη). A small knife used in the Prothesis or early part of the present Greek liturgy to divide the parts to be consecrated from the rest of the holy loaf. The action commemorates the piercing of our Lord's side. The priest makes four cuts in these parts and stabs them more than once, accompanying each action with texts of Scripture—"He was led as a lamb to the slaughter," &c.

The rite is probably not a very ancient one. It is wanting, not only in the Oriental liturgies of other families, but also in that of St. James, and is not mentioned by St. Germanus. It is observed, however, in the monastery of Mount Sinai, where all the new rites of the present Greek Church have not been admitted. Martigny gives a drawing of a "Culter Eucharisticus," said to have belonged to St. Thomas of Canterbury, and to have been used for a similar purpose. (See Goar, who gives a drawing of the liturgical lance; Le Brun, tom. iii. vi. 4; and Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," p. 413.)

LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH. This title is used for want of a better to denote the Church's practice of celebrating Mass, administering the sacraments, and generally of performing her more solemn services in dead languages. For the Church cannot be said to use, or even to prefer, any one language. She requires some of her clergy to use Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Slavonic, in the Mass, just as strictly as she requires others to employ Latin. Latin no doubt is far more widely used than other ancient languages in the offices of the Church, but this has arisen chiefly from the fact that those who would naturally use Greek, &c., in their offices have fallen away from Catholic communion. We will begin with an historical account of the discipline observed, and then give the principal reasons adduced to justify it.

Benedict XIV. ("De Missa," lib. ii. cap. 2) mentions the opinion of those who held that the Apostles said Mass in Hebrew, or that originally Mass was said only in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the three languages on the title of the cross; and he continues, "Those who are skilled in ecclesiastical history have shown sufficiently that the Apostles and their successors did, not only preach, but also celebrate the divine offices in the vulgar tongue of the people in whose land they preached the Gospel." He quotes Bona, Le Brun, and Martène in support of his own statement, which surely does not need support. Mass, then, and the other offices, were said originally in the vernacular, because it was the vernacular; but the Church, so far as we know, has never once allowed a change in the language of the liturgy when the language in which it had been originally written

had become unintelligible to the people. Nor at present is Mass ever said in a tongue still generally spoken and understood. Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopic, are, and have long been dead languages, while the ancient Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and Slavonic, used in the liturgies, are quite distinct from the modern languages which bear the same names. Even schismatical and heretical bodies which have preserved the true priesthood, and therefore the true Mass, have not ventured to substitute translations into the vulgar tongue for the ancient language of their liturgies. Indeed, Mass said in such a language as Coptic is much less understood than Mass in Latin, not only because Coptic has no affinity with the Arabic spoken by the people, but also because many of the Coptic priests can hardly read the Coptic words of their church books, and do not understand the meaning of a single sentence. One exception may here be mentioned, the only one with which we are acquainted, to the general rule, that all schismatical and heretical bodies preserve the ancient language of their liturgies, and clearly it is an exception which proves the rule. Le Brun (tom. iii. diss. vi. a. 6) notices that the Melchites—*i.e.* schismatic Greeks in the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who are in communion with the "orthodox" Greek Church of Constantinople—sometimes say Mass in Arabic, because it is often hard to find deacons and other assistants who can even read Greek. A friend versed in liturgical science and in the Oriental languages informs us that this exceptional usage still occurs, *e.g.* at Jerusalem.

On the other hand, the Church has not pursued the same uniform policy in dealing with nations newly converted to the Christian religion, and therefore destitute of a liturgy. In the middle of the ninth century the Oriental monks St. Cyril and St. Methodius introduced, not a Latin or Greek, but a Slavonic or vernacular liturgy among their Moravian converts. This measure of theirs was approved by Pope Hadrian II., and tolerated by John VIII. on condition that the translation was faithful, and the Gospel read first in Latin, then in Slavonic. But in 1061 the legate of Alexander II. in a council of Croatian and Dalmatian bishops prohibited the use of the Slavonic liturgy—which must not be confounded with the Slavonic versions of the Greek liturgies still used—and the prohibition was repeated by Gregory VII. in a letter of the year 1080 to Ladislaus, King of Bohemia. However, even as late as 1248 Innocent IV. allowed a Slav bishop to use it by special dispensation. In 1615 Paul V. gave the Jesuit missionaries leave to celebrate Mass and the divine offices in Chinese, but the brief never reached those to whom it was addressed. The Jesuits renewed their petition, and a Chinese version of the Missal was presented to Innocent XI.,[1] but nothing came of the negotiation. In the "Propylaeum" of the Bollandist Lives for May a summary is given of the reasons urged for a vernacular Chinese liturgy by Father Couplet, Procurator-General of the Jesuit missions.

Such, then, is the rule of the Church. She never allows an ancient liturgy to be altered because the language in which it is written has been altered or displaced by a modern one, and she is unwilling, though she does not always absolutely refuse, to allow the use of vernacular liturgies among nations newly converted. The Council of Trent declares (sess. xxii. cap. 8, De Sacrific. Missae) that the Fathers of the council thought it inexpedient to have Mass "celebrated everywhere in the vulgar tongue," and condemns those who affirm "that Mass ought only to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue" (*ib.* can. 9). We must beware, however, of pressing these statements too far. Benedict XIV. defends Colbert, bishop of Rouen, who taught in a pastoral that the ancient mode of celebrating Mass in the language of the people was the fittest means to prepare the minds of the congregation for participation in the sacrifice; or at least argues that this conviction is not condemned by the Council of Trent. The Church may have had good and weighty grounds for forgoing a usage which in itself would tend to the greatest spiritual edification.

These reasons seem to consist, first of all, in the jealousy with which the Church guards her ancient rites, and her unwillingness to face the danger of constant change in them to meet the changes in modern languages. Such changes might seriously endanger the purity of doctrine, or at least the reverence of the faithful for the rites of the Church. Let the reader only consider how much of the reverence which Protestants feel for the Book of Common Prayer is due to the fact that its pure and noble language has been preserved unchanged for centuries. A new edition in modern English would certainly be better understood, but how much of its power to soothe the heart and to inspire a sober and rational devotion would be lost in the process? Again, the preservation of the ancient forms enables priests to celebrate and the faithful to follow Mass in all lands, and thus impresses upon us, in a way which no one who has experienced it can forget, the unity of the Church. Lastly, the words of the Missal, admirably fitted as they are for the use of the priest, are by no means fitted for the use of uneducated persons, and this difficulty would not be met by a translation.

Protestant objections arise to some extent from misunderstanding the nature of Catholic worship. The Mass is a great action

[1] So Benedict XIV. in the edition before us; but he says this was done in 1631, long before Innocent XI. began to reign. Possibly 1631 is a misprint for 1681.

in which Christ's sacrifice is continued and applied. Those who are present bow their heads at the consecration, and unite themselves in spirit, if they do not actually communicate, with the communion of the priest. Christ crucified is set forth in their midst, and they know that they, on their part, must offer their souls and bodies in constant sacrifice to God by a life of purity, labour, and self-denial. It is the expressed wish of the Tridentine Fathers that the meaning of the Mass and its rites should be constantly explained to the people by their pastors; and surely the most ignorant peasant who follows Mass in the way just described, and accompanies the priest's action with prayers which come from his own heart, offers to God a reasonable service. A life of self-sacrifice and devotion—that is a great lesson taught by the sacrifice of the Mass, and it is a lesson independent of the language in which Mass is said.

The texts quoted from 1 Cor. xiv. against the Catholic usage are not to the point. "I would rather," says St. Paul, "speak five words in the church through my intelligence, that I may instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue." We believe St. Paul is referring to ecstatic utterances—sighs, exclamations, broken sentences which were unintelligible to others, and in which the tongue of the speaker was not controlled even by his own intelligence. Be this as it may, no parallel can be drawn between "speaking in tongues" and the use of Latin in the Mass. Strangers would not think a priest "mad" (v. 23) if they heard him reading the Latin Missal. The priest prays with "his understanding" (v. 14), for he knows Latin: others are "edified" (v. 17); and no extraordinary gift of interpretation (v. 13) is needed, for our English prayer-books give translations of the Mass. Moreover, St. Paul was familiar with a custom closely analogous to ours, and with this neither he nor any other Apostle finds fault. The services of the temple and the synagogue, like those of the synagogue at this day, were in a dead language, with the difference only that more pains are taken to diffuse the knowledge of Hebrew among poor Jews than of Latin among poor Catholics. (See Fortescue in "Cath. Enc." *Rites*, v.)

LAPSED (LAPSI). A name given to those who fell away from the faith under heathen persecution. The name comes into special prominence in the persecution of Decius (249–251), which exceeded all previous ones in method and severity. Some Christians fell away by actually offering sacrifice to the false gods (*thurificati*, *sacrificati*); others bought a certificate that they had sacrificed (*libellatici*); others allowed their names to be enrolled on the official lists as having obeyed the imperial edict (*acta facientes*). Benson (in Smith and Cheetham) argues that the "libellus," or certificate, was of two kinds—either a document coming from the Christian himself to the effect that he had recanted his religion, or from the magistrate, who certified that the Christian had recanted, the Christian himself remaining passive and merely accepting this means of escape.

The "Lapsi" were subjected to long—sometimes life-long—penance, varying according to the degree of their guilt, and, if priests, were reduced to lay communion. But great weight was given to the "libelli pacis"—*i.e.* documents from confessors or martyrs in prison, begging the restoration, of those who had fallen and repented, to the peace of the Church. (See under INDULGENCES.] (Cyprian's "Letters" and his treatise "De Lapsis" are the chief authorities on the subject; Batiffol, "Études d'Histoire" &c. p. 111 *sqq.*; Morinus, "De Disciplina in adm. Sacrae Poenit." For the certificates of apostasy recently discovered see Leclercq, "L'Afrique Chrétienne," p. 176.)

LAST DAY. We have already had to speak of the Last Day, under the articles ANTICHRIST and JUDGMENT, GENERAL AND PARTICULAR. In this place we proceed to note certain points in ordinary Catholic belief not included under these previous articles.

Scripture tells us of certain signs which will precede the Last Day. The Gospel will first be preached all over the world (Mt. xxiv. 14), which, as St. Augustine warns us (Ep. 99, PL, xxxiii. 715), does not mean that all men will be converted, but that the Church will exist in all nations. When the fulness of the Gentiles has come in, then—for the words need not imply more than this (see Estius, *ad loc.*)—the great mass of the Jews will embrace the Christian belief (Rom. xi. 25). Enoch and Elias, according to the common belief, will appear to preach penance. This idea has an interesting history, which deserves more special mention, but we will begin by introducing the current belief itself in the words of St. Augustine (PL, xxxviii. 1376): "Enoch and Elias," he says (Serm. 299), "live; they have been translated; wherever they are, they live. And if a certain conjecture of faith made from the Scripture of God is not wrong, they will die. For the Apocalypse relates that at a future time two wonderful prophets will both die and rise again, in the sight of men, and go up to the Lord; and they are understood to be Enoch and Elias, although in that passage their names are not given." Let us trace the origin of that belief. Genesis and the Book of Kings tell us that Enoch and Elias were removed from the earth in an extraordinary way. From Malachias iv. 5, and from Mt. xvii. 11—though the inference is precarious—it was

inferred that Elias, not only in spirit and power, but in his proper person, would reappear before the end of the world. From the words of Ecclus. xliv. 16, "Enoch pleased God, and was translated into Paradise, that he may give penance to the nations," the same conclusion was drawn with regard to Enoch, though in the Greek the words simply are, "Enoch pleased God, and was translated, [being] an example of repentance to the nations." This belief in the reappearance of Enoch and Elias was connected with, and, as it was thought, supported by, that remarkable section of the Apocalypse, xi. 1–13. The holy city—*i.e.* Jerusalem (see v. 8)—with the exception of the ναὸς, or temple in the strict sense of the word, is to be trodden under foot by the heathen. Two witnesses of Christ, who are compared with the lamps and olive-trees in Zacharias, are to prophesy for about three years and a half, and to show miraculous power, but at last they are to be killed by "the beast." However, after three days and a half, they are to live again and go up "to heaven in the cloud." The fate of Jerusalem here depicted was taken as an allegory of the fortunes of the Christian Church, and it was commonly supposed that Enoch and Elias were the two witnesses. This belief is expressed clearly by Tertullian ("De An." 50, PL, ii. 733), and was undoubtedly the prevalent and, indeed, all but universal opinion of the ancients. Thilo, on the "Evangelium Nicodemi," c. 25, has treated the whole question elaborately. Bede, however, is said (by Dusterdieck, on the Apocalypse, *ad loc.*) to have rejected this interpretation; and we are able to quote Maldonatus (on Mt. xvii. 11), for what is, as we venture to think, a far more likely interpretation—viz. that St. John refers to Moses and Elias, who represented the law and the prophets, and had already witnessed to Christ in his transfiguration.

Another sign of the nearness of the last day is "the Apostasy" of 2 Thess. ii. 3, which St. Thomas and Estius, against many other interpreters, take to mean "a defection from the Catholic faith, and that a universal one, by which not only persons, however many (a thing that has often happened in former ages), but also the kingdoms and all, or all but all, provinces will withdraw from the Catholic Church." Signs, too, are the natural portents, famine, pestilence, earthquakes, darkening of the sun, &c., mentioned in Mt. xxiv. and Lk. xxi. But, after all, "concerning that day or hour no man knoweth, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father" (Mk. xiii. 32). The mistakes which even able and pious men have made on this point are well known. "Even some of the Fathers," Jungmann writes ("De Noviss." p. 208), "as St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, and distinguished preachers of the divine word, like St. Norbert and St. Vincent Ferrer, have sometimes expressed the opinion that the day of the Lord was at hand, because of the signs which seemed to them to be present." The persons who have been led away after this fashion in our own time have been of very different intellectual and spiritual calibre, and their warnings have occasioned some amusement but very little panic.

The order of events on the last day is quite uncertain. St. Augustine conjectures ("De Civit. Dei," xx. 30, PL, xli. 708), but merely conjectures, that the appearance of Elias will come first, then the conversion of the Jews, the persecution of Antichrist, Christ's advent, the resurrection, the separation of the good and the wicked, the conflagration and finally the renovation of the world. On the other hand, St. Thomas ("In Sentent. IV." dist. xlvii, q. 2. a. 3), whose opinion is most commonly followed, argues that the action of fire will begin before the judgment. It will, he thinks, kill and destroy the bodies of all upon the earth, torturing the evil, serving as purgatorial torment to the imperfect, and inflicting God's vengeance on the wicked. Further, it will cleanse and renew the earth, not after the judgment, as St. Augustine thought, but before it. This St. Thomas gathers from Rom. viii. 21, which, as he considers, makes the renovation of the world synchronous with the resurrection of the just. (See Jungmann, "De Novissimis"; Billot, "De Novissimis"; Atzberger, "Die Chr. Eschatologie" and "Geschichte der Chr. Eschatologie"; Oxenham, "Christian Eschatology"; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 541.)

LAST THINGS. The four Last Things are generally said to be Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell. These are not all, but the most important, things which happen to men as they leave and after they leave this world. The Germans speak of Eschatology (ὁ τῶν ἐσχάτων λόγος) as a special department of theology, and the name has been adopted by English writers. It includes the consideration of purgatory, the resurrection, the eternal reign of Christ, the destruction and renovation of the world. A very useful treatise "De Novissimis" has been published by Jungmann (Ratisbonae, 1874). Most of the subjects which fall under this head are discussed in separate articles. [See the previous article.]

LATERAN, CANONS REGULAR OF THE. A Congregation of Augustinian Canons who derive their name from the fact that for some centuries (until 1391) they formed the chapter of the great Lateran basilica. Their office for the feast of Pope St. Gelasius (d. 492) states that the pontiff established them at the Lateran. (See AUGUSTINIAN CANONS; Allaria in "Cath. Enc." *Canons Regular.*)

LATERAN CHURCH AND COUNCILS. The family of the Plautii Laterani had a magnificent house on the Coelian hill—"egregiae Lateranorum aedes," as Juvenal calls it (x. 17). This house, or a house on the same site, was known as the Lateran palace, and belonged to the Empress Fausta (Fleury, "H. E." x. 11). Her husband, Constantine, built close to it the Church of "the Saviour," known as the Basilica Constantiniana, and also—because the Emperor built a Baptistery there, and Baptisteries are associated with St. John Baptist—as the Church of St. John Lateran. It is the chief or Cathedral Church of Rome, and there the "Stations" are held on many solemn days (*ib.* xi. 36).[1] Bulls of Gregory XI., in 1372, and of Pius V., in 1569, have confirmed its pre-eminence over all other churches, even St. Peter's, and justified the proud inscription which meets the eye at the entrance, "Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput." In this church, besides an important council in 649 against the Monothelites, five general councils have been held.

(1) Under Calixtus II., in 1123. More than 300 bishops and 600 abbots were present. This was the Ninth General Council, and the first ever held in the West. The chief object was to end the strife on Investiture [*q.v.*] between the Emperor Henry V. and the Holy See. The arrangement made at the Concordat of Worms was confirmed. Henry agreed to leave the choice and consecration of prelates free, to resign all claims to invest with ring and staff, and to restore Church goods, while the Pope allowed the elections to take place in the Emperor's presence, gave him the right to decide in contested elections after taking counsel from the metropolitans and provincial bishops, and to confer the regalia with the sceptre. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 630 *sqq.*)

(2) The Second Lateran Council (Tenth General Council), held in 1139 under Innocent II., and attended by about 1000 prelates, excommunicated Roger of Sicily (champion of Anacletus II. the Antipope), suspended clerics promoted by Anacletus, and imposed silence on Arnold of Brescia, the great ecclesiastical demagogue of the day. Thirty canons were passed on simony, incontinence, clerical dress, breaking the "Peace of God," and contests dangerous to life. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 721).

(3) The Third Lateran and Eleventh General Council was convoked in 1179, by Alexander III., was attended by more than 300 bishops, and numbered about a thousand members in all. It ordered that future Popes should be elected by a majority of two thirds, and passed sentence of excommunication on anyone who accepted the Papacy on other conditions, as well as upon those who supported him. Disciplinary enactments were also made against simony, clerical incontinence, intercourse with Saracens and Jews. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 1086 *sqq.*)

(4) Innocent III. opened the Fourth Lateran and Twelfth General Synod, the most imposing, probably, of all councils ever held, in 1215, for the recovery of the Holy Land and the reform of the Church. The representatives of Frederick II., of Henry, Emperor of Constantinople, of the Kings of England, France, Aragon, Hungary, Cyprus, Jerusalem, and of other princes, 412 bishops, 800 abbots, many representatives of absent bishops and chapters, were present. The seventy decrees of the council concern most important points of discipline and doctrine. The Bishop of Constantinople was made the first of the Eastern patriarchs; the Greek rites, the jurisdiction of the other patriarchs, were fully acknowledged; while at the same time the Greek practice of rebaptizing children already baptized by Latins, and of washing altars to mark their defilement if they had been used by Latin priests, was reprobated, and the supremacy of Rome insisted on. Regulations were made and indulgences offered for the coming crusade. The duty of annual Confession and Communion was enforced. Definitions were issued on the absolute unity of God. Abbot Joachim had maintained that the three divine Persons were one God only in the same sense as many human persons are all men or Christians one with each other and with Christ. In other words he substituted a specific or moral for that numerical unity in which, with the real distinction of the three Persons, the mystery of the Trinity consists. The council, on the contrary, defined that each of the three Persons is identical with the one divine substance. It also defined the Catholic doctrine on the sacraments, &c., against the Albigenses, and in particular that the bread and wine in the Mass are "transubstantiated" into Christ's Body and Blood. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 1316–1398; Denzinger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion," p. 188–195.)

(5) The Fifth Lateran Council (Eighteenth General) was opened by Julius II., in 1512, and closed by Leo X., in 1517. The Church was distracted at the time by the schismatic Council of Pisa. The Fifth Lateran was attended by 15 cardinals and 79 (afterwards 120) bishops, mostly Italian. The decrees of Pisa were declared null, the "Pragmatic Sanction" condemned, and the French Concordat was approved, canons passed on preaching, exemption of regulars, *monts de piété*, &c., &c. Two decrees of the council are of wider interest. It defined (Bull "Pastor aeternus") the Pope's "authority over all councils," and (Bull "Apostolici regiminis") condemned those who held that the intellectual soul is mortal, or only one in all men, or that these propositions were true at least philosophically. (For the

[1] "Où est marquée la station des jours les plus solennels." But this is not borne out, at least by the present Missal.

French objections to the oecumenical character of the council, see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 90, and the article COUNCILS.)

LATIN. [See LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH.]

LATRIA (λατρεία) in itself simply means "service," whether rendered to God or man; but the usage of the Church has made it a technical term for that supreme worship which can lawfully be offered to God alone. The word is so used by the Greek Fathers and the Seventh General Council; and St. Augustine ("Contr. Faust." xx. 21, PL, xlii. 385) adopts it on the ground that no one Latin word will do instead. It was probably St. Augustine's influence which made it a familiar term in Latin theology. The sacrifice of the Mass is the principal act of latria, hence it is called in patristic literature λατρεία τῆς οἰκονομίας (Petavius, "De Incarnat." xv. 2).

LATROCINIUM (σύνοδος λῃστρική: "Robber Synod," "Council of Bandits"). A name given by Pope Leo (and current ever since) to the heretical council which met at Ephesus in 449 (Ep. xcv., PL, liv.). Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, had come forward in defence of the doctrine that there is but one nature of the Incarnate Word, and being discontented with the decision of the bishops who met at Constantinople and affirmed that Christ was one Person in two natures, he used his influence with the Empress Eudocia to have a general council convoked at Ephesus. Pope Leo did not oppose the meeting of the council, although he had clearly laid down the doctrine of the two natures in his letter to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. Dioscorus presided at the council, the Papal legates, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and Flavian of Constantinople, being present. Dioscorus tore their papers from all notaries except his own, and is accused of having falsified the Acts; he called in soldiers and fanatical monks, armed with cudgels, Flavian was trodden under foot and imprisoned, and the other bishops, with few exceptions, were forced by violence and starvation to sign a blank paper on which Dioscorus afterwards set the condemnation of Flavian. The Papal legates, however, protested at once. Flavian died shortly afterwards on his way to exile. Theodosius confirmed the decrees of this synod, but it was rejected by the churches of Syria, Asia Minor, Pontus, and the West. Pope Leo of course absolutely refused to acknowledge it. [See CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF. Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 584–621.]

LATTEN. [See BRASSES.]

LAUDA, SION. [See HYMNS.]

LAUDS. [See BREVIARY.]

LAURA. (Gr. λαύρα, properly an alley or lane.) An aggregation of separate cells, tenanted by monks, "under the not very strongly defined control of a superior." [1] Usually each monk had a cell to himself, but in the laura of Pachomius one cell was assigned to three monks. For five days in the week the tenants of the laura remained in their cells, living on bread and water, and working at basket-making, or some similar employment; on the Saturday and Sunday they took their meals together in the common refectory, and worshipped God in the common church. The discipline of the laura was a kind of intermediate stage between the eremitical life of St. Antony and the monasticism founded by St. Basil and St. Benedict. It flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries in the desert country near the Jordan; St. Euthymius, St. Sabbas, and the abbot Gerasimus were its chief types and promoters. St. Euthymius lived to be ninety-six years old; just before he died he told the person whom the monks had designated as his successor that it was the will of God that the laura should be turned into a monastery, as if foreseeing that this was the discipline of the future for the more perfect souls. (Fleury, livr. xxviii., xxix., xxx.; Smith and Cheetham.)

[1] *Dictionary of Christian Antiq.*

LAUS TIBI, CHRISTE. [See GOSPEL.]

LAVABO. The first word of verse 6 of Ps. xxv., which the priest recites while the acolyte pours water on his hands shortly before the Canon of the Mass. The rite indicates the perfect purity of heart with which the priest should celebrate those holy mysteries. This washing of the hands (by the deacon, however) is mentioned by St. Cyril of Jerusalem. The psalm is also recited during the washing of the hands in the liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. It is not said in the Ambrosian Mass, in which the priest purifies his hands silently just before the consecration. There is a great variety on this point in our old English rites. In that of York the washing is accompanied by a verse of Ps. xxv., the "Veni, Creator," and a prayer; in that of Hereford, by the "Veni, Creator," and a prayer; in those of Sarum and Bangor (?), simply by a prayer. (Le Brun, Benedict XIV., Maskell; Duchesne, "Christian Worship"; Fortescue, "The Mass," 309–311.)

LAW. The word is used in two widely different senses. When we speak of the "law of gravitation," we mean an observed invariable uniformity of co-existence and succession connecting certain effects with certain conditions or causes, so that when the conditions are present the effect invariably follows. The necessity which links the cause to the effect we do not understand, nor can account for: we only know by an unfailing experience that it exists: and as it forms an element in the phenomenal system of motions and changes in the midst of which we live, we call it a *physical* necessity, and the resulting uniformity we term a *law of nature*. But when we speak of the law of the Twelve Tables, or of the laws of Lycurgus, or the Mosaic, or the Gospel law, we mean a uniformity which *ought* to be imposed (assuming the law to be just) on

the actions of those subject to it, but which is not always observed in fact, because the subjects of the law are free agents and can refuse to obey it. The necessity which should, but does not always, make the conduct conformable to the precept, we call a *moral* necessity, or obligation; and the precepts which, being addressed to free agents, enjoin but do not compel their own fulfilment, we term *moral* laws, and divide into civil, criminal, natural, positive, &c. Of laws in this second sense, the first is the natural law, which we must carefully distinguish from "laws of nature" or physical laws. This natural law is implanted by God in the mind of every one of his reasonable creatures, distinguishing for them good from evil, and bidding them follow the one and shun the other (Rom. ii. 14, 15). But since the will of man has been weakened by the Fall, he is not able to obey the dictates of this natural law without some kind of assistance or reinforcement. This assistance is given, partly by human ordinances, directing, forbidding, rewarding, and punishing, partly by the revealed law of God; through the operation of which it appears to have been His will, first, to educate a single people to a more perfect knowledge and obedience; next, gradually to leaven and transform all the tribes of mankind, as they become one by one incorporated in the Catholic Church. Accordingly the revealed law is divided, historically, into the law of the Old and that of the New covenant. The law of the Old covenant, given on Mount Sinai, prepared the way for the kingdom of Christ, and—except as to that portion of it which was a restoration of the natural law and is perpetually binding—lost its divine authority on the establishment of the Church. The law of the New covenant is that which Christ the king proposes through the Church [see CHURCH OF CHRIST, GRACE, SACRAMENTS] to the human race. Thus every man, besides being subject to the internal or natural law seated in the conscience, is under two external laws. He is first—if not actually and *de facto*, yet potentially and *de jure*—under the divine law as interpreted and administered by the Catholic Church. Secondly, he is under the *lex loci*, the system of human law belonging to the country of his birth or domicile. If a conflict arise between the two external laws—as when the law of the land enjoins idolatry, or forbids the frequentation of the sacraments—it is manifest that the lower law ought to yield to the higher, and that individual Christians are bound, whatever may be the consequences, to "hear the Church," and disobey any contrary injunction. (Aberlé, in "Kirchenlex."; Cathrein, in "Cath. Enc."; St. Thomas, 1ª 2æ, q. 90 *sqq.*; Suarez, "De Legibus.")

LAX. [See MORAL THEOLOGY.]

LAY BROTHERS AND SISTERS. Persons who take the habit and vows of religion, but are employed mostly in manual labour, and are exempt therefore from the duties of choir, when they exist, or from the studies, &c., incumbent on the other members of religious orders, where there is no choir.

The first instance of a distinction between lay brothers (*fratres conversi*, *frères convers*) occurred in the monastery of Vallombrosa, founded in the earlier part of the eleventh century by St. John Gualbert. Afterwards we find lay brothers among the monks of Hirsau, and the Abbot William is said in his Life to have instituted this kind of religious. The Carthusians adopted the new practice, and now lay brothers and sisters are to be found in most religious orders, even among the Benedictines, who knew nothing of such a distinction at first.

Two causes, according to Fleury, contributed to the change. The greater part of the monks (contrary to the old usage) in the eleventh century were ecclesiastics, and it was necessary to provide for those who had the religious but no ecclesiastical vocation. Next, in the eleventh century, Latin was no longer a vulgar tongue, and hence many of the religious, ignorant of Latin and often unable to read, were unfit for the duties of the choir (Fleury, "H.E." lxi. 4, lxiii. 58; Discours, viii. a. 5.)

LAY COMMUNION is a phrase scarcely used at present among Catholics. But in the language of the early Church it often occurs to describe the state to which a cleric was reduced by forfeiting the right to exercise his functions without being excommunicated and losing the ordinary privileges of a Christian. Thus the Council of Agde (anno 506), canon 50, orders that bishops, priests, and deacons, guilty of certain great crimes, should for the rest of their lives only receive lay communion (*communionem laicam*). (Hefele-Leclercq ii. 1000.)

A cleric may be reduced to lay communion in three ways. (*a*) A cleric in minor orders may lawfully marry, but in this case the canon law deprives him of office, benefice, and privileges of his state. The Council of Trent however (sess. xxiii. c. 17, De Reform.) allows the promotion of men already married to minor orders, provided they are not "bigami" and there is a lack of other candidates. They have the privileges *canoni fori* if they wear tonsure and cassock. (*b*) A cleric in holy orders may be dispensed from his obligations—*e.g.*, of wearing the clerical dress, reciting his breviary, of celibacy, &c.—by the Pope. In that case the cleric in question is usually prohibited from exercising the functions of his office. (*c*) The old law of the Church reduced to lay communion clerics who were deposed or removed from their office. But, according to the more modern canon law, the loss of clerical privileges is not entailed by degradation.

LAYMAN. One of the people (λαὸς), as distinguished from the clergy. The Septuagint (Exodus xix. 24, Isai. xxiv. 2) used the word λαὸς in contradistinction to the priests. The other Greek versions have the words λαικὸς "laic," and λαικοῦν "to profane"; and so the Vulgate (1 Kings, xxi. 4) has the expression "laicos panes." Clem. Rom., Ep. i. 40, uses laic or layman (λαικὸς) for the first time in Christian literature, but he means by it a Jewish and not a Christian layman. But in the Clementine Homilies, Epist. Cl. § 5; in Clem. Al. "Strom." iii. 12, p. 552, ed. Potter; in Tertullian, "Praescr." 41, PL, ii. 57, we find the modern use of λαικὸς and *laicus* for Christian layman.

LAZARISTS. This is the popular name for the "Congregation of the Priests of the Mission," founded by St. Vincent of Paul in 1624, and established a few years later in the College of St. Lazare at Paris. St. Vincent, being engaged as a tutor in the family of the Countess de Joigny, was summoned one day to the sick-bed of one of her vassals, a well-to-do peasant held in general esteem, who desired to make his confession to him. Pressing the inquiry firmly into the state of the man's soul, St. Vincent discovered with consternation that he had the burden of several unconfessed mortal sins on his conscience, in spite of which he had been going on for many years making sacrilegious confessions and communicating. Being brought by the saint to a proper sense of the enormity of his conduct the man was very grateful, and declared without scruple his conviction that he owed more than his life to St. Vincent. The countess, hearing what had happened, entreated the holy man to preach in the church of Tolleville (near Amiens), where most of the congregation were her vassals, on the sin and danger incurred by making bad confessions. The consciences of the hearers were aroused, and numbers crowded to the confessional who had hitherto made no use, or a bad use of it. The countess now conceived the idea of founding and endowing an institute for the purpose of preaching missions in country districts. She desired Vincent to obtain if possible the services of Jesuits or French Oratorians; but neither society was able to undertake the work at the time. Finally it was arranged that Vincent, aided by several pious secular priests, who had for some years been associated with him in his various works of mercy and instruction, should commence the missions; that the institute should be established in the Collège des Bons Enfans, offered for the purpose by the Archbishop of Paris; that the countess should endow it with forty thousand livres; but that Vincent should not leave her house while she lived. Thus was the institute founded in the March of 1624; the countess died the same year. The congregation (which was confirmed by a bull of Urban VIII. in 1632) had a threefold end—the sanctification of its own members, the work of the missions, and the training of an exemplary clergy. As a rule, eight months in the year were devoted to missions, which were conducted nearly on the same plan on which Redemptorist and Passionist missions are conducted at the present day. St. Vincent, having lived to see twenty-five houses of the new institute established—in France, Italy, and Poland—died in 1660, being eighty-five years old. It has been already stated that the congregation removed to the College of St. Lazare (which had belonged to the regular canons of St. Victor) in 1632. It was a spacious site, and the third superior-general, Edmond Joly, erected on it the vast range of buildings still seen there. St. Vincent of Paul was beatified in 1729, and canonized in 1737. In the time of Hélyot—that is, early in the 18th century—there were eighty-four houses of the institute in nine provinces, whereof six were in France, two in Italy, and one in Poland. Some of the fathers showed an inclination towards Jansenism; but the firm and prudent government of the general of that day, M. Bonnet, checked in time the evil tendency. At the Revolution St. Lazare was twice plundered by the mob; several of the fathers were massacred in September 1792; and those who would not take the condemned oath were driven out of France. The *maison St. Lazare* was turned into a prison for women. Under the first Napoleon the congregation was allowed to re-enter France, and under the Restoration the grant was made to it of a house in the Rue de Sèvres. The missions left vacant in China and the Levant on the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773 were transferred to the Lazarists. The Congregation has at present missions in almost every land.

In the time of the Crusades there was a religious and military order of "Lazarists" whose chief duty was the care of lepers (Lk. xvi. 20 *sqq.*). When the Holy Land fell into the hands of the infidels the members betook themselves to France, and established the famous lazar-house at Paris, known as St. Lazare, originally a house for lepers as its name imports. (Bougaud, "Hist. de S. Vincent de Paul"; Maynard, "Hist. de S. Vincent de Paul"; De Broglie, "S. Vincent de Paul"; Hélyot, "Annals of the Congregation of the Mission.")

LEAGUE OF THE CROSS. The Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross was founded in 1873, for the purpose of uniting Catholics in a holy warfare against intemperance, and of thereby raising the religious, social, and domestic state of our Catholic people. "Total abstinence from intoxicating drinks is for all persons the surest safeguard, and for vast numbers the only safeguard, from intemperance. Those, therefore, who abstain from intoxicating drinks for the sake of Christian prudence towards themselves, or of Christian charity towards others, by so

doing please Almighty God."[2] The fundamental rules of the League are :—

1. The pledge is of total abstinence, and is taken without limit as to time.

2. Only Catholics can become members of the League.

3. All members, after they have joined the League, must live as good, practical Catholics.

4. No one who is not a practical Catholic can, as long as he fails to practise his religion, hold any office in the League.

The form of the pledge is : "I promise to you, Rev. Father, and to the League of the Holy Cross, by the help of God's grace, to abstain from all intoxicating drinks." To this is usually added : "And I also promise to be faithful in the practices of my holy religion." The pledge is not an oath or a vow, and is not of itself binding under sin. But it would be a sin for those to break the pledge who know that they would thereby expose themselves to the danger of intemperance. Many indulgences have been granted to members by the Holy See. (From the abstract of the Constitution and Rules of the League of the Cross.) [See also the art. TEMPERANCE.]

LECTERN, LECTURN, OR LETTERN. The reading-desk, called also *pulpitum* or *ambo* (*q.v.*), but most frequently *legite*, in French "jubé." St. Benedict (sixth century) calls it *analogium*. It is made of wood, stone, or metal, often in the shape of an eagle, whose outspread wings formed the stand for the volume to rest upon. (J. C. Cox, "Pulpits, Lecterns and Organs in English Churches"; Rock, i. 170.)

LECTION OR LESSON (*Lectio, ἀνάγνωσις.*) Some details on this subject have been given under EPISTLE, GOSPEL, BREVIARY. But something remains to be said now on the history of lections in general, and on the variety of practice which separates the ancient from the modern, and again the Eastern from the Western Church.

There was a far more extensive and continuous use of Scripture in the public services of the early Church than there is among us. Usually speaking, our people only hear the Gospel and Epistle read in the Mass, with the psalms and the little chapter (scarcely more than a verse or two), usually from the Epistle, at Vespers and Compline on Sundays or great feasts. In the primitive Church it was very different. Thus St. Augustine ("Praef. Exposit. in 1 Joann." PL, xxxv. 1977) says that he "was accustomed to handle (*tractare*) the Gospel according to John in the order of the lessons"; and that, although this order had been necessarily interrupted by lessons for special solemnities, the continuous reading had only been "intermitted, not omitted." In this way Genesis was read in Lent, Job in Holy Week, Acts between Easter and Pentecost, &c., &c. Our Breviary lessons for the first nocturn are no doubt a relic of this custom. But they are only a relic, partly because they are very incomplete, partly because the multiplication of festivals causes many even of the portions given in the office to be left out altogether; above all because the laity, as a rule, cannot assist at those Breviary offices. Chrysostom, says Scrivener, referring to "Hom. x. in Joann.," exhorts his hearers to peruse and mark the passages (*περικοπαὶ*) of the Gospels which were to be publicly read to them the ensuing Saturday and Sunday. (See his "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," 2nd ed. p. 69 *seq.*) Those sections, still preserved with little alteration in the modern Greek Church, are very different from our Gospels and Epistles. They contain the whole text of the Gospels, and at least nearly the whole text of the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles. On the other hand, while the Greeks read the Gospel on Sunday mornings in the office as well as in liturgy, their daily offices contain no lessons from Scripture.

It is certain, however, that the custom of introducing lections in the Breviary office, still maintained in the West, was at one time familiar to the Eastern churches. The Council of Laodicea, canon 17, requires a lesson to be read after each psalm, and Cassian ("Coenob. Inst." ii. 4) mentions that the Egyptian monks read two lections, one from the New, one from the Old, Testament, after each series of twelve psalms. This practice was already very ancient even in his time. At the end of the sixth century at latest, as appears from Gregory the Great (Epist. xii. 24, PL, lxxvii. 1234) and from the rule of St. Benedict, not only Scripture but also homilies upon it by Fathers and Doctors of the Church were read in the office. Charlemagne, in a "Constitutio de Emendatione Librorum et Officiorum," of 788, caused these lections from the Fathers to be revised and altered by Paul the Deacon. We have earlier evidence for the custom of reading the Acts of the Martyrs, which had begun before St. Augustine's time (Serm. cccxv. c. 1, PL, xxxix. 1426).

LECTIONARY. The oldest Latin Lectionary was known as the "Comes" (*i.e.* the cleric's "companion")—the "Comes Major" if it contained the Epistles and Gospels for the year in full, the "Comes Minor" if it merely noted the beginning and end of the portions read. The authorship was attributed to St. Jerome, and although there is no sufficient evidence for this belief, the Comes must have been compiled about St. Jerome's time, for it is mentioned by name in a document dated 471 (Mabillon, "De Re Diplomat." 1, vi. 482 *seq.*, edit. 3 Naples). It has, however, undergone several alterations. A Gallican Lectionary containing sections from the Prophets, Epistles, and Gospels, was discovered by Mabillon, and edited by him ("De Liturg. Gall." tom. ii.). It is written in Merovingian characters, recog-

nizes among the few feasts which it names that of St. Geneviève, and usually assigns three lections to each Mass, after the manner of the ancient Gallican Liturgy.

In the Greek church the Lectionaries consist of lessons from the Gospels (εὐαγγελιστάρια); from the Acts and Epistles (πραξαπόστολοι); while a few books known as ἀποστολοευαγγέλια have lessons taken both from the Gospels and Apostolic writings. Traces of Church lessons occur in MSS. of the fifth and sixth centuries—viz. in the Alexandrine MS. and in the Codex Bezae. Of Greek Lectionaries in separate volumes, none perhaps are older than the eighth century. The general name for tables of lessons, corresponding to the "Comes Minor" in Latin, is συναξάριον; for tables of week-day lessons ἐκλογάδια (τῶν δ' εὐαγγελιστῶν or τοῦ ἀποστόλου) while tables of lessons for Saints' days are called μηνολόγια. The oldest known Synaxarion is prefixed to the Codex Cyprius (K), of the eighth or ninth century; another is found in the Codex Campensis (M), which is perhaps a little later. An elaborate account of the Greek lessons will be found in Scrivener ("Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T."), from whom the latter part of this article has been taken. (Baudot, "The Lectionary," Eng. tr.)

LECTOR (ἀναγνώστης). A cleric, in minor orders, whose duty originally consisted in reading the Church lessons. The great antiquity of the order—the second of the minor orders among the Latins, the first among the Greeks—is proved by the facts that it is mentioned by Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in the middle of the third century (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." vi. 43), and that it is common to sects who differ from each other, and who separated from the Catholic Church in the fifth century—viz. Copts, Syrian Jacobites and Nestorians, not to speak of the schismatic Greeks. The Ethiopians, indeed, ignore this order, but it is mentioned in their ancient canons and councils. (Denzinger, "Ritus Orientalium," tom. i. p. 118.)

The very form of ordination, as it still exists with very slight alteration among us at the present day, is given in canon 8 of the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage, before the close of the sixth century. The bishop is to give the book (*codicem*) from which the Lector is to read, with the words "Take it, and be a reader of the word of God, to have, if thou fulfil thy office faithfully and usefully, part with those who have ministered the word of God."

The Greeks, according to Chardon, 793, have from ancient times ordained their Readers by imposition of hands, the handing of the book after ordination being among them comparatively modern. As to the other Oriental rites, the Jacobites, Copts and Syrians do not, the Nestorians do, confer this order by laying on of hands: all of them hand the book at the end of the ordination rite, but without any form of words. (Denzinger, tom. i. p. 134.)

Besides reading in church, the Lectors were also employed as secretaries to bishops and priests. They were often younger than the Ostiarii or Porters, for the Lectorate was the first order conferred on young clerics (Chardon, 789). The Roman Pontifical also assigns to them the office of blessing bread and the new fruits, a duty first mentioned in Pontificals of the years 600 and 700. (*Lector*, in "Kirchenlex.") At present this order is regarded chiefly as a step to the priesthood, and it is only in the office of Good Friday that the Missal recognizes their functions.

Altogether distinct from the Lectors just described are the "Lector Mensae," or reader at table in religious houses; the "Lector dignitarius," who regulated the reading of the lessons in some cathedral churches; and the Lectores—*i.e.* lecturers or professors—in monasteries and universities. (Morinus, "De Sacr. Ord.")

LEGATE. Among the Romans *legati* were either ambassadors, or officers of high rank appointed with the sanction of the senate to assist a dictator, consul, or proconsul in the performance of his duties, military or civil. In modern acceptation the term is confined to ecclesiastics representing the Holy See and armed with its authority. Legates are of three kinds—legates *a latere*, emissaries or nuncios (*legati missi*, *nuntii*, *internuntii*), and legates by virtue of their office (*legati nati*). The dignity of a legate *a latere* is, and has long been, confined to cardinals, though in former times it was not so: *e.g.* Pandulf, the legate sent by Innocent III. to receive the submission of King John, was only a sub-deacon. Legates *a latere* are either ordinary or extraordinary: the first govern provinces belonging to the Ecclesiastical State—such as were (before 1860) the Romagna and the March of Ancona—in the Pope's name; the second class are deputed to visit foreign Courts on extraordinary occasions, such as a negotiation for a peace, or arrangements for a general council, &c. *Legati missi* correspond to the ambassadors and ministers maintained by secular States at foreign capitals. Formerly they were called *apocrisiarii* [APOCRISIARIUS]: now, nuncios or internuncios—the latter being of inferior rank. *Legati nati* are, or were, archbishops to whose sees by an ancient Papal concession the legatine authority was permanently attached: as was the case with Canterbury in England, and Salzburg and Prague in Germany.

All three classes of legates above mentioned formerly enjoyed an ample, and even an immediate, jurisdiction, as representing the Holy See, in the provinces where they resided. Hence frequent collisions with episcopal authority arose. To put an end to these conflicts, the Council of Trent[1] decreed that

[1] Sess. xxiv. cap. 20, De Ref.

legates, even those *de latere*, nuncios, ecclesiastical governors, or others, were not to presume, on the strength of any faculties whatsoever, to impede the bishops in matrimonial causes or in those of criminous clerks, nor in any way to curtail or disturb their jurisdiction; nor, on the other hand, were they to take proceedings against clerks or other ecclesiastical persons, unless after recourse had been had to the bishop and he had neglected to act. The jurisdiction of legates is now, therefore, chiefly appellate. (Ferraris, *Legatus*; Taunton; Phillips in "Kirchenlex.")

LEGEND, GOLDEN. A collection of lives of the saints by Jacopo de Voragine (d. 1298). It was entitled by the author "Legenda Sanctorum," but was known as "Legenda Aurea" on account of the high estimation in which it was held. It is divided into five sections corresponding with the seasons of the year, viz. from Advent to Christmas, Christmas to Septuagesima, Septuagesima to Easter, Easter to the octave of Pentecost, and from the octave of Pentecost to Advent. Besides the lives of the saints it contains treatises on the meaning and importance of the great seasons, *e.g.* Advent, Christmas, &c. From the historical point of view it is valueless; but considered as legendary and parabolic it is admirably adapted to promote the love of God and devotion to His saints. Melchior Canus has severely denounced it ("De Locis Theol." XI. vi.); while on the other hand the Bollandists, usually inclined to be critical, have praised it (Jan. I, 19). The editions in the original Latin and in the translations have been numberless. The best Latin ed. is that by Graesse (Dresden and Leipzig, 1846, &c.). Caxton published an English version in 1483. Longfellow's "Golden Legend" derives its name and much of its matter from De Voragine's work. (Ott in "Cath. Enc."; Nostitz-Rieneck in "Kirchenlex."; Butler, "Legenda Aurea—Légende Dorée—Golden Legend.")

LEGITIMATION BY SUBSEQUENT MARRIAGE. The Civil Law and the Law of the Church agree in ascribing so great efficacy to the marriage tie that it is held to spread itself over, reach back to, and legitimate the birth of children to the same parties before the marriage. The Civil Law recognized this principle somewhat less unreservedly than the Canon, inasmuch as it ascribed a certain measure of relative lawfulness to the relation of concubinage. Against this the Church set its face, refusing to allow that there could be any lawful union between persons of opposite sex except by the way of marriage, and treating the child of a concubine as in no superior position, legally, to the child of a courtesan. However long a time may have passed, even though the father may have had a lawful wife and children in the interval, nevertheless, the first wife being dead, marriage with the mother of his natural children, even although he may be no longer capable of being a father, or be on the bed of death, legitimates the children of the illicit union, and makes them as capable of inheriting as if they had been born in wedlock. The reason is that the Church, like Christ, whom she represents in the world, yearns over her erring children, and desires to leave open for them a *locus poenitentiae*; and this all the more because the temporal interests and natural feelings of the innocent children are promoted and consulted by such lenity.

All that has been said, however, proceeds upon the assumption that at the time when the natural children were conceived or born the parties were free to marry. It is only in that case that the efficacy of the subsequent marriage can be held to reach back to the illicit union. If either the father or the mother was married at the time of the birth of the child, it is the offspring of adultery, and no subsequent marriage can legitimate it. It has been strenuously maintained by many canonists that if one of the parties was not free to marry at the time of the conception of the child, even though such freedom existed at the date of birth, the child is adulterine, and cannot be legitimated by subsequent marriage. The tendency of opinion, however, has for a long time past been towards the doctrine that the question should be decided simply by the date of birth; and that if at that time either party were so circumstanced that he or she could not possibly, even with the aid of a dispensation, have married the other, the child cannot be afterwards legitimated; but not otherwise.

A letter addressed by Benedict XIV., writing as a private doctor, to the Archbishop of San Domingo, in 1744, discusses this important subject in all its bearings with the utmost lucidity and force.

The Common Law of England, following, it may be supposed, some ancient Teutonic custom, does not allow that children born out of wedlock can be legitimated, or can inherit, through a subsequent marriage between the parties. This was decided so far back as 1236. At a council of the great men of the kingdom held at Merton, the bishops, who had found that collisions were of frequent occurrence between the spiritual and secular jurisdictions on account of their different views on this question—persons being bastardized by the one who were legitimated and held capable of inheriting by the other—"requested that the king's writs should no longer direct them to inquire specially whether the individual in question were born before or after marriage, but generally whether he were legitimate or not. They objected to the practice of the other courts: (1) that it was contrary to the Roman and Canon Law; (2) that it was unjust, because it deprived of the right of

inheritance the issue of clandestine marriages, though such marriages were not annulled by any law; and (3) that it was inconsistent with itself, because, while it bastardized the child born, it legitimated the child that was only conceived before marriage, though in both cases the moral guilt of the parents was exactly the same. But their arguments were fruitless. The earls and barons unanimously returned the answer [1] which has been so often repeated and applauded: 'We will not change the old and approved laws of England.'" [2]

This difference continues to exist; and since the marriage law of all countries in continental Europe, Protestant as well as Catholic, is based on either the Roman or the Canon Law, it is a common practice for English parents of natural children to settle, marry, and become naturalized abroad, so that their offspring, under the milder sway of the Canon Law, may cease to suffer from that slur of bastardy from which in England nothing can ever deliver them. (Ferraris, *Legitimatio.*)

LENT. A fast of forty days preceding Easter, kept, after the example of Moses, Elias, and, above all, of Christ Himself, in order to prepare the faithful for the Easter feast, and also of course on account of the general advantages to be derived from a long period of penance. The Greek and Latin names for the fast (τεσσαρακοστή, *Quadragesima*) indicate the number of days. The Italian *Quaresima* and the French *Carême* come from the Latin; the German *Fastenzeit* and the Dutch *Vasten* denote the fast by pre-eminence, like ἡ νηστεία in the Greek calendar; our own word Lent comes from the Anglo-Saxon *Lencten*, *i.e.* spring (*cf.* German *Lenz*, Dutch *Lente*, spring).

There is no mention in Scripture of the observance of Lent, or, indeed, of any determined time for fasting among Christians. In Acts xxvii. 9 St. Paul and his companions are said to have put to sea at a dangerous time, viz. "when the fast was already over." But the fast in view was evidently the one Jewish fast commanded in the law, that on the Day of Atonement, the tenth of Tisri. At that time the autumnal equinox was past, and, as a rule, no more voyages were undertaken for the season.

There is, however, proof that Lent, in the general sense of a fast preceding Easter, has been known from, or nearly from, Apostolic times. Thus Tertullian, in his Montanist treatise on fasting, tells us that according to his Catholic adversaries those days were set apart for fasting "under the Gospel dispensation (*in Evangelio*) in which the Spouse was taken away" ("De Jejun." 2; *cf.* 13; PL, ii. 955), whereas the Montanists kept additional fasts. An earlier writer, Irenaeus (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." v. 24), speaks of the fast before Easter, and the different modes of observance which prevailed in different places. The words occur in a letter to Victor, who was Bishop of Rome from about 190 till 202; and it is important to notice that Irenaeus says the difference of observance was no new thing, but had arisen "even long before, in a past generation" (καὶ πολὺ πρότερον, ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν). It is plain also that from very early times the Lenten fast, whatever its duration may have been, was considered obligatory. This is clearly implied in the language of Tertullian in the passages quoted above: "dies jejuniis determinatos"; "constituta esse solemnia huic fidei scripturis vel traditione majorum." [1] Passages to the same effect abound in the later literature of the Church. The Council of Gangra, in the middle of the fourth century, anathematizes (Can. 19) those who neglected to keep the fasts "observed by the Church." Jerome (Ep. 41, PL. xxii. 475) lays down the strict obligation of keeping the Lenten fast (see also Ambrose: *e.g.* "De Noe et Arca," 13, PL, xiv. 381). A number of similar statements may be seen in Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," part i. ch. v. A famous incident, mentioned by Sozomen ("*H. E.*" i. 11), and often alleged against the Catholic practice, is really an exception which proves the rule. There the story is told of a Bishop Spyrido (Spiridion) who, having no other food, not even bread or flour, in the house, gave an exhausted traveller swine's flesh at the beginning of Lent, and bade him eat it without scruple. But the stranger at first refused to eat it, on the ground that he was a Christian; and the bishop before furnishing this food "prayed and begged pardon" of Heaven. All things, as the bishop argued, are pure to the pure, and then, as now, the Lenten rule yielded to charity and necessity.

We have taken Lent hitherto in its widest acceptation, as meaning a fast of some sort before Easter, and in Ante-Nicene Fathers, so far as we are aware, no clear notice occurs of a fast consisting even approximately of forty days. In a very obscure and possibly corrupt passage of Irenaeus (*apud* Euseb. v. 24) the Benedictine editor Massuet (diss. ii. 23 *seq.*) sees an allusion to the forty days with which we are now familiar. He understands the saint to say that some kept the fast of extraordinary strictness known as xerophagy for one day, others for two or more, others for all the forty days of Lent. This is a possible and even plausible explanation, but it cannot be considered certain, and many scholars, Catholic and Protestant, believe that Irenaeus refers to an absolute fast from all food during two or more days, or for forty hours. However, from the early part of the fourth century onwards, there are many references to Lent as a period of about forty days. The word τεσσαρακοστή is found in Can. 5 of the Nicene, and Can. 50 of the Laodicean, Council,

[1] "Nolumus leges Angliae mutare."
[2] Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.* ii. 493.

the latter being held, according to Hefele, somewhere between 343 and 381. Even if the word was originally connected with the forty hours during which Christ lay in the tomb, it was taken in the fourth century at least to mean a period of forty days. St. Gregory Nyssen (tom. ii. p. 253) reckons Lent as a time of rather less than two months; while, in the West, St. Augustine (Ep. lv. c. 15, "Ad Januar."; PL, xxxiii. 217) connects the fast of Quadragesima with the forty days' fast of Moses and Elias. Still in this century, and the next also, the duration of Lent varied very considerably in different churches. Socrates ("H.E." v. 22) expresses his surprise that all used the same name τεσσαρακοστή to describe a fast which lasted in different places for seven, six, or only three weeks. There are no doubt inaccuracies in the statement as Socrates makes it, but we see no ground for questioning its correctness as to the main fact. From Sozomen, also a writer of the fifth century, we get more trustworthy information. All Africa, Egypt, Palestine, and the Westerns generally, he says ("H.E." vii. 19), kept Lent for six weeks, the church of Constantinople and the neighbouring provinces for seven. Cassian ("Collat." xxi. c. 24–27) says in general terms that some fasted seven, others six, weeks, but he gives the reason—viz. that some excepted Sundays and Saturdays, others Sundays only, from the fast. St. Ambrose ("De Elia et Jejunio," c. 10, PL, xiv. 708) recognizes the exemption from fasting on both days. The practice, however, of the Roman Church and of most Latins was to fast six weeks excepting Sundays—*i.e.* for thirty-six days. If the Greeks dispensed the Saturday fast, the older Roman usage appears to have dispensed in its place the Thursdays in Lent. In the older Sacramentaries these Thursdays have no special Mass, and those which were inserted in the seventh century are merely taken from other parts of the book. St. Gregory Nyssen's "rather less than two months" means eight weeks (fifty-six days in all) during which, fasting five days a week, we have a full Lent of forty days. Such a Lent may have begun on Septuagesima Sunday and have terminated on the eve of Palm Sunday—leaving Holy Week as an independent observance. The usage of Constantinople, on the other hand, prevailed in the East, and the Council in Trullo, in 692, ordered (Can. 55) that there should be no fasting on Saturdays in Lent, and no Mass said except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the feast of the Annunciation (Can. 52). Mass and fasting are in the minds of the Greeks incompatible, so that they observed seven weeks or thirty-five days of fasting—all Saturdays except Holy Saturday, the feast of the Annunciation, and all Sundays, being deducted.

However, more than a century before the Council in Trullo the Greeks could fairly claim to count forty days in their Lent. True, it is only on the Monday in Quinquagesima week that they enter on the strict abstinence both from flesh meat and *lacticinia*, and so Quinquagesima is called by them τῆς τυροφάγου, because, according to their way of calculating, it ends the week in which cheese &c. may be eaten. But after Sexagesima Sunday (hence named τῆς ἀπόκρεω) no meat is eaten, and this their present custom was already in force under the Emperor Justinian in 546 (see Fleury, "Hist." livr. xxxiii. No. 23, and *cf.* Thomassin, part ii. ch. i.).

Various attempts were made in the West to complete the number of forty days. St. Ambrose (Serm. 34) blames the custom of those who began the fast in Quinquagesima week, and the Fourth Council of Orleans (anno 541, Can. 2) likewise enforces uniformity and censures those who began Lent with Sexagesima or Quinquagesima. The Eighth Council of Toledo (Can. 9, anno 653) expresses a feeling then and earlier very common in the Church, when it describes the thirty-six days of Lent as a tithe of the year which Christians dedicated to God. But the monks aimed at greater strictness, for the "Regula Magistri," which Thomassin places at the beginning of the seventh century, enjoins religious to fast three days in Sexagesima and three in Quinquagesima week in order to supply for the six Sundays of Lent which were not fast-days.

At last the Latin Church added the four days of fasting before the first Sunday in Lent, which now began with Ash Wednesday. This new discipline is recognized in Canon 76 of the Council of Meaux (anno 846), and it appears from the words of the monk Ratramnus, who wrote about the same time, that these additional days were observed by the Roman Church and in the West generally. Still in the eleventh century St. Margaret of Scotland (Surius, Junii die 10) had to introduce the habit of beginning Lent with Ash Wednesday among her subjects; and St. Charles Borromeo, in the first council which he held, fully acknowledged the right by which the churches in the city of Milan and in other parts of the diocese which had retained the Ambrosian rite began Lent with the first Sunday and thus maintained their ancient usage.

We can only touch lightly on the other acts of piety by which Lent has been sanctified from early times. It was a season in which the faithful begged God's mercy for themselves, and were therefore expected to show mercy to others. The money spared by fasting was given in alms; the Imperial laws (see the references in Thomassin, part i. ch. xxviii.) forbade criminal processes, and while the Church reconciled penitents at the altar the emperors released prisoners, masters pardoned their slaves, and enemies became friends. It was a season of mourning, and hence the Church has always strongly dis-

countenanced festivities of all kinds during Lent. Lastly, the body is mortified, in order that the soul may be invigorated, and so from early times communions, sermons and spiritual exercises generally have been multiplied in Lent. (Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," Paris, 1685; Liemke, "Die Quadragesimalfasten der Kirche"; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week"; Ermoni, "Le Carême"; Vacandard, in DThC, *Carême.*)

LESSON. [See LECTION.]

LIBELLATICI. [See LAPSED.]

LIBELLI PACIS. [See LAPSED and INDULGENCES.]

LIBER DIURNUS. An ancient collection of formularies used in the Roman church. Garnier supposes that it was compiled shortly after 714. It was divided by him into seven chapters, which are subdivided into "titles." The seven chapters treat of the following subjects: (1) formularies used by the Pope in writing to the Emperor, Exarch, Consul, Patriarchs, Archbishop of Ravenna, &c.; (2) formularies for the election and consecration of the Pope, with the accompanying notice to the Emperor, Exarch, &c.; (3) for the election and consecration of the *episcopi suburbicarii*; (4) four formularies for giving the Pallium; (5) twenty-one formularies for despatch of business with Italian bishops consecrated by the Pope; (6) on the administration and alienation of the property of the Roman church; (7) on privileges granted by the Popes to monasteries and other ecclesiastical institutes.

The first edition was that of Garnier (Paris, 1680). In our own day there have been editions by Rozière (Paris, 1869), and Sickel (Vienna, 1889). The last-named was printed from the only manuscript then known, preserved in the Vatican: A more complete MS. was afterwards discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and published by Ratti (Milan, 1891). (Kirsch in "Cath. Enc.")

LIBER PENITENTIALIS. [See PENITENTIAL BOOKS.]

LIBER PONTIFICALIS. The "Book of the Popes" contains the lives of the pontiffs from St. Peter to Stephen VI. (*d* 891), with the exception of John VIII., Marinus I., and Hadrian III. It was formerly ascribed to Anastasius, librarian of the Roman Church in the ninth century. Duchesne and Mommsen are, however, of opinion that it is an expansion of certain primitive catalogues of the Popes, some dating as far back as the second century, and that there were two redactions of it, the later of which has alone come down to us. According to Duchesne, the earlier redaction took place under Boniface II. (*d.* 532), the later under Vigilius (*d.* 555). Mommsen places the earlier redaction later than Gregory I., and the second redaction later than Pope Conon (686–687). There have been many editions. That of Duchesne (Paris, 1886–92) has superseded all others. Mommsen's edition (Berlin, 1898) only goes down to Pope Constantine (*d.* 715), and is based upon Duchesne's labours.

LIBER SEPTIMUS. By this name are known two different collections, neither of which is of authority. 1. Pierre Matthieu, of Lyons, made a collection of Decretals from the pontificate of Gregory XI. to that of Sixtus V., and printed them in 1590. They have been included in two or three editions of the "Corpus," but are generally held to have no validity as a collection. 2. It was under contemplation in the time of Clement VIII. (1592–1605) to publish under this name a collection of recent Papal Constitutions and conciliar decrees. The book was actually printed in 1598, but permission to publish it was refused. There is an edition by Sentis (Freiburg, 1870). (Kober, in "Kirchenlex.")

LIBER SEXTUS. The Sext ("Liber Sextus Decretalium"; see art. on CANON LAW) received its name with reference to the *five* books of Decretals published by order of Gregory IX., but is itself divided, like that earlier collection, into five books and a certain number of titles.

LIBERA ME. A responsory sung by the choir after the Mass of the dead and before the "absolution" of the corpse. [See ABSOLUTION and FUNERALS.]

LIBERA NOS, &c. The *embolismus* or continuation of the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Mass. It is said secretly by the priest as soon as he has added "Amen" to the "Pater." On Good Friday, however, he sings it aloud. The prayer with slight variation is found in the Gelasian and Gregorian Canons. The principal changes that have been made are in the mention of the saints. At present only the Blessed Virgin, St. Peter and St. Paul (the founders of the Roman Church), and St Andrew, who was the first called to the Apostolate, are mentioned by name. But other names occur in the Gregorian Canon — viz. Dionysius with Rusticus and Eleutherius and Chlodoaldus: Even in the Middle Ages, as appears from the "Micrologus," the officiating priest could add names of saints here at discretion. In the Frankish recensions of the Gregorian Canon, the names of national Saints are interpolated (Denis, &c.). Rome never had any but Peter, Paul, and Andrew.

All the Western liturgies have a prayer, not only corresponding to but resembling our "Libera nos." The prayer in the Ambrosian Mass is merely a form of our prayer with slight variations. The Mozarabic prayer "Liberati a malo" has at least a general resemblance. The old Gallican liturgy is furthest removed from the Roman standard. There the continuation of the Lord's Prayer varies with the Mass. That for Christmas begins "Libera nos, omnipotens Deus, ab

omni malo," &c. (Benedict XIV. "De Missa"; Hammond's "Liturgies, Eastern and Western"; Fortescue, in "Cath. Enc.")

LIBERIUS was Bishop of Rome from 352 to 366. Because of the firm support he gave to the Nicene faith, and to Athanasius, its champion, he was banished to Beroea by the Arian Emperor Constantius, some time after the Synod of Milan in 355, the Arian Felix being put in his place at Rome. Liberius was separated even from his companions in exile in order to increase the rigour of his punishment and break his constancy. In 357 Constantius was in Rome, and found that scarcely anyone communicated with the usurper Felix, and that the populace were clamouring for the recall of Liberius. At last, nearly a year later, the Emperor consented to restore Liberius to his see. But on what conditions? Many ancient documents (we shall have to examine their real value further on) testify that Liberius bought his pardon dear—viz. by condemning Athanasius, communicating with heretical bishops, and subscribing a formula which denied, or at least betrayed, the Nicene faith. This is the view, not only of Protestant, but also of many Catholic historians. It is held, *e.g.*, by Baronius; Petavius, "De Trin." i. 9; Bossuet, "Def. Cler. Gall." p. iii. lib. ix. c. 33; Fleury, "Hist." livr. xiii. 46; Döllinger, "Papst-Fabeln"; Hefele-Leclercq (i. 908 *seq.*); and many others. On the other hand, the Bollandist Stilting, "Acta SS." tom. vi. Sept.; Zaccaria, "De Commentitio Liberii Lapsu"; Palma, "Praelect." tom. i. par. 2; and recently Reinerding, "Beiträge zur Honorius- und Liberiusfrage," 1865; and Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte" (vol. iii., 1880, p. 106 *seq.*), treat the "fall of Liberius" as an Arian fiction. The question has naturally assumed great prominence from its bearing on the Papal infallibility. In this article we treat of the historical fact and of its dogmatic import separately.

Theodoret, Socrates, and Sulpicius Severus are altogether silent on the fall of Liberius, and we may fairly take their silence as proof either that they had not heard of or else did not believe it. But we have, on the other hand, the distinct and contemporary evidence of Athanasius twice repeated: "Liberius, being exiled, later on, after a period of two years, gave way (ὤκλασε) and, in fear of the death with which he was threatened, subscribed (φοβηθεὶς τὸν ἀπειλούμενον θάνατον ὑπέγραψεν). But even this shows their violence, and the hatred of Liberius against the heresy, and his decision (ψῆφον) for Athanasius when his will was free. For things done through torments contrary to the original judgment—these are not acts of will on the part of those who have been put to fear, but of those who inflict the torture" ("Epist. ad Monach. et Hist. Arian." 41; PG, xxv. 741). He speaks to much the same effect in the "Apol. contr. Arian." 89; PG, *ib.* 409. "O wretched man that you are," says another contemporary, St. Hilary, addressing Constantius ("Contr. Constant. Imper." c. 11; PL, x. 589), "I know not whether there was greater wickedness in your banishing him [Liberius] than in your sending him back" ("nescio utrum majore impietate relegaveris quam remiseris"). This looks like an allusion to the price Liberius had to pay for his recall. Sozomen ("H.E." iv. 15) gives us the details. "Constantius," he says, "united the delegates from the bishops of the East [*i.e.* from the Semi-Arian Council of Ancyra] to the prelates who happened to be present with him in the Court at Sirmium. They combined the definitions of the Antiochene Council in 269 against Paul of Samosata and those of Sirmium against Photinus with the symbol of the Antiochene Council of 341" (probably Sozomen refers to the fourth of their symbols), "and persuaded Liberius to subscribe the new formula or collection of old formulas in which the word 'consubstantial' was abandoned. They brought him to take this step by telling him that the ὁμοούσιος was a mere cloak for Sabellianism. Liberius, however, insisted that he who did not confess the Son to be in essence and in all things like the Father was to be excommunicate." Lastly, Jerome, in his Chronicle (PL, xxvii. 683), says of Liberius, "overcome by the weariness of exile, setting his name to heretical error, he entered Rome as a conqueror." And again, "Catal. Script." 97, he charges Fortunatianus of Aquileia with compelling Liberius to subscribe heresy.

This surely is a fourfold cord of evidence not easily broken. All the witnesses are of great, two (Athanasius and Hilary) of the greatest conceivable weight. And all the accounts are at once independent of and consistent with each other. Liberius would make no terms with the Anomoeans, or extreme Arians, but he did communicate with the semi-Arians, who condemned Athanasius, and abandoned the touch-stone of orthodoxy—viz. the Nicene term ὁμοούσιος. He subscribed the Semi-Arian formula which was compiled from older documents and is known as the third formula of Sirmium.[1] But he did all this under fear, consented to omit the ὁμοούσιος only when persuaded that it was understood in an heretical (*i.e.* Sabellian) sense, and he accompanied his subscription with a protest against pronounced Arianism. We can easily understand why Athanasius speaks with such touching gentleness of Liberius in the moment of his infirmity. Moreover, Liberius soon recovered himself from his fall, for we find him confirming the orthodox Council of Alexandria in 362.

Stilting and his numerous followers, who

[1] This is given as highly probable, for historians differ much as to the particular formula signed by Liberius. See Newman's *Arians*, 2nd ed. p. 332, and Bossuet, *loc. cit.*

exculpate Liberius altogether, are driven to expedients which we cannot help regarding as desperate. They explain away the words of Hilary, regard Jerome and Sozomen as deceived by Arian rumours, and try to show that the decisive words of Athanasius are interpolations. "Hilary's words," says Hergenröther, "may only mean that on this occasion also [*i.e.* in the recall of Liberius] Constantius displayed his impiety." But how could he display in recalling Liberius impiety greater or equal to that which he had shown in driving him from his see if he allowed him to return to it without dishonourable conditions? Next, as to the places in St. Athanasius. Undoubtedly it is true that the passage in the "Hist. Ar. ad Mon." did not belong to the original draft sent to the monks, for it was written before the supposed fall of Liberius; but then Athanasius begged them (see the introductory epistle, c. 3) to send the letter back, and afterwards ("Epist. ad Serap." i. 1) he forwarded it to his friend the Bishop Serapion, and there is not the least difficulty in supposing that Athanasius completed his history by adding to it the account of an event which had happened in the interval. The same chronological objection is made to the second passage from Athanasius, and is disposed of by Hefele just in the same way. Besides, it is hard even to imagine what could have led to the interpolation of the passages. Certainly they were not forged in the interests of Arianism. In style and tone they are every way worthy of St. Athanasius, while the statement they make explains, and at the same time is confirmed by, the words of Hilary.

We should have to think much more severely of Liberius if certain Fragments attributed to Hilary (particularly Fragments iv.–vi.; PL, x. 678–681, 689–695) and the letters of the Pope incorporated in Fragment vi. were genuine. In Fragment vi. Liberius is called an "apostate" and a "traitor" (*praevaricator*) and anathematized three times; while Liberius himself makes a formal and deliberate confession of Arian belief. The Fragment containing these letters was supposed by the Benedictine editor Coustant to belong to a lost work of Hilary against Ursacius and Valens. There is nothing to allege in favour of this supposition except a note in the margin of the MS. "Sanctus Hilarius illi [sc. Liberio] anathema dicit." And there are strong reasons for rejecting the Fragment as none of Hilary's and regarding the letters of Liberius as supposititious. We must refer the reader for the arguments drawn from chronological errors, the barbarism of the style, the clumsiness and unnaturalness of the forgery, to Hefele. He thinks the letters were forged in the name of Liberius and in the Anomoean interest by a "Graeculus" who had but a very slight knowledge of Latin. On the other hand, Leclercq (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 91 n. 2), Hefele's latest translator and editor, following Gwatkin ("Studies of Arianism," p. 193) and Turmel (*Le Pape Libère* in "Rev. Cath. des Églises," 1906, t. iii.), looks upon Hefele's arguments as poor. Dom Chapman, however, in "Cath. Enc." stands by Hefele.

It is amazing that anyone, after an impartial consideration of the facts, should have pressed them into the service of Gallicanism. Liberius, at the time of his fall, taught nothing and imposed no belief. Besides, if the Pope is to teach *ex cathedra*, common sense requires that he should be free. Liberius, on the contrary, subscribed the Semi-Arian formula separated from his friends and counsellors and in terror of death. It is as if, to borrow an illustration of Cardinal Newman, a judge were hurried away by bandits, kept without notes, books, or counsel, and forced under terror of death to decide a legal case in one particular way. Nobody, save from prejudice, would pretend that such a decision was valid. What the case does prove is the extreme importance attached to the judgment of Liberius. They knew his zeal and energy, and "the impious," writes Athanasius, "said to themselves 'If we persuade Liberius, we shall quickly master all'" ("Hist. Ar. ad Mon." c. 35; PG, xxv. 733).

(The literature has been given with tolerable fulness in the body of the article. We ought to add that Newman, even in the second edition of his "Arians" (1871), assumed the authenticity of "Hilary," Frag. iv. and vi., and consequently of the letters attributed to Liberius, but he afterwards (1886, ed. 5) accepted Hefele's view. See "Arians," p. 323.)

LIBRARIES. The two captures of Rome in the fifth century, first by Alaric and afterwards by Genseric, must have been fatal to any large accumulation of books in the Eternal City; but mention is made of a Vatican library in the time of Pope Vigilius (†555), and under Leo IV. (†855) the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia was its librarian (Thomassin, II. i. 95). Gregory the Great had certainly the command of a large library. The famous Alexandrian library—a monument at once of the enlightenment of the Ptolemaic dynasty, and of the high grade of culture which the confluence of the Semitic with the Aryan intellect at that city rendered possible—perished, if we accept the common story, through the bigotry of Omar;[1] but a few years later new libraries began to be formed on northern shores and islands, where barbarism had hitherto reigned supreme. Bede[2] tells us that the abbot Benedict Biscop conveyed to his monastery of Wearmouth, on returning from his numerous Roman journeys, a large and splendid library (*bibliothecam nobilissimam copiosissimamque*), which, "as

[1] But, as Gibbon says (ch. li.), the common story is more than doubtful; it rests on the sole authority of Abulpharagius, a writer of the thirteenth century.

[2] *Hist. Abbatum*, § 9.

necessary for a completely furnished church, he ordered should be kept entire, and neither damaged through neglect, nor dispersed " in the hands of borrowers. This was about A.D. 680. Archbishop Egbert founded at York a " nobilissima bibliotheca " about 750; the fact is mentioned in one of Alcuin's letters.[1] The library of Glastonbury, for some time after St. Dunstan had been abbot there, was the best in England. William of Malmesbury, to whose sterling literary qualities the student of English history is under such deep obligation, himself actively aided abbot Godfrey in forming a large and well-chosen library at Malmesbury Abbey.[2] That every large Anglo-Saxon monastery had its library there can be no doubt. In Ireland, at all the great monastic centres, such as Armagh, Clonmacnoise, Inisfallen, Boyle, Kells, &c., there were large collections of books—a fact which the number of Irish MSS. still surviving, in spite of the havoc made by war and rapine, and the effects of a damp climate, amply attests. Generally it is true of Europe that all through the mediaeval period a threefold process, of accumulation, loss or dispersion, and re-accumulation of books, was going on. Barbarians from Scandinavia ruined most of the libraries of Anglo-Saxon monasteries, and a large number of those in Ireland. Under St. Dunstan books were again copied and collected; a second dark period ensued till about 1050; after the Conquest a long era of comparative peace and progress began. A glance at the " Philobiblon " of Richard of Bury (†1345), the learned and polite bishop of Durham, shows that the collection, binding, conservation, and utilization of books, everything in short that appertains to the office of a librarian, was already well understood in the fourteenth century. The Kings of France began from about 1370 to form the library of the Louvre. In the fifteenth century, the printing-press having come into use, and ancient learning, especially Greek learning, being held in greater esteem than ever before, new books and editions were multiplied and libraries extended. In this work Italy took the lead. The Vatican library, founded by Nicholas V. (1447–1455) and enriched by later gifts and collections, soon became the best library in Europe. (Pastor, " Hist. of the Popes " ii. 207 *sqq.*) Even at this day, although in the department of printed books it is probably surpassed by many, there can be few, if any, that can point to so superb a collection of MSS. The Medici family founded the Laurentian library at Florence, which could also boast of the public library of St. Mark, established in 1437. Venice and Ferrara laboured in the same field. Out of Italy, Matthias Corvinus founded, about 1480, a celebrated library at Buda, and stored up in it a large number of Greek MSS. which he had rescued from the Turkish conquerors of Constantinople. Unfortunately, his capital was too near to the still expanding power of the Ottomans, and his literary treasures were in great part dispersed or lost. Heidelberg, Vienna, and Leyden, all founded libraries in the fifteenth century. The great Cardinal Ximenes added a well-stocked library to the university which he founded (about 1500) at Alcalá. In England the views of the early Reformers were not favourable to the interests of learning. It is well known that the commissioners of Edward VI. ordered a large collection of MSS., which had been given to the University of Oxford by the good Duke Humphrey, to be burnt, on the suspicion that they contained matter of Papistry. Sir Thomas Bodley, about the end of Elizabeth's reign, repaired this havoc, built a large portion of the present library, brought into it a fine collection of books and MSS., and endowed it with ample estates. The library of the British Museum, originating in the purchase from Sir Hans Sloane in 1753, lavishly aided ever since by public money, and enriched by the grant of the library of the Kings of England, and the purchase of George III.'s collections from George IV., takes the lead of all similar institutions in England in the number both of books and of MSS. The Bodleian occupies the next place. (Hallam's " Literature of Europe"; Thurston in " Cath. Enc."; Gasquet, " Mediaeval Monastic Libraries " in " The Old Eng. Bible, &c. "; Scudamore, in " Dict. of Chr. Antiq.")

[1] Will. Malm. *Gest. Pontif.* p. 246. [2] *Ib.* p. 431.

LIE. [See MENTAL RESERVATION.]

LIGHT OF GLORY. [See BEATIFIC VISION.]

LIGHTS. [See CANDLES; LAMPS.]

LIGUORI, ST. ALPHONSUS. [See MORAL THEOLOGY.]

LIMBO. The Latin word *Limbus* (or " fringe ") was used in the Middle Ages for that place on the fringe or outskirts of hell in which the just who died before Christ were detained till our Lord's resurrection from the dead. It likewise signifies a place (also supposed to be beneath the earth and on the outskirts of hell) inhabited by infants who die in original sin.

(*A*) The *Limbus Patrum* is the Paradise of Lk. xxiii. 43, so called because it was a place of rest and joy, though the joy was imperfect. In Lk. xvi. 23 it is called by the Rabbinical name " Abraham's bosom " (חֵיקוֹ שֶׁל אַבְרָהָם) because there the just remained in loving intercourse with Abraham, the father of the faithful. Estius thinks it was to the spirits in the Limbo of the Fathers as well as to those in Purgatory that Christ is said to have preached (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20). The passage, however, is difficult, and different interpretations are given by Fathers and other Catholic commentators.

(*B*) *Limbus Infantium.*—It is an article of faith that those who die without Baptism, and in whose case the want of Baptism has not

been supplied in some other way, cannot enter heaven. This is plainly stated, *e.g.*, by the Council of Florence in the Decree of Union (Denzinger-Bannwart, 693). But there was a natural repugnance to the belief that those who had committed no sin should be tortured in hell, and this difficulty led theologians to adopt various theories as by way of escape.

1. Some few theologians thought that God might be pleased to supply the want of Baptism in infants by other means. Thus St. Bernard ("De Baptismo," c. i. n. 4, c. ii. n. 1) thought that possibly such infants might be saved by the faith of their parents. A similar opinion is attributed to Gerson, Cardinal Cajetan and others—viz. that the lack of Baptism might be supplied by the wish for the sacrament on the part of their parents or others; Cajetan requiring in addition the use of some external sign with the invocation of the Trinity. (See Billuart, "De Baptism." diss. iii. a. I.)

Another theologian, Knoll, *i.e.* Albertus a Bulsano ("Compend. Theol." vol. ii. § 325, quoted by Jungmann, "De Noviss."), believed that God might commission angels to confer Baptism on infants who might otherwise perish without it.

2. The theologians of the Augustinian order (*e.g.* Noris and Berti) held an opinion at the opposite pole—viz. that the infants in question were punished both by exclusion from heaven and by positive pain, though much less pain than is inflicted on those who died in actual mortal sin. This undoubtedly is the opinion of St. Augustine (Serm. 294, PL, xxxviii. 1337), where he teaches that unbaptized infants were consigned to eternal fire, though their damnation will be "the lightest of all" ("De Peccat. Meritis et Remiss." i. 20).

3. The great majority of theologians—the Master of the Sentences, St. Bonaventure, St Thomas, Scotus &c.—teach that infants dying in original sin suffer no "pain of sense" but are simply excluded from heaven. This opinion is no modern invention, for it is found in St. Gregory Nazianzen ("Or. in Sanct. Baptism." 23;[1] PG, xxxvi. 389). But do they grieve because they are shut out of heaven? Bellarmine ("De Amiss. Gratiae," vi. 6, *apud* Jungmann) answers Yes. St. Thomas answers that they do not, because pain of punishment is proportioned to personal guilt, which does not exist here. He says they do not grieve because they cannot see God, any more than a bird is grieved because it cannot be emperor or king: "nay, they rejoice, because they share in God's goodness and in many natural perfections." The opinion of St. Thomas is the common one in the Church. It is believed that unbaptized infants in Limbo know and love God by the use of their natural powers, and have full natural happiness.

The existence of the Limbo of Infants has never been defined by the Church, although the Jansenist Council of Pistoia was censured by Pius VI. for scoffing at it as a Pelagian fable. The doctrine of the Pelagians was widely different. They denied original sin and obliterated the distinction between grace and nature, and when pressed to explain the need of Baptism replied that it was necessary to secure admittance to the kingdom of heaven, but not to obtain eternal life. "Eternal life," to which the Pelagians admitted unbaptized infants, was of the same order as the Kingdom of Heaven. The happiness obtained in the Limbo of Infants is of a wholly different order, being natural instead of supernatural. (The dogmatic theologians speak of the Limbo of Infants in their treatises on Original Sin and the Last Things. See also the art. BAPTISM.)

LITANIES (λιτανεία, earnest supplication). A form of united prayer by alternate sentences, in which the clergy lead and the people respond: usually of a penitential character. A litany may thus be distinguished from other modern devotions, such as that of the Stations, in which, with much that is alternate, there is also much that is not. There were four forms of litany recognized by the Church as suitable for use in public worship: viz. the Litany of the Saints, that of the Blessed Virgin (usually called the Litany of Loreto), that of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, and that of the Sacred Heart. The Litany of the Saints is chanted on the feast of St. Mark (April 25), and on the three Rogation days; on the former occasion it is called the Greater (*litaniae majores*), and on the Rogation days the Lesser (*litaniae minores*). During the devotion of the Forty Hours, the Litany of the Saints is sung with the addition of certain verses; on the other hand, when it is sung on Holy Saturday and Whitsun Eve, a number of verses are omitted. The Litany of the Blessed Virgin—in which titles expressive of the transcendent dignity and privilege of the Mother of God, as well as of the love, trust, and veneration of her children towards her, are woven into a chain of animated supplication—is now usually sung at Benediction. It came into general use from having been observed to be sung in the Santa Casa of Loreto, whence pilgrims carried it into all Christian lands; but a large portion of it is far older than the foundation of the sanctuary, which of course only dates from the thirteenth century. Clement VIII. directs that, whereas a number of unauthorized litanies had lately been published, no one should for the future presume to publish, or to use in public worship, any litany but those in Breviaries, Missals, Pontificals, and Rituals (*i.e.* the Litany of the Saints in its various forms), and the Litany of Loreto. But it is

[1] He thinks that infants who die unbaptized "will neither be glorified nor punished by the just judge, as being without the seal [*i.e.* Baptism] indeed, but without wickedness."

universally held that the use of the Litany of the Most Holy Name, having been already sanctioned by the Holy See before the date of the bull "Sanctissimus," is in no way affected by its prohibitions. It was formally approved by Leo XIII. (June 16, 1886). The Litany of the Sacred Heart was also approved by Leo XIII. in 1899. Later still, Pius X. gave his approbation to the Litany of St. Joseph (March 18, 1909). All of the above-mentioned Litanies may be recited publicly and liturgically. Bishops may sanction the printing of other Litanies for private use.

If the Greater Litanies fall on Easter Day they are transferred to the Tuesday following. Priests are bound *sub mortali* to recite the Litanies both on St. Mark's day and on the three Rogation days. No new names of saints can be inserted without the special permission of the S.R.C.

The earliest and simplest form of litany is the "Kyrie Eleison," which was recited in various ways in primitive times, but in the twelfth century settled down to the form still in use. The first litanies were embedded in the liturgy; later on they were developed independently, chiefly through being used in processions. Under the heading "Litania Romana" there is extant in a Sacramentary of the age of Gregory the Great a Litany of the Saints, evidently intended for use in some Gaulish church;[1] it contains 101 names. There is a manifest connection between such a litany and collections of short metrical lives of saints—such, *e.g.*, as that in a Bodleian MS. (No. 779), which contains 104 lives.

The practice of singing the Litany of the Saints on St. Mark's day is said to have been instituted by St. Gregory. Seven processions, starting simultaneously from seven Roman churches, and singing litanies as they went, all met in the church of St. Mary Major.[2] Their use on the Rogation days was begun by St. Mamertus, archbishop of Vienne, in the year 447, the special intention being the deliverance of the people from wolves, which in that year were more than usually ravenous. [See ROGATION DAYS.]

LITERAE FORMATAE. [See EPISTOLAE ECCLESIASTICAE.]

LITERAE PATENTES. Certain public documents were so called from the form in which the notaries commenced them: *e.g.* "Per praesens publicum instrumentum cunctis *pateat* evidenter";[3] "Let it be clearly made known to all by the present public instrument." Canonists speak of the *Letters Patent* of Louis XI. in 1475 as the earliest instance in France of the application of the doctrine of the royal *pareatis* ("ye may obey") or *placitum regium* [see CANON LAW, p. 104] to the reception of bulls, briefs, &c., from Rome. ("Kirchenlex." *Placitum Reg.*)

LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. The authorship has often been attributed to Peter Damian, but Bona ("Divin. Psalm." c. 12) brings strong evidence of its use in monasteries as early as the pontificate of Pope St. Zacharias (741–752). He quotes to that effect Peter the Deacon ("In Reg. S. Bened." c. 64), who indeed goes so far as to make St. Gregory II. (715–731) its originator. Bona further appeals to St. John Damascene as a contemporary witness of its vogue in the East in the eighth century.

It consists of psalms, lessons, and hymns in honour of the Blessed Virgin, arranged in seven hours like the Breviary office, but much shorter. It is not influenced by the course of the Church year, except that the Alleluia is omitted in Lent, and that a change is made in the office from Advent to the Purification. Even the Alleluia is not added to the invitatory antiphons, responsories and versicles in Easter time (S.R.C., 28 Martii, 1626).

The Council of Clermont, under Urban II. in 1096, made the recitation of the Little Office obligatory on the clergy, but secular priests who are not bound to recite the office in choir are now free from all obligation of reciting the Little Office, as has been clearly stated by Pius V. in his bull "Quod a nobis postulat" prefixed to the Breviary (see Maskell, "Mon. Rit." vol. iii. p. lxii.). By the Constitution *Divino Afflatu* (Nov. 1. 1911) the choral recitation was abolished.

On the other hand, the dispensing of the clergy from the obligation led to the introducing of the peculiar office of S. Maria in Sabbato, arranged by St. Pius V. and made obligatory by Clement VIII., which introduces several characteristic elements of the Little Office.

In many religious orders, and in rules for persons in the world, the Little Office is prescribed instead of the Breviary hours.

LITURGIES. I. *Meaning of the Word.*—The word λειτουργία means a public service, and especially at Athens a public service which the richer citizens discharged at their own expense. The theocratic constitution of the Jewish commonwealth naturally led the Septuagint translators to use λειτουργία and the kindred forms chiefly of the service of God in the sanctuary. It answers to various words in the original Hebrew (see *e.g.* Exod. xxviii. 21, Num. xxxviii. 25, 2 Paralip. xxi. 4). In Lk. i. 23 it denotes the service of a Jewish priest, and it is used in the New Testament of any service rendered to God (see, *e.g.*, Philipp. ii. 17). There is no clear instance in the New Testament of λειτουργία or λειτουργεῖν signifying a service performed by the Christian clergy, though in Acts xiii. 2 the words "As they ministered to the Lord (λειτουργούντων

[1] Art. by Hotham, in Smith and Cheetham.
[2] Hotham, *ubi sup.*
[3] This is the opening of the notarial report of a sermon preached at Oxford in 1382 (MS. Bodl. 240, p. 848.)

αὐτῶν) and fasted " may possibly refer to the action of the " prophets and teachers " in preaching and guiding the devotions of the congregation. Clemens Romanus (Ep. 44, PG, i. 297) does use λειτουργία for the functions of the Christian presbyters. In the fourth century the use of the word for priestly ministrations was fully recognized (see, *e.g.*, the Council of Ancyra, canon 1 ; anno 314), and from that date down at least to the sixth century it was used for any solemn service (*e.g.* evening prayer, baptism, &c.), but especially for the Eucharistic service. In this sense it has been adopted bythe Greek Church, which speaks of " divine liturgy " where Latins would say " holy Mass." It is in this, its narrowest signification, that we take the word here. Under " liturgies " we include all forms and services in any language and in any part of the church for the celebration of the Eucharist. We may add here that σύναξις (assembly) is another word used by the Greeks for the Mass, and that *dominica solemnia* (Tertull. " De Fug." 14, PL, ii. 119); *dominicum celebrare* (Cyprian, " De Op. et Eleem." 116, Ep. 63, ed. Hartel, p. 714); *officium* (Tertull. " De Orat." 18, PL, i. 1177), besides "sacrifice," "offering," "bloodless and rational sacrifice," are names common among the Fathers. The word " Mass " first appears in St. Ambrose. [For its meaning see Mass.]

II. *Liturgical Notices to the Middle of the Fifth Century.*—Scripture tells us little or nothing of the way in which the Apostles celebrated the Eucharist, but from the year 150 onwards we have abundant proof that the Church in all parts of the world had a fixed order and, to a certain extent at least, fixed words for this the greatest of all her services.[1] This section of our article is taken from Le Brun, vol. iii. diss. i. a. 5, from whom we borrow the patristic references.

The Mass was said by the bishop, or in his absence by priests assisted by at least one deacon (Cyprian, Ep. 5, ed. Hartel, p. 479).

It began with lections from the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists. These lessons from the Old or New Testament are mentioned by Justin in his first Apology, written in 138 or 139. And it was the custom of the East, as attested by St. Chrysostom (" Hom. 19 in Act. Ap." PG, lx. 151), of Gaul (Sulpic. Sever. " Vit. Martin." 7), Milan and Spain, to read the Prophets as well as the Epistles and Gospels. On the other hand, in the Roman and African churches there were usually only two lections—one from the Epistles, another from the Gospels, with a psalm between them (August. " Serm." 176 *al.* 170, PL, xxxviii. 950). Nevertheless, as regards Rome, many indications (the double Gradual, the Ember Day Masses, &c.) point to the fact of her primitive Liturgy having likewise included a lesson from the Prophets, preceding the Epistle. These lections were not, as now in our Mass, preceded by an introit.

Then followed a sermon, after which certain prayers were said over the catechumens, and they were dismissed (Ambrose, Ep. 14). Here we have the first great division of the Mass into the " Missa catechumenorum " and " Missa fidelium." The Council of Laodicea, canon 19, mentions a prayer for the penitents who were dismissed after the catechumens, but in 390 Nectarius of Constantinople abolished public penance in the East.

The altar was then covered with cloths (Optat. lib. vi.) and the celebrating bishop's hands were washed by a deacon (Cyril of Jerusalem, " Mystagog." 5), and in all the East (Justin, " Apol." 2 ; Concil. Laod. can. 19 ; Chrysost. " De Compunct. Cordis "), in Spain and Gaul, the faithful gave each other the Kiss of Peace ; whereas in Rome and Africa the Pax immediately preceded the Communion. The bread and the mixed chalice (of which latter even Justin speaks) were presented, and in Carthage from St. Cyprian's time verses of the psalms were sung at this part of the Mass. The Offertory rite, both as to position and form, has always greatly varied. The prayer " Super oblata " (or as we call it the Secret) is found in the earliest Roman Sacramentaries.

The " Sursum corda " is mentioned by Cyprian ; and Augustine says the Church over all the world answered " that they lifted up their hearts to the Lord " (" De Vera Relig." 3, PL, xxxiv. 125). The Preface, according to St. Chrysostom and St. Cyril, was followed by the Sanctus. We know very little from the Fathers about the words of the Canon. They tell us generally that the words of institution were accompanied by prayer, the faithful answering " Amen " at the end ; and St. Augustine (" In Symb.") says the sign of the cross was made at the consecration. The fraction of the Host in Africa, and, before the time of St. Gregory the Great, at Rome, took place, as it still does in the Ambrosian Mass, before the Pater Noster. In the ancient use of the Roman and African churches the Pax was given after the Pater Noster. At Jerusalem the celebrant, in other Eastern churches the deacon, said " Holy things for holy persons " (*τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*). The veil of the sanctuary, as St. Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Alexandria mention, was partially drawn aside and the faithful received Communion under the form of bread in their hands from the bishop or priest, while the deacons gave them the chalice. In the church of Carthage from the fourth century verses of the psalms were sung, and we know from St. Cyril

[1] A remarkable study of the Ethiopic Rite made by the erudite Dom Cagin seems, however, to have put us in the way of reconstructing the Liturgy in the very wording of the second and third centuries (" Eucharistie," tome ii. Solesmes, 1913).

that they used to sing the verse "Taste and see that the Lord is good" in the church of Jerusalem. The faithful were taught to say "Lord, I am not worthy," &c., as they went to communicate. All ended with thanksgiving and the salutation or blessing from the bishop, "Grace be with you and peace" (Chrys. "Hom. iii. ad Coloss." PG, lxii. 325). These extracts from the Fathers are not, of course, meant to convey the impression that one liturgy or even that all the forms just given were used throughout the Church. What they do prove is that the Church everywhere had certain forms, and with regard to some of these forms the date and the character of the incidental notices which survive show that their origin may be traced almost to Apostolic times and that their reception was universal.

III. *When were Liturgies first written?*—Very different answers have been given to this question, which would not arise at all if we could assume that the Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, and St. Clement were rightly named. It is, however, absolutely impossible to suppose that these liturgies, as we have them, came from those whose names they bear. The Clementine Liturgy comes to us under the most suspicious circumstances in the latest book of a notorious forgery, and there is no reason to believe that it ever was actually used in any church. The Liturgy of St. James contains insertions from that of Constantinople which must have been made as late as the fifth—one (the hymn οἱ τὰ χερουβίμ) as late as the seventh century; words of controversial theology abound in it (see Hammond, "Ancient Liturgies," xliv.); and the very fact that no extant liturgies (except the Clementine) have any form of dismissing penitents points to a time later at least than the abolition of public penance in the East by Nectarius in 390. Doubtless these liturgies contain older elements, but we can only know or conjecture what they are by collecting information from extraneous sources.

These sources are of course the writings of the Fathers and the decrees of councils, and from these it may, we think, be safely inferred that there was no entire written liturgy during the first three centuries of the Church. Tertullian ("De Corona," 3, PL, ii. 78) assumes that various most important liturgical usages (*e.g.* celebration of the Eucharist early in the morning, oblations for the dead on the feasts of martyrs (*pro natalicius*), reception of the Eucharist from the hand of the "president") rest simply on "custom" and "tradition." He makes no allusion to a written liturgy. Cyprian (Ep. 63, ed. Hartel, 702) argues against those who used water only, instead of wine mixed with water, in the Eucharist. He argues at length, and is evidently anxious to adduce every possible reason against the novelty; but he, again, appeals simply to "the tradition of the Lord," without the remotest reference to liturgical documents. These, it may be said, are, after all, only arguments from silence. But if we contrast Cyprian's argument with that of the Council in Trullo, between four and five hundred years later, we shall see how strong this argument becomes. The council (canon 32) strictly forbids the Armenian custom of consecrating wine unmixed with water, and in proof that this was wrong appeals to the three Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom —*i.e.* to the three liturgies then as now used in the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Le Brun, tom. iii. p. 9). Further, notwithstanding the full information we have about the sacred books which the Christians were required to surrender in the Diocletian persecution, we hear nothing of their liturgies.

We assert, then, that there was no written liturgy in the first three centuries, and this though Probst ("Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte," *ad init.*) has tried hard to show that such liturgies existed from 150. Probst's learning and accuracy deserve all respect, but we cannot think equally well of his logical power, and we confess that we are utterly unable to discover anything which approaches proof in his laborious argument. We are disposed, however, to go further and follow Le Brun to the full extent of his thesis—viz. that written liturgies did not exist for the first four centuries. He relies on Basil "De Sp. Sancto," c. 27: "Which of the Saints has left us in writing the words of invocation at the exhibition of the bread of the Eucharist and the chalice of benediction? For we are not content with those mentioned by the Apostle or the Gospel, but we also say other words before and after, as having great force with respect to the mystery, receiving them from unwritten tradition." The reader must judge for himself as to the import of these words. So excellent an authority as Maskell ("Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," ed. 3, xxvii.) believes that St. Basil only means to deny that the liturgical words were contained in Scripture. Early in the fifth century Pope Innocent I., writing to Decentius, who had applied to him for the Roman Use, reminds him that he had often come to Rome and witnessed the customs observed "in consecrating the mysteries and in the performance of other secret rites" ("in caeteris agendis arcanis"), and that this sufficed. He tells him, however, that the Pax should be given, not (as in the East) before the consecration, but "after all the things which I ought not to disclose." This does not look as if the Canon of the Mass had even then been committed to writing in the Roman Church. Long before this, however, there may have been a fixed, even if there was not a written, Canon of the Mass. The memory of the ancients, who were obliged, before the invention of printing, to

use the faculty much more than we are, must not be measured by our modern standard. It was a common thing in the ancient Church for persons to know the Psalter by heart, and priests learned to repeat the Canon without book (even now no surprising feat) long after it had been written.

IV. *Families of Liturgies.*—The most superficial observer cannot fail to be struck by the difference between the Eastern and Western liturgies. Each of the former can be printed in very narrow space, because it is only in the lessons and subordinate hymns that any variation occurs. It is very different, *e.g.*, with our Roman Mass, with its wealth of collects, Prefaces, &c. Moreover, in the Roman Mass there were at one time a much larger number of variable Prefaces. There is the same variety in the liturgies of Gaul and Spain, and in these last even a great part of the prayers corresponding to the Roman Canon vary also. Thus it comes that a separate volume is needed for each Western liturgy, while all the chief Eastern ones, with slight omissions, can be printed in one manual.

We are able, however, to divide the liturgies on a more exact and thorough system. "It is now thoroughly recognized," says Hammond ("Ancient Liturgies," xvi.), "that there are five main groups or families of liturgies, which are distinguished from each other chiefly, though not solely, by the different arrangement of their parts." Three of these are Oriental, two Western—one purely so, the other Western in respect of the countries where it was used and many of its characteristics, but presenting at the same time certain Oriental peculiarities. These groups are called: 1. the Western Syrian and derivatives; 2. Alexandrian and derivatives; 3. Eastern Syrian and derivatives; 4. Hispano-Gallican; 5. Roman and its derivatives.

(1) *The West Syrian Family* places the great intercession for the living and the dead (which is common to all liturgies and which is familiar to us as the Mementoes for the living and for the dead) after the invocation of the Holy Spirit—which in Oriental liturgies follows the consecration. The oldest member of this family is the Liturgy of St. James, but this again is, "without doubt, a direct modification of a liturgy nearly if not quite identical with the so-called Clementine." St. Basil's Liturgy is a recast from that of St. James, and St. Chrysostom's an abbreviation of St. Basil's. In its chief characteristics, and even in part of its wording, the Armenian liturgy follows St. Basil's. The Liturgies, then, of St. James, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, of Armenia, are the members of this family. Palestine, Armenia, the whole territories of the Greek and Russian churches, are, as we shall see, the countries where it prevails.

The *Clementine Liturgy* never seems to have been actually used in any church. Le Brun places its composition at the end of the fourth century. Hammond thinks it may represent liturgical use in the middle of the third century, at a time when the worship of the Church, though not uniform, still had not been broken up into the separate and developed forms of the later liturgies. It bears unmistakeable marks of great antiquity. Such are the exact agreement with the order of the parts of the liturgy mentioned by Justin; the prayers over catechumens, the possessed, penitents; the prayer for persecuting emperors, &c. Again, the great length of the Preface points to a time when there was no elaborate cycle of feasts to fix the mind on particular grounds of thanksgiving. The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions as it stands is probably not older than the fifth century. But the compiler would not have ventured to put an entirely new liturgy into the mouths of the Apostles. The puzzling feature of this liturgy is the absence of the Lord's Prayer.

Liturgy of St. James.—Its antiquity is proved by its correspondence with the description of the Liturgy by St. Cyril of Jerusalem. It was once current throughout the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch. It exists in two recensions, Greek and Syriac, of which, as Renaudot has shown, the Greek is the original. In its Greek form it is now used only by the Schismatic Greeks at Jerusalem and Zakynthos on St. James's day, October 23. (See Article *Liturgy* in Smith and Cheetham.) In its Syriac form, it is the chief and prototype of the many liturgies used by the Jacobites or Monophysite Syrians and by the Maronites who are Catholics. The Maronites, however, have changed the words of consecration to the Roman form and reduced the invocation of the Holy Spirit to a prayer for the spiritual benefit of the communicants, who now receive only under one kind.

The *Liturgies of Constantinople*—viz. those of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom—are now used far more widely than any other Eastern liturgies. The Liturgy of St. Basil may very likely be his in substance, and since the Council in Trullo (*i.e.* from the close of the seventh century) the "Liturgy of St. Chrysostom" (an abbreviation of St. Basil's) has borne its present name. The Liturgy of St. Basil is said on Sundays in Lent except Palm Sunday, on Holy Thursday and Saturday, the Vigils of Christmas and Epiphany, and on St. Basil's day. In Lent, except on Sundays and Saturdays, the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified (of uncertain date and authorship) is used; on all other days of the year the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. The Liturgies of Constantinople are used, not only by all Greeks subject to Constantinople, or again (in Slavonic) throughout the Russian church, by the Bulgarians, Georgians, &c., but also by the Melchites or Oriental "Orthodox" in

communion with Constantinople, and by the United or Catholic Greeks in Italy and other parts of the world. A letter of Balsamon shows that Constantinople in the twelfth century had already imposed her liturgies on a remnant in the other Eastern Patriarchates which had not become Nestorian or Monophysite. She had thus secured a barren uniformity at a heavy price. If it had not been for the vitality of Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monothelite heresies, the liturgies of Constantinople might have obtained exclusive possession, and rites no less Catholic and venerable than those of Constantinople might have perished altogether under the influence of bigotry and ambition.

The *Armenians* use only one liturgy, founded on the Greek one of St. Basil. The United Armenians use the same rite with some modifications. Bartholomew of Bologna, a Dominican missionary, had the Roman Missal (Dominican edition) translated into Armenian, and introduced it in the middle of the fourteenth century among the "United Brethren," an order for converted Armenians. The two most striking peculiarities in the true Armenian rite—the use of unleavened bread and wine without water—are shown by Le Brun (tom. iv. diss. x. a. 10) to have been introduced by an Armenian council about 640, in order to symbolize the Monophysite doctrine that Christ had only one nature.

(2) The *Second or Alexandrian Family* is characterized by the occurrence of the "Great Intercession" for living and dead in the midst of the Preface, and by the prominent part assigned to the deacon. The original Church language of the Alexandrian church was Greek, and we possess three Greek liturgies belonging to it: viz. those of St. Mark, St. Basil, and St. Gregory. Originally there were twelve Coptic liturgies, and these are still preserved in Ethiopic by the Abyssinians, who depend on Alexandria; but Gabriel, 70th Patriarch of the Copts, who lived in the twelfth century, limited the Copts to three liturgies—viz. those of St. Cyril, St. Basil, and St. Gregory, all in Coptic. Of course the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Basil, whether Greek or Coptic, must be carefully distinguished from that of Constantinople.

The Greek Liturgy of St. Mark is in its main features very ancient, for it contains references to persecution as still likely, though it has been altered under the influence of Constantinople. The Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril exhibits close and often verbal agreement with that of St. Mark, and has the true Alexandrian arrangement of parts throughout. The Coptic St. Basil, on the other hand, is identical with that of St. Cyril up to the Anaphora, but in the Anaphora—*i.e.* from the "Sursum corda" to the end—it conforms to the Constantinopolitan or West Syrian model. Hammond supposes on very plausible grounds that the Alexandrian St. Basil, whether Greek or Coptic, arose from uniting the Anaphora of St. Basil used by the Greek church to the proanaphoral portion of the original Alexandrian liturgy. Finally, the Liturgy of St. Gregory follows the type of the Coptic St. Basil. The chief Ethiopic liturgy, the "canon universalis," closely follows the Greek St. Mark and the Coptic St. Cyril. It is unique, as Hammond points out, in omitting the "Sursum corda," with its response.[1] Of their three existing liturgies, the Copts ordinarily use that of St. Basil. St. Gregory's is only used in the midnight Masses of Christmas and Epiphany; St. Cyril's, which, as we have seen, is the purest representative of the old national liturgy, only on the Friday before Palm Sunday. (Marquis of Bute, "Coptic Morning Service for the Lord's Day," Introduction.) The Catholic or United Copts have imitated the Latins in several points—viz. Communion under one kind, the use (mostly) of unleavened bread, and kneeling at Communion. (Marquis of Bute, *ib.*)

(3) The *East Syrian Family* places the general intercession between the words of institution and the invocation of the Holy Ghost. It includes the liturgies in the Syriac tongue used by the Nestorians and Chaldeans, &c., descendants of Nestorians who abjured heresy and returned to the Church, preserving, however, their ancient rites.

The Nestorians have three liturgies. The most ancient, and also that in ordinary use, is "The Liturgy of the Blessed Apostles, composed by Lord Addaeus [prob. Thaddeus] and Maris, Doctors of the Children of the East." It omits in its present form the words of institution, though Bickell has proved that it originally contained them (see Hammond, lix.) The other two liturgies are called after Theodore (of Mopsuestia) and Nestorius, though there are reasons for believing even this last to be older than the Nestorian schism in 431. The liturgy of Nestorius is the only one of the three which has been corrupted in the interest of heresy (Le Brun, diss. xi. a. 10). Le Brun (*ib.* a. 11) asserts that the Chaldeans or Nestorian converts of Diarbekir have adopted a Syriac translation of the Roman Missal, using, however, leavened bread. He seems to have been misinformed; at all events this is not the case now. Badger, the learned author of "The Nestorians and their Ritual," whose authority is decisive on such a point, says the Catholics of the Chaldean rite use the same three liturgies as the Nestorians. They have, however, introduced the words of institution in the liturgy of the Apostles, and placed them after the invocation in the other two liturgies. They

[1] It is true that Renaudot (i. p. 487) omits the "Sursum corda," but he is likely enough in error. Brightman (p. 228) duly gives it; with, however, the peculiarity that it follows instead of preceding the equivalent to our "Gratias agimus." See also Fortescue, *Lesser Eastern Churches*, pp. 284, 317.

elevate the Host and chalice, and they give the laity at communion the Host dipped in the Precious Blood. Moreover, the priest reserves the particles over after the communion of the people, instead of consuming them like the Nestorians; priests say Mass daily, and even, if there are several priests in one church, have more than one Mass on the same altar (Badger, vol. ii. p. 241 *seq.*).

(4) *The Kindred but Independent Liturgies of Gaul and Spain.*—Here the Great Intercession comes just after the offertory, though the Mozarabic Mass has also a Memento of the living after the Pater Noster. Not only collects, lections, &c., but also the greater part of the prayers which correspond to the Canon are variable. It has been supposed that these liturgies are partly due to the church of Asia Minor, with which the ancient church of Lyons was connected. However that may be, certain it is that this Western family of liturgies has some Eastern peculiarities: such are "Sancta sanctis" in the Mozarabic Liturgy, and, in both the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, the regular reading of a lection from the Old Testament, the various proclamations by the deacon, the "Preces" (*i.e.* probably a series of intercessions like the *ectene*, or deacon's litany in Eastern liturgies), and the giving of the Pax early in the service, whereas in the Roman Mass it has always been given, according to the earliest notice extant, after the consecration.[1]

The word "Mozarabic" is from *Mozzarab*, the participle of an Arabic verb meaning "to adopt the Arab mode of life." It must have been applied to Christians living under the Moors, but the liturgy is much older than its name, for it is substantially the same as that known to Isidore of Seville in the sixth century. It was, indeed, this Saint and his brother, St. Leander, who had the principal share in compiling the Spanish Missal, and St. Isidore presided over a Council of Toledo which imposed it on all Spain and on Narbonne, which did not belong to the Franks till 759. In Charlemagne's time the Mozarabic or Gothic rite fell into some disrepute because of expressions in it supposed to favour the Adoptionist heresy. Early in the ninth century, after much discussion between Rome and Spain, the Missal, from which the incriminated phrases had been removed, was declared orthodox; the Spaniards, however, being required to conform the words of consecration to those in the Roman Missal. But in the next century, Alexander II., Gregory VII., and Urban II., made great efforts to substitute the Roman Missal. In the thirteenth century the Mozarabic rite had disappeared from every cathedral church, and at the end of the fifteenth it had disappeared altogether. In 1500, Cardinal Ximenes published the Mozarabic Missal with some few assimilations to Roman use, and built a collegiate church in which this Missal and the Mozarabic Breviary (printed 1502) were to be used. At present the Mozarabic rite is followed, not only in this church, but in one at Salamanca (?). The most remarkable feature in the Mass to an ordinary observer is the elaborate symbolism of the Fraction. The Host is divided first into two, then into nine parts, each with a separate name, taken from the mysteries of Christ's life. Dom Férotin of Farnborough has recently discovered and published in their entirety the Mozarabic Missal and Rituals. Hence we have now fuller knowledge of the details of the Visigothic Liturgy than (with the exception of the Roman) of any other. (See Jenner in "Cath. Enc." *Mozarabic Rite.*)

Gallican Liturgy.—This venerable liturgy does not exist in a complete form, since no Gallican "Antiphonarium" (the book containing introits, offertories, &c.) has yet been found. But we have three Sacramentaries printed by Cardinal Thomasi in 1680, and again by Mabillon in his "De Liturgia Gallicana," in 1685. The first is called by Mabillon "Gallico-Gallicanum," and was probably used in South Gaul; the second, "Missale Francorum," used in North-Western Gaul, contains a large admixture of Roman elements—the prayers are Gelasian, the Preface, though retaining its Gallican name, "Contestatio," ends like the Preface in the Roman Mass; the third, "Gallicanum Vetus," seems free from Roman admixtures, except in the office for Good Friday. Besides, we have a Gallican Lectionary edited by Mabillon in his work cited above, and a "Sacramentarium Gallicanum," found by Mabillon in the monastery at Bobbio, and printed by him in his "Museum Italicum." But this last has the Gregorian or Roman Canon. Further, we have a most detailed and valuable exposition of the old Gallican Mass, in an extract from two letters of St. Germanus of Paris, written in the middle of the sixth century. Additional fragments of eleven Gallican Masses have been published by Mone ("Griechische und lateinische Messen," Frankfort, 1850), and a few more by Bunsen ("Analecta Ante-Nicen.") and Mai ("Script. Vet. Vaticana Collect." tom. ii.). From the materials at his command, Le Brun has been able to give a very full and trustworthy account of the Gallican Liturgy, which in the order (though not in the name) of its various parts is almost identical with the Mozarabic Liturgy, which we possess entire. Want of space compels us to refer our reader to Le Brun's clear and interesting account in tom. iii. It was under the influence of Pepin and Charlemagne that the Gallican gave way to the Roman rite. The Caroline books, composed in 790, certify that

[1] St. Justin, however, in the second century describing a Greek liturgy, probably that in use in Rome in his day, distinctly puts the giving of the Kiss of Peace before the Preface.

the Roman was already received in "the provinces of all the Gauls," in Germany and Italy, as well as among the Saxons and "certain nations of the North." It is needless to say that the revision of the Roman Missal made for the use of their dioceses by French bishops in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and now at last entirely abandoned, must not be confounded with the ancient Gallican Missals. Rome never approved these modern revisions by episcopal authority, while, on the other hand, the ancient Gallican rite, if it had been retained, would have been in no way affected by the decree of Pius V. forbidding any deviation from the Roman Missal as approved by him, except in churches where a prescription of two hundred years could be claimed for the liturgy in use.[1]

(5) *The Roman Missal and its Derivatives* are characterized by the position of the Pax just before communion; the division of the Great Intercession into a Memento of the living before, and of the dead after, the consecration; and the absence of the invocation of the Holy Ghost to consecrate the oblation (Epiklesis). The early history of the Roman Liturgy is unknown. Writers of great name, Milman, De Rossi, Lightfoot, Westcott, &c., have contended, with great probability, that the original Roman church was composed mainly of persons who spoke Greek. A large proportion of the names in the salutations of the Epistle to the Romans, and nearly all the names of the Roman bishops for the first two centuries, are Greek. So is all the early literature of the Roman church. And it is held by Westcott ("Canon." p. 269) and many others that the early Latin versions of the New Testament were made for Africa, not for Rome. Again, St. Paul wrote to the Roman Church in Greek; for few now will adopt the unfortunate suggestion of the scholiast in the Peshito, that the original of the Epistle was in Latin. If we adopt this view, we shall also be led to the supposition that the liturgy was in Greek. When Justin wrote his "Apology" to the Emperor Pius, he was living in Rome. If in describing the celebration of the Eucharist he draws his picture (as would be most natural) from the Roman church, then, undoubtedly, the Roman Liturgy was Oriental in character. The liturgical order in Justin differs in marked features from the Latin Mass of Rome, as it was when we first hear of it and as it is now, and agrees with the Oriental liturgies of Family I.

The oldest authentic notice of the Roman Mass is in Innocent's letter to Decentius (anno 416). He mentions two characteristics which distinguish the Roman Mass from all other liturgies—viz. the giving of the Pax towards the end of the Mass, and the Memento of the living after the oblation and in the Canon ("Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc eorum nomina, quorum sunt, edicenda, ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur"). The Roman order was already ancient, for Innocent attributes it to St. Peter. The Canon of the Roman Mass must have been fixed in every detail in St. Leo's time (440–461); for, according to the ancient author of the "Lives of the Popes," he added the words "Sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam." We have a Leonine Sacramentary, published by Muratori in his "Liturgia Romana Vetus," but unfortunately it contains merely collects and Prefaces without Ordinary or Canon. The "Lives of the Popes" attributes a more important work of revision to Gelasius (492–496), who, it is there said, composed prayers and Prefaces. Walafrid Strabo adds that Gelasius set in order the prayers composed by himself and others. The Gelasian Sacramentary was edited at Rome from a MS. "copied before the year 700" (so Le Brun, tom. iii. diss. ii. a. 2; Hammond, on the contrary, says "from an early ninth-century MS."), and afterwards from other MSS. by Gerbertus, in his work on the old German Liturgy (1776–79). It agrees closely, and has perhaps been altered into conformity with the Gregorian Ordo and Canon. Pope Vigilius (elected 538) sent the Roman Canon ("Canonicae precis textum") to Profuturus, bishop of Braga, in Spain. He tells him that this Canon was invariable the whole year through (and here let the reader note a distinguishing mark of the Roman as contrasted with all other Western liturgies), except that on the solemnities of Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Epiphany, and of the Saints, certain "Capitula" appropriate to the day were added. These "Capitula" were most likely, as Le Brun conjectures, short additions similar to those now made in the "Communicantes" and "Hanc igitur." The finishing stroke was put to the work by Gregory the Great (590–604), whose Sacramentary was edited by Pamelius in the second volume of his "Liturgicon Latinum" (Cologne, 1571), by Rocca (Rome, 1597), and by the Benedictine Ménard (in 1642) with learned notes. Gregory made a slight change in the Canon—viz. by directing the words "diesque nostro," &c., to be said in every Mass (see article CANON), and another of far greater moment, by placing the Fraction after, whereas till then it had occurred before, the Lord's Prayer. He abbreviated the rest of the Mass. Thus he substituted verses for entire psalms, and whereas the Gelasian Mass had two or three prayers before the Epistle, one Secret, two Post-communions—of which one

[1] But certain genuine Gallican rites were preserved down to the Revolution in many French churches, notably the episcopal benediction between the Pater Noster and the "Pax Domini" (preserved at Sens, Paris, Auxerre, Troyes, Meaux, &c.), and the lection from the Old Testament in the Masses of Christmas Day. Le Brun, tom. iii. iv. 4.

was said over the people ("super populum") —Gregory reduced the ordinary number of these prayers to three: Collect, Secret, Post-communion: and of the Prefaces—very numerous in ancient times—kept only those few which we still have (Muratori, "De Rebus Liturg." p. 14; and Mabillon, "De Lit. Gallican." i. cap. 2, iv. *apud* Maskell). Since Gregory's day, rubrics have been multiplied, Masses added for new feasts, &c., &c., "but there has been," says a learned Protestant, "no change of importance in the Roman Liturgy. That is to say, the number of prayers composing the Mass, the order in which they occur, and the names of them, have remained unaltered" (Hammond, p. lxxiii).

The Ambrosian Mass is not a daughter but a sister of the Roman or Gregorian Liturgy. In the crucial tests, the position of the Pax and of the Great Intercession, it differs from the Mozarabic and Gallican, and exactly agrees with the Roman Mass. But like the Roman Liturgy before Gregory, it is rich in Prefaces, and has the Fraction before the Pater Noster. It has, however, adopted the "diesque nostros," &c., from the Gregorian Canon; and several introits, and the arrangement of the three Masses on Christmas, have been borrowed from Rome. It has been thought that Greek influence may be traced in the prayers over the corporal ("super sindonem"), the litanies said on Sundays in Lent, the proclamation by the deacon before the Epistle, &c.

We pass over the Liturgy of the Patriarchate of Aquileia, which seems to have been a mere variety of the Roman Use, but of which little is known; and we pass on to a subject of far greater interest to us—viz. the Liturgical Use of the Ancient Church of England down to the Reformation. We take as our guide the admirable works of Maskell —one entitled the "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," and the other, "Monumenta Ritualia." It is probable, from St. Augustine's question to Pope Gregory, that the ancient British churches used a liturgy akin to those of Gaul and Spain. But the influence of St. Augustine led to a wide adoption of the Roman Liturgy in its main features. In 747 the Council of Cloveshoe, which may fairly be taken as representing south and middle England—for the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Rochester, three bishops from Mercia, two from Wessex, one from Lincoln, and one from Sussex were present (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 903) —decreed that "the holy feasts of our Lord's dispensation in the flesh, in all things duly pertaining to them—*i.e.* in the office of Baptism, in the celebration of Masses, in the manner of the chant—should be celebrated according to the copy which we have in writing from the Roman Church." These words are clear and express, nor is there room for doubt that as Christianity spread among the Saxons, the Roman replaced the Gallican Canon, and that gradually the whole Missal, in its main features, was modelled after the Roman prototype.

It is true then, in a general way, that our ancestors used the Roman Liturgy. But only in a general way: first, because before the invention of printing, the uniformity which has prevailed since Pius V. issued his authoritative edition of the Roman Missal was a matter of impossibility; and, next, because the power of bishops to regulate public worship in their dioceses was not restrained, as at present, and they used this power in introducing minor differences, though they preserved all the main character of the Roman Mass. Thus different Uses arose. About 1085 Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, promulgated a form for his diocese, which became accepted in the South of England and spread into Ireland and Scotland. Then there were the Uses of York and Hereford, and (in fewer dioceses) those of Lincoln and Bangor. Many of the ancient books were destroyed at the Reformation, and only a fragment of the Lincoln Use remains. It is not certain that we know the Use of Bangor, though Maskell believes that a MS. from which he has printed the Ordinary and Canon contains the Use of that church. Besides, there was a Use of St. Paul's in London (where the Sarum books were not received till 1414), of which we know nothing. And no doubt there were varieties in the Sarum rite which might be, and were, to a certain extent, regarded as separate Uses.

Maskell has placed the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass according to the Sarum, (supposed) Bangor, York, Hereford, and Roman Uses, in parallel columns. To this we must refer the reader, for a complete enumeration of the points in which these Uses differ from each other would be long and tedious, and would, after all, convey a much less vivid impression than any reader familiar with the Roman Mass can gain for himself with little pain by reading the texts. We content ourselves, therefore, with a few general remarks.

There is not only (we need not say) no difference of doctrine between the old and the present rites of the English church, but not even (with one exception) any detail of wording or ceremonial from which any theological argument could be deduced. This exception occurs in a single prayer. After the priest has put a fragment of the Host in the chalice, he prays, in the four English Uses, that this mixture of Christ's Body and Blood may be to [redacted] *and to all who partake of it* ("omn[redacted] sumentibus," "et omnibus sumen[redacted] health of mind and body. The word[redacted] are a relic of the time when t[redacted]

communicated under both kinds, retained long after they had ceased to do so. They, of course, are no evidence of change of doctrine, though they do prove change of discipline; but Cranmer, in his answer to the Devonshire rebels, availed himself of them as an argument for communion in both kinds.

The first impression upon a modern Catholic reader made by the reading of these old English Uses will be, we think, one of surprise that he finds himself so much at home in them. They are utterly unlike the "Communion Service" of the church now established, while we are convinced that if they were re-introduced among us to-morrow our people would scarcely feel any difference. In the Ordinary of the Mass, the old English and modern Roman rites agree part for part and, as a rule, word for word. In the Canon, almost every word is the same down to the end of the "Libera nos"—*i.e.* to the end of the Canon proper. After that, many of the prayers are different. This difference is easily explained, for the prayers which follow the "Libera nos" are later than St. Augustine's time; nay, with the exception of the "Agnus Dei" (added by Pope Sergius, and adopted in all the English Uses), they are later—some of them much later—than the Council of Cloveshoe, which imposed the Roman Missal on England. Indeed, the prayer which the priest says before the Pax ("Domine Jesu Christe") was not to be found in the Roman Missal even in 1090, after St. Osmund's time. We need not wonder, then, that there is in this part considerable divergence between the English Uses and the Missal of Pius V.

What we had, therefore, was not a national Liturgy like that of the Copts or Chaldeans, or even a Liturgy so distinct from the Roman as that of Milan, but English editions or recensions of the Roman Liturgy. Nor must it for a moment be supposed that Rome deprived us of our ancient usages. Rome in no way interfered, or would, so far as can be conjectured, ever have interfered. She has not only tolerated but enforced the ancient Liturgies of the East. She allows the Dominican variety of the Roman Mass, &c., &c. The bull of Pius V., as he expressly stated, did not impose the new edition of the Missal on any church which had rites of its own with a prescription of two hundred years. The Reformers set themselves energetically to destroy the Sarum books; copies became extremely rare, and our clergy, forced to get their education abroad, naturally preferred to say Mass and office from the modern Roman books which were so [illegible] more easily procured.

[illegible]full account of the literature will be [illegible] Smith and Cheetham, article *Litur-*[illegible]e of the most important works [illegible]oticed in the course of this article. [illegible] Explication de la Messe," is a most accurate and convenient repertory of all the results obtained by Renaudot, Mabillon, Ménard, &c. It abounds besides in original research, and gives full accounts of the chief Liturgies, with learned notes. But no student should be without Hammond's reprint of the texts of the Ancient Liturgies, accompanied by an excellent Introduction. Hammond puts the student in possession of a rational classification of the liturgies, and teaches him to fix his attention on the cardinal points in reading larger books. As regards the Eastern Liturgies, Hammond's work is now replaced by Brightman's volume, which is professedly based upon it and is far more complete. The discovery of Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book has thrown much light on the origin of the Alexandrian rite. The works of Probst; Cabrol, "Les Origines Liturgiques," "Etudes Liturgiques," complete bibliography; Duchesne, "Origines du Culte Chrétien" (Eng. ed. "Christian Worship"); Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," "Lesser Eastern Churches," "The Mass"; Lucas, "Holy Mass"; Srawley, "Early History of the Liturgy," &c., should also be consulted, together with the articles in DACL.)

LOCI THEOLOGICI. The sources from which theological arguments are drawn. The name has become familiar through the celebrated work of Melchior Canus (1523–1560), a Spanish Dominican, Professor of Theology at Salamanca, employed at the Council of Trent under Paul III., and finally Bishop of the Canaries. In this work, which is written in most elegant and classical Latin, Canus uses the word *loci* or τόποι exactly as Aristotle and Cicero had done—*i.e.* in the sense of *sedes e quibus argumenta promuntur*. It discusses the use to be made by the theologian of Scripture, Councils, Fathers, Philosophy, &c., and forms a scientific introduction to Dogmatic Theology. Canus complains that theologians argued little from the Councils, not frequently enough from Scripture, scarcely at all from History, and he sets himself to guide them into a fuller and more discriminating use of the material which the revival of letters was opening up. Both in style and in method Canus marks a new era. He had a most powerful influence in inaugurating the critical and historical, as distinct from the merely scholastic, theology. (From the work of Canus itself, and from Kuhn, "Dogmatik," i. p. 486 *seq.*)

LOGIA JESU ("sayings of Jesus"). [See AGRAPHA.]

LOGOTHETE (λογοθέτης, properly, an accountant). Besides a number of officers in the civil service who bore this title at the Byzantine Court,[1] it was given to the chief official of the Patriarch of Constantinople, the *logotheta ecclesiasticus*, whose functions closely resembled those of an episcopal

[1] See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. liii.

chancellor in the Western Church. [See CHANCELLOR, EPISCOPAL.] (Streber, in "Kirchenlex." *Logothet.*)

LOLLARDS. [See WYCLIFFITES.]

LORD'S PRAYER. [See PATER NOSTER.]

LORETO. A few miles south of Ancona, on a hill three miles distant from the sea, there is a stately domed church, the work of Bramante, rising among the houses of the little city of Loreto. On entering the church, the pilgrim or traveller observes under the dome "a singular rectangular edifice, of no great height, constructed apparently of white marble, and richly adorned with statues and sculpture." This is the famous Santa Casa, or Holy House, which tradition asserts to be the very same building in which the Blessed Virgin Mary dwelt at Nazareth, where she heard the message of the archangel, and where the Holy Family resided during the childhood and hidden life of our Lord. Its internal length is about 31 feet; its breadth, 13 feet. The roof is modern. Externally, the original walls cannot be seen; but within the building the coarse stonework of the original masonry is exposed to view. The material is a dark reddish-coloured stone. Towards the eastern end of the house stands an altar, and behind the altar is an image, said to be of olive wood, now blackened by the smoke of the lamps; this is the famous image of our Lady of Loreto.

The legend of the Holy House in its main features runs as follows. The Christian power having been finally expelled from Palestine,[1] the house in which God's Mother dwelt for many years with her Divine Son and St. Joseph was completely at the mercy of the infidels. That it might be removed to a place of safety, and be for the future in Christian hands, angels lifted it from its foundations, and bore it through the air, in the first place to Illyria, where it rested on the top of a hill at Tersatz or Tersatto, near Fiume, in the night of May 10, 1291. But the Holy House did not long remain at Tersatz. After three years and a half, on December 10, 1294, it was removed to the opposite side of the Adriatic. Shepherds near Recanati are said to have seen it borne through the air, and deposited in a wood near the sea called Lauretum, either from the laurels which grew there or because it belonged to a rich lady of Recanati named Laureta. Soon pilgrims visited it in great numbers, but the place being remote, brigands also made their appearance, and to approach the house became a work of danger. In less than a year (August 1295) there was a third removal, to a hill three or four miles from the wood, along which passed a public road. The spot where the Holy House alighted belonged to two brothers, who quarrelled as to their respective rights of property in the site. Again, in December 1295, the house was removed from its place, but only for a very short distance, and was set down in the middle of the public road above mentioned, where it has remained to the present day. The Blessed Virgin, appearing in a vision to a holy hermit who dwelt near Recanati, soon after the final translation, unfolded to him the true character of the house. After a time the people of Tersatz heard where it was, and numbers of them crossed the sea to visit it.

Such being the legend, it remains to inquire by what kind of testimony it is supported, and to consider objections which have been advanced against various portions of it. No contemporary book or record, with the exception of two documents which will be considered further on, can be appealed to as noticing the translation. No extant writing of the fourteenth century directly[1] mentions it. The earliest account of the translation which can be distinctly traced was drawn up by Peter George Teremanus, or Teramano, Guardian of the Santa Casa, in 1460; on this the accounts given by Baptista and Angelita were evidently based. Teremanus put together a narrative which he inscribed on a tablet and hung up in the Santa Casa; this tablet was seen and read by Baptista and Angelita. Two bulls of Paul II., dated 1464 and 1471, speak of the "Domus et Imago" of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Loreto; the later of the two refers in general terms to the translation.

The first writer who, in works still extant, speaks of the translation, seems to have been Baptista Mantuanus, an Italian poet of some note, who joined the Carmelite order (to which the custody of the sanctuary of Loreto was committed by Sixtus IV.) and wrote a history of the church about 1480.[2] He derived his information chiefly from the tablet of Teremanus, whom he calls Neronianus. In his "Agelarii," a poem in Latin hexameters,[3] Baptista enlarges in a florid style on the marvellous translation. After Baptista came the Jerome Angelita already mentioned, who dedicated his circumstantial history of the Santa Casa to Clement VII.; he was followed by the Jesuits Torsellino and Riera, and many others.

There is, however, evidence of earlier date that Loreto was, and had long been, a celebrated shrine of our Lady; and the question suggests itself, on what did that celebrity rest? Flavius Blondus, born in 1388, in his work "Italia Illustrata," of which we may

[1] By the capture of Acre, 1291.

[1] The expression "directly" is used because Jerome Angelita, who was perpetual chancellor of the commune of Recanati, and wrote on Loreto early in the sixteenth century, declares that he had found among the town records a brief of Benedict XIII. (for XII.) dated in 1341, which he understood as *indirectly* referring to the image contained in the Santa Casa. The brief indulgenced a picture in a church at Recanati, which, being a copy of the said image, was visited by aged persons who could not walk out as far as Loreto.

[2] Baptista, *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, 1576), vol. iv. p. 216.

[3] *Ib.* vol. i. p. 362.

place the date between 1430 and 1440,[1] speaks of the "sacellum" of the Blessed Virgin at Loreto as of a shrine of great celebrity, and notices the number of costly *ex-votos*, testifying to the gratitude of the offerers, which were hung on the walls of the church. It can hardly be doubted that this "sacellum" was identical with the Santa Casa now at Loreto. The same word is frequently used by Baptista in his history already mentioned, and there it evidently refers to the Santa Casa, the migrations of which he describes nearly in the same manner as in the legend given above. Therefore, if Flavius did not mean the Santa Casa by the "sacellum" of the Virgin (which he distinguishes from the "basilica" to which it was attached), he must have meant some building which in the interval between 1430 and 1480 totally disappeared, and was replaced by a house built of stone brought from Palestine for the purpose,[2] to represent our Lord's abode at Nazareth. Flavius, therefore, when he mentions the "sacellum celeberrimum" of Loreto, is speaking of the present Santa Casa, the antiquity of which is thus traced to within 150 years of the time at which the legend says it was brought to Loreto. But surely his words authorize us to go further; he speaks of this as the most famous shrine of the Virgin "in the whole of Italy"; but the growth of such a fame must have been an affair of many years; we should naturally suppose that the commencement of the devotion could not have been later than the middle of the fourteenth century. Hence by a process of legitimate inference we are led to the conclusion that the present Santa Casa must have been at Loreto within some fifty years of the time which the legend fixes for its arrival.

A further question arises—Can the existence of the Santa Casa be traced *before* its alleged removal to Loreto? A remarkable passage in a description of the Holy Land by a Greek writer named Phocas[3] throws light on this point. Phocas visited Nazareth in 1185, and says that he found two churches there, one of which contained the house of Joseph in which the Annunciation and Conception were said to have taken place. He says in one place that this house was "transformed into a most beautiful church": but a few lines further on we come to a passage which shows what his meaning was. For after saying that in this church, on the left side, near the altar, there was a cave, he adds: "Proceeding from the mouth within the cave you come down a few steps, and thus gain a view of that which was anciently the house of Joseph, in which, after her return from the fountain, . . . the angel thus saluted the Virgin. Now on the spot where the salutation took place there is a cross of black stone, graven in relief on white marble, and on the right side of the said altar was a small cot (*μικρὸς οἰκίσκος*), in which the ever Virgin Mother of God had her chamber." It is contended that either the whole house here mentioned, or else the "cot" on the right side of the altar,[1] was the Santa Casa now at Loreto. This much, at any rate is clear, that about 100 years before the date assigned to the first removal of the house to Tersatz, there was a building within a church at Nazareth which tradition named "the house of Joseph." Nothing seems to have been changed at a period nearly seventy years later (1253), when St. Louis visited Nazareth. About 1262 this church as is mentioned in a letter from Urban IV. to St. Louis, dated in the following year, was "levelled to the ground" by the Sultan of Babylon. But it does not necessarily follow that the house was destroyed, for the Christians would be likely to block up and conceal the entrance of the cave. For a specimen of the way in which travellers spoke of the state of things at Nazareth after 1291, we may take the passage cited by Meyrick from Sir John Maundevile, who visited Palestine about 1350. "It [the church] is now all downe; and men have made a litylle resceyt, besyde a pilere of that chirche, for to resceyve the offrynges of pilgrymes." There is no mention here of anything like what Phocas saw. Gradually a new subterranean chapel was fashioned, smaller than the Santa Casa, but partly on the same area; this is now called the "Chapel of the Angel." The original foundations of the "house of Joseph" were explored in the seventeenth century by the Franciscan guardians of the shrine at Nazareth; and they testified that they exactly tallied with the dimensions of the house at Loreto.[2]

Adamnan of Iona, a writer of the eighth century, also speaks of the two churches at Nazareth, and his language has been supposed to imply that the house of Joseph *had* existed on the site of one of them, but was in existence no longer. But the words need not necessarily be so understood; they are compatible with the actual existence of the house at the time when Arculfus, Adamnan's informant, visited Nazareth.

A few of the common objections to the authenticity of the Holy House call for some remark. Dean Stanley, who gives a glowing and really beautiful description of the environs of the Lake of Gennesareth in his "Sinai and Palestine," was led to treat of the history of the Santa Casa in connection with his visit to Nazareth. No one can be surprised that a man so prepossessed in favour

[1] At the end of the treatise Flavius speaks of Eugenius IV. († 1447) as still living.

[2] The necessity of this inference will be shown further on.

[3] The original may be read in the *Acta Sanctorum*, t. ii. Mai. p. 3,

[1] Benedict XIV. favoured the second of these suppositions.

[2] Hutchison, p. 71.

of a non-miraculous and non-clerical Christianity rejected the Loreto legend, though he cannot have been insensible to its beauty. He thought he could show that if the Santa Casa was ever connected with a grotto in the side of the hill at Nazareth, according to the received view, either the house had no door, or there was a dead wall between it and the grotto, and no way of passing from one to the other. His argument is met and shown to be fallacious in the work of Father Hutchison. The Dean thought that the house must have been built of set purpose by some devout person or persons in the Middle Ages, to keep alive devotion to the mystery of the Incarnation, just as the chapels of the Sacro Monte at Varallo were built, and with the feeling that prompted the Pisans to bring home earth from Palestine in their galleys and cover their Campo Santo with it. It is enough to say that this is pure conjecture, and that if such a work had ever been undertaken at Loreto, some record of it could hardly fail to have been preserved.

It was for a long time a common Protestant objection that the Santa Casa could not have been the house at Nazareth, because it was of brick, and brick buildings were unknown at Nazareth. It is now well known that the house is built of stone; but it has been maintained that this stone is the common red volcanic stone of the neighbourhood, and "wholly unlike anything in Palestine." The contradictory of this assertion appears to have been established through the exertions of Mgr. (afterwards Cardinal) Bartolini, who sent to an eminent professor of chemistry at Rome four samples of stone—two brought from Nazareth, and two taken (with the Pope's permission) from the walls of the Santa Casa—with a request that he would analyse and report on them. The professor reported that the chemical composition of the four samples was absolutely identical, although in appearance and mechanical characteristics they differed considerably.[1] Father Hutchison concludes that "the stone of which the Holy House is composed is *limestone*, identical with that of Nazareth, the stone about Loreto being of a totally different character."

Since the above article was written (1883) historical criticism, even by Catholic writers, has thrown grave doubt upon the truth of the legend. The case against the Holy House has been forcibly stated by Chevalier ("Notre Dame de Lorette," 1906). He contends that there was no Holy House standing at Nazareth before the time of the so-called translation; that no change was observed there after the ranslation; that there was already at Loreto a church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. As to the evidence produced, he shows that the earliest testimony for the legend is 180 years after the supposed date of the translation. A Catholic would naturally be most influenced by the fact that no fewer than forty-seven Popes and countless saints have expressed their belief in the story. Even as lately as 1894 Leo XIII. said: "The happy house of Nazareth is justly regarded and honoured as one of the most sacred monuments of the Christian faith . . . . No sooner was it, as the annals of the Church bear witness, miraculously translated to Italy and exposed to the veneration of the faithful, on the hills of Loreto, than it drew to itself the fervent devotion and pious aspiration of all, and, as the ages rolled on, it maintained this devotion ever ardent." But, "with regard to Papal pronouncements," says Fr. Thurston ("Cath. Enc."), "it is to be remembered that in such decrees which have nothing to do with faith or morals, or even with historical facts which can any way be called dogmatic, theologians have always recognized that there is no intention on the part of the Holy See of defining a truth, or even of placing it outside the sphere of scientific criticism, so long as that criticism is respectful and takes due regard to place and season."

The legend of "Our Lady's House" at Walsingham almost exactly corresponds with the Loreto legend (see "Month," Sept. 1901).

(Caillau, "Hist. Critique et Relig. de N.D. de Lorette," 1843; Flavius Blondus, "Opera," Basle, 1559; Hutchison, "Loreto and Nazareth," 1863; Jerome Angelita, "Hist. della Traslatione della Santa Casa," 1571; Kenrick, "The Holy House of Loretto," Philadelphia, 1876; Mantuanus Baptista, "Opera Omnia," Antwerp, 1576; Martorelli, "Teatro Istorico," &c., Rome, 1732; Meyrick, art. on Loreto in "Christ. Remembrancer," April 1854; Torsellino, "Historia Lauretana," Cologne, 1622; English version of Torsellino, by T. P., 1608; Zucchi, "Istoria di Loreto," Italian version of Torsellino, with an additional book, Venice, 1610; Garratt, "Loreto the New Nazareth," reproducing the old traditions from an uncritical standpoint. Fr. Thurston, in "Cath. Enc." *Santa Casa*, gives a long list of Catholic reviews which have accepted Chevalier's contentions.)

LORETTO, LITANY OF. [See LITANY.]

LORETTO NUNS. The founder of this order, Mary Theresa Ball, an Irish lady, took for her pattern the rule and customs of the Institute of the B.V.M. (see that article), in the York house of which community she had been trained to regular discipline during seven years, and made herself fully acquainted with the excellent system of female education there practised. Returning to Ireland, and supported by the approbation of Archbishop Murray, Mother Ball purchased a large mansion at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, and, in November 1822, commenced the institution which has since become so well known, and so

[1] Hutchison, p. 79. The Report is given *in extenso* by Father Hutchison, p. 80.

deservedly celebrated, as the convent of "Our Lady of Loretto." In 1841 a colony of eleven sisters went to India, and, with the aid of Archbishop Carew, established themselves in Calcutta, whence they have sent out several branches. In 1845 the order was introduced into Mauritius, and two years afterwards a colony of nuns was planted at Toronto in Upper Canada, whence they have spread to several other places. Mother Ball died in 1861. After her death the constitutions were approved by Pius IX. Since that time the order has been introduced into Australia, where there are a number of flourishing houses. (Dean Murphy's "Sketches"; Irish Catholic Directory.)

LOURDES, a little town in the department of Hautes Pyrénées, France, the most famous place of pilgrimage in modern times.

1. *The Apparitions.*—On Feb. 11, 1858, a young girl, Bernadette Soubirous, while praying at the grotto outside the town, had a vision of "a young and beautiful lady, clad in white, with a blue sash, her feet bare, but with a golden rose upon each foot." On eighteen different occasions the vision appeared, the last taking place on July 16. At first the vision did not speak, but on February 18 and again on February 27 it broke silence. On the latter occasion it said: "Go and tell the priests to build a chapel here" (at the grotto). On the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, in answer to Bernadette's persistent inquiries as to her name, the vision said: "Je suis l'Immaculée Conception." Bernadette lived for twenty years after the apparition of July 16, 1858, but never saw the vision again. She became a nun at Nevers, edified all by her humility, and died a holy death on December 12, 1878.

Contrary to what might be expected, the story of the visions was not readily accepted by the ecclesiastical authorities. First the parish priest, M. Peyramale, refused to believe in it. Only after careful inquiry and examination of Bernadette did he report the matter to the bishop of Tarbes, Mgr. Laurence. He also was sceptical, but the popular belief was so strong that he named a committee to inquire into the story. Miracles had already been reported to have taken place at the grotto, and crowds of the faithful had gone there in pilgrimage. It was not until January 18, 1862, that the bishop issued a "mandement" in favour of the truth of the vision. This decision he declared to be subject to the judgment of the Holy See. Although no formal judgment has been given by the Popes, they have clearly expressed their approval by their action. Pius IX., on many occasions, spoke and wrote in favour of it. Leo XIII. authorized a proper office and Mass of the apparition. Pius X. made the feast obligatory. It is kept on February 11, the anniversary of the first occasion on which the vision appeared. A basilica, built upon the rock of Massabielle, was consecrated in 1876. A second church, under the title of the Rosary, was built at the foot of the other, and consecrated in 1901. Leo XIII. delegated the archbishop of Rheims to represent him on this latter occasion.

2. *The Pilgrimages.*—The story of the apparitions soon excited the curiosity and piety of the people in the neighbourhood of the grotto. Bernadette had said that "the Lady" expressly wished that they should come in pilgrimage there. And wonderfully has that wish been carried out. Not only the neighbours, but pilgrims from all parts of France and from other countries, came in their thousands to the shrine. By the end of the year 1908, fifty years after the date of the apparition, the number of pilgrims reached 5,000,000. This number shows no sign of diminishing. The railway companies calculate that a million travellers are received at the station of Lourdes every year.

3. *The Miracles.*—Still more remarkable than the apparitions and the pilgrimages are the miracles constantly wrought at the shrine. For some years the marvellous stories were either disbelieved or considered as merely ordinary cases of faith-healing. But now that the evidence has been carefully sifted and the various cases have been thoroughly examined, the ablest medical men have agreed that the facts can no longer be denied: the only question is how they are to be explained. Thus in "Annales des Sciences Psychiques," edited by Dr. Ch. Richet, a well-known infidel, we find a whole number devoted to Lourdes (December 1907). The writer, M. Mangin, reviewing M. Georges Bertrin's "Histoire critique de Lourdes," says: "Sa lecture entraînera chez tous les esprits non prévenus la conviction que les faits sont réels." Anyone who has visited the bureau at Lourdes and conversed with the able director, Dr. Boisserie, will be convinced that every effort is made to arrive at the truth. The utmost publicity is invited. The word "miracle" is not used there; all the marvels are called simply "cures." The only business of the bureau is to ascertain (1) that the pilgrim was diseased when he arrived, and (2) that he was cured when he left. How the cure was brought about is no affair of theirs. "These questions," says Dr. Boisserie, "are extremely difficult. In order to understand them it is necessary to free one's mind from all preconceived opinions, and to ground one's judgment on serious and long-continued observation, and not on fugitive impressions hastily collected, which cannot be tested" ("Annales de Lourdes," Juin 1894). To go into the medical questions would be beyond the scope of the present work. The reader is strongly recommended to consult an article in the volume of "Studies," by Dr. J. R. Gasquet, who spent five weeks at Lourdes in 1894. He came to this conclusion: "The great majority of the cures I witnessed at

Lourdes were evidently, in one way or another, due to the influence of the mind on the body; but I saw a few instances which, if they stand further inquiry, I cannot ascribe to any natural agency."

It may be worth while to note that Zola's denial of any real cure at Lourdes rests upon a base distortion of facts. He describes a well-known case of advanced phthisis. The woman's name in real life was Marie Lebranchu, called in the romance "La Grivotte." Zola himself saw her cured, but he makes her have a severe relapse and die on the way home! As a fact, she lived many years afterwards, perfectly cured. When remonstrated with by Dr. Boisserie, Zola replied that he could do as he pleased with his puppets!

The best work on Lourdes is "Histoire critique des Événements de Lourdes—Apparitions et Guérisons," by G. Bertrin; Lasserre's more famous work, "Notre Dame de Lourdes" "in spite of its brilliant literary qualities, or perhaps because of them, was not calculated to satisfy a physician" [Dr. Gasquet]; Boisserie, "L'Œuvre de Lourdes"; Jörgensen, "Lourdes," tr.; R. H. Benson, "Lourdes."

LOW SUNDAY. The first Sunday after Easter. The name given to it in the Missal and Breviary is "Dominica in Albis" (depositis), because then the newly-baptized wore their white robes for the last time. St. Augustine mentions this custom in a sermon for the day, and it is alluded to in the noble Breviary hymn still used in the vespers of Low Sunday, "Ad regias Agni dapes."

The name Low Sunday, like the Greek *ἀντιπάσχα*, emphasises the contrast between the great Easter solemnity and the Sunday which ends the octave. Another Latin name, "Pascha clausum," is preserved in the Dutch name, "Beloken Paaschen," *i.e.* "close of Easter." The name "Quasimodo" is taken from the first words of the introit in the Mass (1 Cor iii. 1, 2), and is the common name for this Sunday in France and Germany.

LUNETTE. A case, fitting into an aperture in the monstrance, in which the Blessed Sacrament is placed for exposition.

LUTHER AND LUTHERANISM. Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, Saxony, November 10, 1483, and died there February 8, 1546. His father was a peasant who afterwards became a miner. Soon after Martin's birth the family removed to Mansfeld, and there the lad received his early education. The public or elementary schools at this time were very numerous in Germany. Martin's gifts were marked from the beginning. He had a fine voice, was admitted to the choir, and, following the custom of the time, sang before the houses of the rich to gain money enough to enable him to prosecute his studies in a higher school. At fourteen he was sent to the school of the Franciscans at Magdeburg, where he remained a year. From Magdeburg he went to Eisenach, where his voice attracted the attention and favour of Dame Ursula Cotta, a wealthy lady, who received him into her house and supported him until he entered the university of Erfurt (1501). Martin's father was now a master-miner and in a position to advance his son. He sent him to Erfurt to study law. There he remained until 1505, when he took his degree of Master of Arts and began a course of lectures on Aristotle. He was of an ardent and impulsive temperament and had strong religious leanings. The sudden death of a friend, who was struck by lightning at his side, seems to have determined his vocation. In spite of the opposition of his father and friends he entered the Augustinian convent at Erfurt to dedicate himself to God (July 17, 1505). There he went through the customary discipline, and in 1507, his father objecting to the last, he was ordained priest. Luther's earnestness and application won the favour of Dr. John Staupitz, the Augustinian provincial of Meissen and Thuringia. Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, had opened a university at Wittenberg and was looking for capable professors. At the recommendation of Staupitz, Luther was offered the chair of dialectics (1508) and afterwards lectured in theology. Urged by Staupitz, he undertook, though at first with extreme reluctance, to preach. His abilities were so marked and his zeal so apparent, that in 1510 he, with a brother monk, was chosen to visit Rome on business of the order. The sight of Rome and the memories it called up moved the impressionable young man so deeply that he fell on his knees and cried "Hail, Rome! holy city, thrice sanctified by the blood of martyrs!"

From his coming to man's estate Luther's mind seems never to have been wholly at rest, nor were his convictions wholly clear on certain doctrinal points. At Rome, the Rome of Leo X., he was scandalized to hear that many priests were unbelievers. Returning to his university he resumed his lectures and his studies, was made Doctor of Theology (1512), and studied closely Greek and Hebrew in order to enable him better to expound the Scriptures. About this time Pope Leo X. proclaimed indulgences in Germany, for those who contributed to the completion of St. Peter's basilica in Rome. Albert of Brandenburg, elector and archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg, was ordered to publish the indulgences, and John Tetzel, of Leipzig, a learned and eloquent Dominican, was appointed by Albert to preach the indulgences among the people.

The proclamation of indulgences was not new in Germany, nor was opposition to it on the part of the people and of both civil and ecclesiastical authorities new. [See INDULGENCES.]

When Tetzel began to preach the indulgences, opposition at once broke out, and

Luther took the lead in the opposition. He drew up his objections in the shape of ninety-five propositions, which he fastened to the door of the castle church at Wittenberg on All Saints' eve (October 31, 1517). In these he attacked the abuse, not the doctrine, of indulgences, pronouncing anathema on whosoever spoke against the truth of Papal indulgences (Prop. 71). He stated, furthermore, that he had no purpose to speak against Holy Writ or the doctrines of the Popes and Fathers of the Church. Nevertheless the propositions contained the germ of his future heresy.

In assailing the abuse of indulgences Luther only gave voice to a widespread feeling in Germany. He at once gained a number of adherents, among them men of influence both in Church and State. The Bishop of Würzburg wrote to the Elector Frederick to protect Luther. A heated controversy arose. There were various replies to Luther, one of the ablest being by Tetzel. A more famous and learned opponent still was Dr. John Eck, vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. Luther, now wholly roused, replied with heat and haste to his adversaries, and in a style and manner not at all in accord with modern ideas of controversial courtesy. His opponents were asses, pigs, dolts, &c., and were assailed with still viler epithets. Where he failed in argument he took refuge in invective, often of the coarsest kind. As the controversy deepened he struck further away from the doctrinal truths he had hitherto preached and taught. Yet he claimed to be in perfect accord and sympathy with the centre of Catholic doctrine, and in the letter to Pope Leo X. which accompanied his propositions and their defence he wrote: "Most Holy Father, I cast myself at thy feet with all that I have and am. Give life or take it; call, recall, approve, reprove; your voice is that of Christ, who presides and speaks in you."

Probably none of the parties engaged in the controversy had any idea at this time whither it was drifting. The Pope took the matter easily. Nevertheless he appointed a court to try the case and summoned (August 7, 1518) Luther to Rome to defend himself. At the request of the Elector Frederick, the Diet of Augsburg was substituted for Rome as the place of trial, and Cardinal Cajetan, Papal legate, was appointed to represent the Pope at the Diet. Luther appeared (October 1518). The cardinal's instructions were to enter into no controversy, but demand an absolute retractation on Luther's part. Luther claimed that he had said naught against the Scriptures, the doctrine of the Church, the decrees of Popes, or reason. He consented to declare formally his reverence and obedience to "the Roman Church in every word and deed, whether in time past, present, or future," and if he had said aught contrary to this declaration he wished it to be considered as having been never spoken. He fled from Augsburg angry at heart.

The Pope issued a bull explaining clearly the true teaching of the Church on indulgences (November 9, 1518), and sent Charles of Miltitz, himself a Saxon, as nuncio into Germany with a view to reconciling all parties and bringing about peace. Miltitz seemed to side with Luther as against Tetzel. He prevailed upon Luther to write another letter (March 3, 1519) of complete submission to the Pope and to the authority of the Church; but the nuncio was deceived in imagining his mission accomplished.

While the German bishops were preparing to meet and confer on the points of dispute, a public discussion took place at Leipzig between Luther and his friends and their opponents. George, duke of Saxony, presided, and a large and cultivated audience assembled. With Luther were his friend Carlstadt and the Wittenberg professors. Opposed to them was the learned Eck, and the professors of Cologne, Louvain, and Leipzig. The chief matters of discussion were the condition of man after the fall; free-will and grace; penance and indulgences; and the primacy of the Church of Rome, which primacy, Luther maintained, rested only on human authority, claiming that the Pope had no more jurisdiction than the Archbishop of Magdeburg or the Bishop of Paris. Here also Luther gave open expression to his doctrine that faith alone, with or without good works, secures salvation. He furthermore denied free-will in man and the infallibility of the oecumenical councils. Duke George, seeing the danger of these propositions, stopped the discussion.

The universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne condemned Luther's propositions (1519). Luther retaliated with abuse of the faculties of those establishments, and on October 11, 1520, wrote to the Pope, sending him his pamphlet on "Christian Liberty," and assailing in virulent terms the whole office and dignity of the Papacy. Meantime he was incessant in defence of his theories, and between 1520 and 1521 he launched out pamphlet after pamphlet, that were eagerly caught up by the German people and spread abroad, creating discussion and tumult everywhere. In these he taught that the Bible was the only source of faith; that human nature was wholly corrupted by original sin; that consequently man was not free, and whatever he did, whether good or ill, was the work of God; that faith alone saves; that the hierarchy and priesthood are unnecessary, and exterior worship is useless; that the sacraments were profitless (a doctrine that he afterwards modified), and that Christian priesthood is universal.

These doctrines, especially the last,

caught the hearts of multitudes, the gist of them being an absolute freedom from all restraint and a practical sanctification of sin. Luther appealed strongly to the spirit of nationality and greed. He addressed the emperor, the nobles, and the peoples. He urged the emperor to overthrow the power of the Pope, confiscate the wealth of the Church, abolish feasts and holidays and Masses for the dead. He substituted German for the Latin which was the literary language of the time, and by this means his teachings spread the more readily among his countrymen, while he made use of vile illustrations to caricature the Pope, the monks, and the teachings of the Church.

On June 15, 1520, the Pope issued a bull specifically condemning Luther's teachings and excommunicating him if he refused to retract within sixty days. Luther retorted with a pamphlet in which he held the author of the bull to be Antichrist. He succeeded in winning over the Elector of Saxony, who used his good offices in Luther's behalf with the emperor Charles V. Luther appealed (November 17, 1520) from the authority of the Pope to a general council, and on December 10, 1520, publicly burned the Pope's bull at Wittenberg, consigning the Pope himself to "fire eternal." The emperor, seeing the flame that was being kindled over the land, convoked the German Diet at Worms (1521). Luther appeared before the Diet to answer the charges against him, and refused to retract unless "convicted of error by Scripture proof or by plain reason," he relying absolutely on his own interpretation of Scripture. All efforts to change him being unavailing, he was ordered to quit Worms, and left under a safe-conduct. He was taken to Wartburg, near Eisenach, and there remained from May 1521 to March 1522, living under the name of "Master George" and dressing as a knight. The Diet of Worms placed him under the ban of the empire as a heretic. But the circumstances of the time and the opposition of the German States rendered the edict ineffective.

At Wartburg, which he called his "Patmos," Luther employed most of his time in translating the Bible into German and in issuing more pamphlets.[1] Leo X. died December 1, 1521, and was succeeded by Adrian VI., who took up with great earnestness the subject of reform within the Church. He urged the Diet of Nürnberg (November 1522) to take active and vigorous steps against Luther, for "the revolt now directed against the spiritual authority will shortly deal a blow at the temporal also." The Diet confessed that it was impossible to enforce the edict against Luther for fear of a popular uprising. Adrian died in 1523, and was succeeded by Clement VII.

Clement sent Cardinal Campeggio to the Diet at Nürnberg, but he was as unsuccessful as his predecessors. Most of the princes seemed to favour a break with Rome, and Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, made himself the chief protector of Luther and those who followed him. The States divided: Mecklenburg, Anhalt, Mansfeld, Prussia, and the cities of Brunswick and Magdeburg declared for Luther, under the leadership of John, the new elector of Saxony, and Philip, landgrave of Hesse, an alliance being concluded at Torgau (May 4, 1526). The other side made an alliance at Dessau, and thus began the division between the Catholic and Protestant States of Germany.

Luther's teachings had already taken effect among the people. Many monks renounced their orders and their vows. Carlstadt, Luther's friend, raised a mob at Wittenberg and destroyed the altars and images of Christ and the saints. The same was done elsewhere. Infant baptism was rejected at Zwickau, where Nicholas Storch organized a society that developed into the Anabaptists. These attracted Carlstadt and other prominent Lutherans, and great excesses were committed by them at Wittenberg. Luther took alarm, and leaving Wartburg reached Wittenberg on Good Friday, 1522. All through Easter week he harangued his followers and condemned their violence. More monks left their convents, took wives, and recruited the Lutheran ranks. The teaching of human irresponsibility for sin and disregard of all authority took effect among the masses. The peasants rose in rebellion against their lords, burned convents, and stormed castles of the nobles. Thomas Münster took the lead, preaching human equality. Luther himself was compelled to preach against those whom his doctrines had aroused, and he urged the nobles to slay without mercy these "children of the devil."[2] His advice was taken, and it is estimated that a hundred thousand peasants were slain in the "Peasants' War."

[1] The *Church Times* of July 26, 1878, speaking of the *List of Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition* (South Kensington, 1877), published by H. Stevens, says: "This catalogue will be very useful for one thing at any rate, as disproving the popular lie about Luther *finding* the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only are there very many editions of the Latin Vulgate long anterior to that time, but there were actually nine *German* editions of the Bible in the Caxton Exhibition earlier than 1483, the year of Luther's birth, and at least three more before the end of the century." Mr. H. Stevens writes in the *Athenæum* of October 6, 1883, p. 434: "By 1507 more than one hundred Latin Bibles had been printed, some of them small and cheap pocket editions. There had been, besides, *thirteen editions of a translation of the Vulgate into German*, and others in other modern languages. . . . Among the most interesting additions latest made [to the Grenville Library in the British Museum] is a nearly complete set of fourteen grand old pre-Luther German Bibles, 1460–1518, all in huge folios except the twelfth, which is in quarto form." The *Athenæum* of December 22, 1883, contains an article on "The German Bible before Luther," in which *it is* shown that what Geffcken calls "the German Vulgate" *was in* common use among the people long before Luther's time; that Luther had evidently the old Catholic German Bible of 1483 before him, when making his translation; and that, consequently, "it is time we should hear no more of Luther as the first German Bible translator, and of his translation as an independent work from the original Greek." (From *The Bible and the Reformation*, by C. F. B. Allnatt.)

Luther called Henry VIII. the "crowned ass, liar, varlet, idiot, snivelling sophist, and swine of the Thomist herd." The learned Erasmus was also drawn into the controversy against Luther, and was answered in similar strain. Luther had now thrown off his monk's habit, and on June 13, 1525, he married Katharina von Bora, an ex-nun of Nimptschen, in Saxony. He had been already famed for his free life even among his own followers, and this final step brought great ridicule on the Reformer. "It was thought," wrote Erasmus, "that Luther was the hero of a tragedy; but for my part I regard him as playing the chief part in a comedy, that has ended, like all comedies, in a marriage."

Luther's adherents had become so numerous that he found it necessary to systematize a form of faith and of ecclesiastical government for them in lieu of that which he had taught them to reject. A synod was called at Hamburg by Philip of Hesse (October 1526). It was there agreed to adopt a synodal constitution which gave each congregation complete control over its own ecclesiastical discipline. This plan, with some modifications to secure outward uniformity, was adopted in the Lutheran States. Preachers were appointed by a commission of ecclesiastics and laymen. The established ecclesiastical foundations were abolished, and the head of the State was made the supreme authority within the State on matters of Church government. To educate the rising generation in his doctrines Luther published a larger and a smaller catechism to be used in the schools (1529). These measures brought the Lutherans closer together, and at the Diet of Spires, held in 1526, the Lutheran States presented a bold and organized front in the persons of their princes. The emperor was at war and consequently not in a position to enforce any demands. The Diet, accordingly, at the dictate of the Lutherans, recognized, until the meeting of an oecumenical council, the right of each State to act for itself in regard to religious matters. The Diet assembled again at Spires in 1529 to determine religious difficulties and take measures against the Turks. The conditions proposed by the Catholic princes were moderate enough, but the Lutherans solemnly protested against them, whence the name of Protestants (April 19, 1529). They claimed to be the exclusive heirs of the true religion, the only members of the one saving Church of Jesus Christ, and pronounced the Mass an idolatrous act of worship which should not be tolerated.

Disputes arose among the Lutherans themselves concerning the Eucharist. Luther denied the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and denied also Zwingli's figurative interpretation of the words "This is my body." He held the theory of consubstantiation. A conference was held at Marburg (October 1, 1529) to settle the dispute, but it only served to widen the dissension and manifest the absurdity of Luther's claim to free interpretation of the Scriptures.

A Diet was held at Augsburg (June 1530), at which the emperor Charles V. presided. The Emperor demanded a written confession of faith from the Protestant princes and a list of the practices of which they complained. Hence originated what is known as the Augsburg Confession, or Symbol of Faith, which was drawn up by Melanchthon and suffered subsequent changes. Luther fully approved of it. The Confession was an embodiment of Luther's teachings in a partially disguised form, and among the pretended abuses were Communion under one kind, private Masses, clerical celibacy, confession, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The Catholic theologians drew up a Confutation of the Confession, which met the approval of the emperor and of the Catholic princes, and the Protestants were ordered to renounce their errors and return to the ancient faith. A hopeless attempt to bring about unity was made, but frustrated by Luther and his more resolute followers. The Zwinglian cities drew up a Confession of their own, and Zwingli himself another of his own. The emperor put an end to the profitless discussion, giving the Protestants till the 15th of the following April to determine on their course.

The Protestant princes met at Smalkald on Christmas Day, 1530, and there entered on an offensive and defensive alliance, known as the League of Smalkald (March 29, 1531), to bind them for seven years. Both Luther and Melanchthon now authorized the use of arms for the maintenance of Protestantism. The emperor, needing the Protestant alliance, entered into negotiations with them, conceding at Nürnberg (July 23, 1532) that until the assembly of a general council no action should be taken against the Protestants, but that everything should remain as it was. This is known as the Peace of Nürnberg.

Clement VII. died in 1534, and was succeeded by Paul III., who was anxious to convene a council, that the Protestants might attend. But they rejected all overtures. The League of Smalkald was renewed (1535) for ten years. In 1534 Luther completed his translation of the whole Bible, and in 1537 issued the Articles of Smalkald, which were accepted by the League, and which embodied a spirit of deep hostility to the Catholic Church. "May God fill you with hatred of the Pope!" was his parting benediction to the League, and thenceforth the League refused to attend any council of the Church.

The Swiss joined the Protestant League in 1538, and the Elector of Brandenburg in 1539. The duchy of Saxony also joined, and Luther continued to inflame the minds of princes and people against the Catholic

Church and the council. The emperor summoned another religious conference, which finally met at Worms (January 14, 1541). It resulted in nothing. A Diet was next called at Ratisbon (April 5), which proved equally ineffectual.

The Anabaptists, supposed to have been crushed in the Peasants' War, now rose up again and appeared in Münster under John of Leyden and others. Polygamy was introduced, and riot of every kind reigned, until the city, after a siege of eighteen months, was taken by storm (June 25, 1535) and the leaders executed with extreme cruelty. Philip of Hesse, who had been married sixteen years, and, with his wife living, was a notorious free-liver, asked Luther to authorize him to marry a second wife. After much hesitation the Reformer, fearful of losing Philip's assistance, granted the requisite authorization "in order to provide for the welfare of his body and soul, and to bring greater glory to God."

Lutheranism now began to be intruded into various places by force of arms. Luther saw the seeds of religious dissolution already at work. His health was broken and his spirit, save as against Rome. He entertained grave doubts about the efficacy of his work. The reform he saw to be a reform downwards. Public morals were at a lower grade than they had been before. "Since we began to preach our doctrine," he said in his pulpit at Wittenberg in 1532, "the world has grown daily worse, more impious, and more shameless. Men are now beset by legions of devils, and, while enjoying the full light of the Gospel, are more avaricious, more impure and repulsive, than of old under the Papacy. Peasants, burghers, and nobles—men of all degrees, the highest as well as the lowest—are all alike slaves to avarice, drunkenness, gluttony, and impurity, and given over to shameful excesses and abominable passions." "Let us go from this Sodom," he wrote to Katharina in 1545, and quitted Wittenberg in disgust, only returning at the demand of the elector and of the university. At Eisleben he died, shortly after delivering a most violent sermon against the Jews.

Owing to the wars, scandals, and disturbances of the time, Lutheranism spread rapidly over many of the German States and cities, being imposed upon some by force of arms. Albert of Brandenburg introduced it into Prussia, and at his death in 1568 Lutheranism was the predominant religion in his domain of West Prussia. It readily made its way to Silesia, where the Lutherans soon quarrelled among themselves on doctrinal matters. It entered more slowly into Poland, and after a severe struggle its progress was stayed by the exertions of some holy and zealous prelates and the coming of the Jesuits. It made more rapid advances in Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Transylvania, though in Hungary it was supplanted by Calvinism. In Sweden it was established by Gustavus Vasa, and soon passed into Denmark, Norway, and Iceland. For its introduction into England see ENGLISH CHURCH, *Reformation Period.* The same causes were at work everywhere to favour its progress: corruption of public morals, wealth of the Church, scandals among the clergy, greed of gain on the part of the princes, nobles, and people. After the first flush of conquest Lutheranism never made any advance in territory. It remained stationary or receded in favour of Catholicity. "The geographical frontier between the two religions," says Macaulay,[1] "has continued to run almost precisely where it ran at the close of the Thirty Years' War; nor has Protestantism given any proofs of that 'expansive power' which has been ascribed to it"; and again: "We think it a most remarkable fact that no Christian nation which did not adopt the principles of the Reformation before the end of the sixteenth century should ever have adopted them." The masses of the Lutheran population in Germany no longer attend church. Lutheranism was first introduced into the North American colonies by a colony of Swedes about 1630, the first church being built in 1637. To-day Lutherans rank about fourth in numerical order among the Protestant denominations of the United States. (The best account of Luther and early Lutheranism is contained in Janssen's "History of the German People"; Denifle-Weiss, "Luther und Lutherthum"; Döllinger, "Die Reformation"; Grisar, "Luther" (Eng. tr.). From the Protestant point of view: Köstlin, "Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften"; Beard, "Martin Luther.")

LYONS, COUNCILS OF. I. The first General Council of Lyons ended the long strife between the emperor Frederick II. and the Church. The emperor, who was educated under Innocent III., was a man of extraordinary abilities and of a wide culture, most unusual in that age. He was a great statesman, he fostered the schools of Palermo and Naples, encouraged the study of Arabic, philosophy and mathematics, and set in his own person an example of taste in Italian literature. Unhappily, he had a superstitious belief in astrology, he was charged with grave immorality, his temper was cruel and despotic, and his word could not be trusted. He had been crowned emperor in 1220, and his differences with the Church, which had begun under the gentle Pope Honorius III., broke out into open war under Gregory IX., in whom Frederick met an antagonist as determined as himself. In 1227, the Pope excommunicated the emperor for constantly deferring a crusade which he had promised to undertake. The latter replied by seizing Rome and driving out

[1] Essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes.*

the Pope. When he did go to Jerusalem, he was still excommunicate; he showed that he had undertaken the crusade purely from political motives; stories were circulated of his contemptuous speeches in the Holy City, which gained for him the reputation of an unbeliever; and it was not till 1230 that he was absolved from excommunication. In 1239 he again incurred excommunication for his attacks on the Lombards, and for setting his natural son Enzio on the throne of Sardinia, a fief of the Church. He seized the States of the Church, and in the midst of the strife Gregory IX. died. Celestine IV. reigned only for a few days, and the Holy See was vacant for two years. In 1243, Innocent IV., a former friend of Frederick's, was elected Pope. The new Pope refused to absolve Frederick except on conditions which the emperor would not accept. Frederick promoted sedition and tumult in Rome, and by occupying all roads, bridges, and harbours, cut the Pope off from intercourse with the rest of the world. In this extremity, the Pope fled from Sutri by Cività Vecchia and Genoa to Lyons, whither, on January 3, 1245, he summoned all kings, princes, and prelates to a general council.

The Byzantine emperor, Baldwin II., the Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, and 140 bishops, besides cardinals, were present at the consultation previous to the council, while the famous jurist Taddeo di Suessa defended the cause of his master, Frederick. At the first session (June 28, 1245), in the cathedral church of St. John, the Pope, in a long speech, enlarged on the five wounds of Christendom—viz. the sins of the higher and lower clergy, the supremacy of the infidels in the Holy Land, the straits of the Latin emperor in Constantinople, the excesses of the Tartars in Hungary and the neighbouring countries, the oppression of the Church by the emperor Frederick. He accused the emperor of perjury, sacrilege, and heresy; of immorality; of maintaining an understanding with the Saracens; of friendship with the Sultan of Babylon. In the third session various decrees were passed on elections to benefices, contributions to be levied for the Holy Land and the Latin Empire in the East, and for help against the Tartars; on the abuse of Church censures, &c., &c. Again Taddeo sought to exculpate his master, and, failing in this, he protested against the proceedings of the council, denied that it was oecumenical, though there were now 250 bishops present, and appealed to a future Pope and true general council. The Pope, at the council's request, solemnly renewed the sentence of excommunication against Frederick, deposed him from his office and absolved his subjects from allegiance, authorized a new election to the empire, excommunicated all who should serve him, whether as emperor or king, and promised that the Holy See would provide for Sicily. The bishops dashed their candles to the ground, in token of assent, and set their seals to the instrument of excommunication.

In 1246, the electors who took the ecclesiastical side raised Henry Raspe of Thüringen, and after his death, in 1247, William of Holland, nephew of the Duke of Brabant, to the royal dignity. Frederick had still a considerable following, but his son Conrad had been defeated at Frankfort in 1246, and he himself met with a decided reverse before Parma in 1248. In 1250 he died in Apulia, 56 years of age. He had made his confession to his friend the archbishop of Palermo, and been reconciled to the Church.

II. Pope Gregory X., who was eager for a new crusade, opened the Second Council of Lyons (the Fourteenth General Council) in May 1274. James I. of Aragon, the Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, ambassadors from England, France, Germany, and Sicily, 500 bishops besides other prelates, met in the cathedral church. St. Thomas of Aquin died on his way to the council; St. Bonaventure was actually present, and died before it was over. A tax was imposed on ecclesiastical benefices in favour of the East. On June 24 the Greek ambassadors arrived, and in the Mass on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul the Gospel and Creed were sung in Greek as well as in Latin, the clause "Filioque" being repeated three times. In the fourth session, July 6, the documents from the Greek emperor, Michael Palaeologus, from the heir to his throne, and from their prelates were publicly read, and the emperor's representative swore that his master renounced the schism and returned to the obedience of the Pope. The union thus effected was scarcely more than nominal and certainly was of short duration, but it led to an important definition by the council—viz. that "the Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son," "as from one principle" and "by a single spiration." An important measure was passed to regulate and accelerate Papal elections. The cardinals were to assemble in the town where the last Pope died, ten days after his decease; they were to be strictly secluded "in conclave" from the outer world; their rations were to be diminished after the first three days, and diminished yet further after eight days, if their business still remained to be done. Other decretals (collected in the "Sextus Decretalium") were published by the Pope, partly during, partly after, the council. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 1633 *sqq.*; vi. 153 *sqq.*)

M

MACCABEES, FEAST OF. [See SAINTS.]

MACEDONIANS (called also *Pneumatomachi*). Heretics who denied that the Holy Ghost was God, equal to and consubstantial with Father and Son. Macedonius was a Semi-Arian and bishop of Constantinople till his deposition by the Acacians, who were pronounced Arians in 360. After his deposition his influence brought the Trinitarian controversy into a new stage. Confessing that the Son was like the Father in substance, he held that the Holy Ghost was a creature, like the angels, and a servant of the Father and the Son. He was joined by several of the Semi-Arian leaders, Eustathius of Sebaste, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Marathonius of Nicomedia. This last was a chief support of the party, and from him they were sometimes called Marathonians. The doctrine, owing partly to the strict life of its apostles, was widely accepted, not only in Constantinople, but also in all Thrace, Bithynia, and the neighbouring provinces. Under Julian, the Macedonians held synods, especially at Zele in Pontus. They were condemned in a Roman synod under Pope Damasus in 374, at a great Illyrian synod in 375, and finally in the Second General Council in 381. In 383, Theodosius prohibited all exercise of their religion. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. ii.)

MADONNA [Italian, "MY LADY"]. A name given to representations of the Blessed Virgin in art, and occasionally used as an invocation in devotions to her.

MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH. [See CHURCH OF CHRIST.]

MAGNIFICAT. The Canticle or Song of the B.V. Mary (Lk. i. 46–55); so called from the opening words in the Vulgate: "Magnificat anima mea Dominum." It was sometimes named the "Gospel of Mary." Like the other two evangelical canticles ("Benedictus" and "Nunc Dimittis"), it is recited every day in the Roman Office.

MAJOR ORDERS. The superior ranks of the sacred ministry—bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons—are said to have major orders. Before the thirteenth century the subdiaconate was one of the minor orders.

MALABAR RITES. Certain practices of the natives of India tolerated by the Jesuit missionaries, but ultimately condemned by the Holy See. The name is really a misnomer, for the missions concerned were not on the Malabar coast, but situated in inner India—Madura, Mysore, and the Carnatic. The questions at issue were similar to those mentioned in the article CHINESE RITES. Fr. de Nobili (1577–1656), convinced of the impossibility of spreading the Gospel in these territories by the ordinary methods, resolved to act on the Pauline principle of becoming all things to all men, and so to become a Hindu to the Hindus. He cut himself off from his own brethren and lived the life of a Brahmin. While carefully rejecting all practices savouring of superstition or idolatry, he allowed his converts to retain their national customs. In a word, he made them Christians without ceasing to be Hindus. This meant principally the recognition of caste and all that is involved in that custom; *e.g.* separate churches and separate priests. His brother Jesuit, Fernandez, who had laboured in vain for many years in the same country, now became alarmed, and denounced de Nobili to his superiors. The matter was carried to Rome, and the innovator was severely reprimanded. When, however, his defence was received, the Pope, Gregory XV., gave a qualified approval to his conduct (1623) after mature consideration of the difficult subject. Thus encouraged, de Nobili went on with his system, taking care, however, that the inferior castes and pariahs should be under the charge of certain of his brethren set apart for that work. He died in 1656, after fifty years spent in missionary labours, leaving his work in a prosperous condition. At the end of the seventeenth century there were 150,000 Christians in the mission founded by him.

Early in the next century a dispute between the Capuchin and Jesuit missionaries in Pondicherry led to the re-opening of the question of the so-called Malabar rites. About the same time the question of the kindred Chinese rites was being discussed at Rome. Clement XI. sent Tournon as Apostolic legate to India and China to investigate the matter on the spot. He landed at Pondicherry on November 6, 1703. He remained there eight months, and, on June 23, 1704, gave his decision against the lawfulness of the "rites." At Rome it was at first received with some reserve, but in 1706 it was confirmed by the Pope. Efforts were made with varying success to mitigate the legate's prohibitions during the succeeding pontificates, until Clement XII. in 1734 practically confirmed the condemnation, though with certain modifications. Further small concessions were made by Benedict XIV. in 1744, who, however, bound the missionaries to exact obedience to the Papal decrees. The suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 put an end to the question for the time. (See the literature under CHINESE RITES; the Constitution *Omnium Sollicitudinum* of Benedict XIV., September 12, 1744, containing Tournon's decree and the decisions of Clement XI., Benedict XIII., and Clement XII. in "Juris Pont. de Prop. Fide," pt. i. t. iii. 116; Brucker in "Cath. Enc." and

in DThC, *Chinois (Rites)*; Hergenröther, in "Kirchenlex." *Accommodationstreit.*)

MANICHEES. Mani or Manes, the founder of this sect, was born at Babylon about the beginning of the third century. From the religion of the Persians he derived the doctrine of the two principles, and from Gnostic sects the notion of the hatefulness of matter. He and his followers must not be regarded as Christians lapsed into heresy, but as heathens who adopted so much of Christian ideas as suited their purpose. Mani was an Oriental philosopher; the notion of a moral fall, and a personal conviction of sin, on which Christianity is built up, were repugnant to him. In his view the soul of man suffered, not from a weak and corrupt will, but from contact with matter. Whatever evils the soul allows itself to commit are on this view physical, not moral—miseries, not sins. Again, the restorative energy must be looked for, not in a religion which reforms the will, and after it the whole nature, but in an enlightening philosophy, which reduces the contaminating contact with matter to a minimum. According to Mani, "two systems stood eternally opposed—God with the kingdom of light and the aeons [see GNOSTICISM], and Satan with his kingdom of darkness and the demons." [1] Light is the animating principle in all nature; and all beings are higher or lower according to the measure of their participation in the light. Woman is the gift of the demons, who impel men to propagate their kind in order that emancipation from matter and darkness may never come to them. The ideal light-clad soul is the Redeemer, or Christ, who descended from heaven in what was a body only in appearance, to teach men to bridle and extirpate their desires, so that they may return to their true home the kingdom of light. The sect observed three seals (*signacula*)—the seal of the mouth, the seal of the hands, and the seal of the bosom. By the first they were forbidden to eat meat or eggs, or to drink wine or milk; by the second, to kill any animal or tear in pieces any plant; by the third, to marry, or at least to have offspring. The members were divided into the "elect" and the "hearers"; the former were expected to observe the Manichaean doctrine strictly; from the latter less was required. They could gather plants and prepare them for food, and when so prepared, the "elect" took them from their hands. The Manichees rejected the Old Testament altogether, and while accepting the New Testament put aside such passages as did not suit them on the pretence that they were interpolated. They regarded Mani as the Paraclete promised by Christ, and had a hierarchy imitated from that of the Catholic Church. The sect became numerous in the East, flourished in North Africa, and even spread to several countries of Southern Europe. The promises of light, wisdom, and enfranchisement which they held out to their disciples seduced for a time the powerful mind of St. Augustine. Everyone knows how he shook himself free from the Manichees, and wrote eloquent treatises against them. Several Christian emperors, down to and including Justinian, published edicts against them, and little is heard of Manicheeism after the sixth century, although the distinctive doctrines of the sect reappear among the Paulicians, the Cathari, the Albigenses, the Bogomiles, and other mediaeval heretics. (Möhler, "Kirchengeschichte." The literature, patristic and modern, is given by Arendzen in "Cath. Enc."; Tillemont, "Mém." iv. 367–411; Kessler, "Mani: Forschungen über die Manichäische Religion"; Fessler, in "Kirchenlex.")

[1] Möhler, i. 316.

MANIFESTATION OF CONSCIENCE. This must be carefully distinguished from confession in the sacrament of Penance. The manifestation here spoken of is the laying bare of the state of one's conscience to a superior for the purpose of receiving direction as to vocation and other matters connected with the spiritual life. The practice belongs to the paternal and domestic side of religious government, and in no way involves ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hence it can be made to a lay (religious) superior, and even to a female. The advantages of the practice to the individual subject and to the order generally are obvious. So, too, are the dangers. These latter have frequently been the matter of papal legislation. By a decree of December 17, 1890, Leo XIII. abolished the compulsory manifestation of conscience in all congregations of women and of laymen. And even in congregations with priests for superiors, the article prescribing manifestation of conscience outside of Confession has been in some cases removed. The papal decree just mentioned must be read in community every year at least once. (Taunton; Fanning in "Cath. Enc.")

MANIPLE. An ornamental vestment worn by subdeacons and by clergy of higher orders at Mass. It hangs from the left arm below the elbow (Gavantus says above the elbow, but he is corrected by Meratus), and is fastened by strings or pins. It is of the same colour and material as the chasuble. Priests put it on before Mass after the girdle. Bishops do not take it till they have said the Confiteor at the foot of the altar. It is supposed to symbolize penance and sorrow, and the prayer which the priest is directed in the Missal to say as he puts it on alludes to this signification: "Be it mine, O Lord, to bear the maniple of weeping and sorrow, that I may receive with joy the reward of toil." And the prayer said by the bishop is much the same. Liturgical writers also see in the maniple a symbol of the cord with which Christ was bound on his capture. Though in origin a handkerchief, it is probable that it was one carried not for use but as a

badge of rank. Hence the stress put upon the bestowal of it at ordinations and various prohibitions of its use by certain classes of clerics.

Many writers, following Cardinal Bona, have thought that they could trace the mention of the maniple to Gregory the Great, who wrote to John of Ravenna because the clergy of that see had begun to use *mappulae*, which, up to that time, had been peculiar to Roman ecclesiastics. It has been shown, however, by Binterim that the *mappulae* were not maniples but portable *baldacchini*. The mosaic of St. Vitalis at Ravenna (sixth century) represents the bishop and clergy without maniples, and it is not till the eighth and ninth centuries that any trace of the maniple is found. It was originally a handkerchief (hence the name *manipulus*) used for removing perspiration and the moisture of the eyes. Mabillon quotes from a document of the year 781, in which "five maniples" are named along with other vestments. In 889, Bishop Ricuif, of Soissons, required each church to have at least two girdles and as many clean maniples ("totidem nitidas manipulas"). In the tenth century, Bishop Ratherius forbade anyone to say Mass without amice, alb, stole, "fanone et planeta." The *planeta* is the chasuble; the *fano* (Goth. *fana*, allied to the Greek πῆνος and the Latin *pannus* and the same word as the modern German *Fahne*) is the maniple; *hantfan* or *hantvan* being the translation of *manipulus* or *manipula* in mediaeval vocabularies. [See FANON.]

The following are the principal changes which have occurred in the form and use of the maniple. Originally, as has been said, it was a mere handkerchief, used indeed at Mass, but then for ordinary purposes. But it was richly ornamented. Thus in 908, Adalbero, bishop of Augsburg, offered a maniple worked with gold at the shrine of St. Gallus. In the Basilica of St. Ambrose at Milan there are four figures of saints, constructed in 835, with ornamental maniples on their left arms, much like Gothic maniples of a much later date. Hefele gives a figure (belonging to the ninth century) of a priest with little bells on his maniple, in imitation doubtless of the bells on the coat of the Jewish High Priest. But even as late as 1100 Ivo of Chartres mentions the use of the maniple for wiping the eyes, and it was only gradually that the maniple became entirely of stiff material. The prayer in the Missal, as we have seen, still alludes to the old and simple use.

Again, in 1100 a Council of Poitiers restricted the use of the maniple to subdeacons, and such is the present custom. But only a little before the council Lanfranc speaks of the maniple as commonly worn by monks, even if laymen. A statute of the Church of Liège (1287) directs that the maniple should be two feet long, which is much more than its present length. Moreover, since the chasuble used to cover the entire body, the priest did not put on the maniple till the chasuble was raised after the Confiteor and his arm left free. A memory of the old state of things is preserved by bishops at their Mass. (Gavantus, with Meratus' notes; Hefele, "Beiträge"; Braun, "Die Liturg. Gewandung," 515–561, and in "Cath. Enc."; Rock, "Hierurgia," ii., 220.)

MANSUS, MANSE. In the Capitularies of Charlemagne respecting Saxony (Baluze, i. 183, quoted by Stubbs in "Const. Hist." i. 228) it is ordered that for every church a house with enclosed yard (*curtis*) and two *mansi* of land shall be provided. Here and in many other places the word seems to signify merely a measure of land, and is probably equivalent to *bovata* or ox-gang, the quantity of land—usually about twelve acres—which could be tilled with one ox. Gradually the meaning of the word changed, till it came to signify "a house with land attached to it," a residence. Thus in an agreement made in 1219 between the bishop of Lincoln and the abbot of St. Albans,[1] it is stipulated that the vicar of Leighton shall have a "mansus competens" along with the small tithes and other advantages. As used by Matthew Paris in his Life of Abbot Paul, who lived soon after the Conquest ("terra trium mansuum cum totidem hortis"), the expression seems to be passing from its earlier into its later meaning.[2] In the Chronicle of Brompton (fl. 1200) the term is used simply for mansion or residence.[3]

MANTELLETTA. A vestment made of silk or woollen stuff, open but fastened in front, reaching almost to the knees, without sleeves but with openings for the arms and with a low collar round the neck. It is worn by cardinals, bishops, abbots, and the "prelati" of the Roman Court, as well as by others to whom the privilege is granted by the Pope. It is used to cover the rochet, so that bishops wear it only when they are out of their dioceses, the uncovered rochet being the sign of jurisdiction. The mantellette of cardinals are of three colours—viz. red, violet, and rose-coloured (*rosaceo*); those of a bishop in Rome are always of the same hue. (Moroni, "Dizionario istorico.")

MANUAL. [See RITUALE.]

MANUAL MASSES. [See MASS.]

MARCIONITE. [See GNOSTICISM.]

MARIST BROTHERS (*Little Brothers of Mary*). A teaching institute founded in France by the Ven. Benedict Marcellin Champagnat, a Marist father, and approved by Pius IX. in 1863. When the religious orders were expelled from France in 1903, the Brothers had charge of 750 schools. The

[1] Matt. Paris (Wats), p. 130.
[2] Matt. Paris (Wats), p. 50.
[3] Twys. *X Script.* 913.

Brothers now number more than 6000, with schools in all parts of the world. [See the next art.]

MARIST FATHERS. This religious Congregation was founded early in the nineteenth century by Father Colin, who was born on August 7, 1790, in the diocese of Lyons.

While he was still a young priest, the Restoration in 1815 offered a favourable opportunity for the revival of religion in rural districts after the ravages of the Revolution. In 1823 he resigned his parochial duties and, with several companions, under the name of the Society of Mary, devoted himself to the work of preaching in the small towns and villages. The blessing of Pius VII. had already been given to the scheme in 1818. About 1835 the attention of the Holy See was seriously turned to the distant missions of the South Sea Islands, a field much in need of labourers. The "Marists" readily embraced the offer made to them to undertake this work. Gregory XVI., to encourage and fortify the new apostles, signed, on April 29, 1836, the brief Omnium Gentium, approving of the "Society of Mary." The final sanction was given by Pius IX. on February 28, 1873. Fr. Colin died on November 15, 1875, and was declared Venerable by Pius X. in 1908.

Progress of the Society. — Before his death he had the consolation of seeing that God had blessed his work. In France the Society of Mary, of which the mother-house was at Lyons, was already divided into two provinces. The infamous Association Act of 1901 scattered the French communities and seized their houses. The members, however, have continued their labours in other lands.

From the beginning the Society of Mary devoted itself to the foreign missions. As stated above, the Congregation of the Propaganda entrusted to it the spreading of the faith in Western Oceania, where no Catholic priest had yet penetrated, and where all the savage tribes, scattered over a great number of islands, had been, or actually were, cannibals. The first departure of missionaries took place in December 1836. Father Bataillon was the first to land in the island of Wallis. In the course of four years of preaching, amid dangers and fatigues, he succeeded in converting the whole island, and since then the Catholic faith has reproduced among that savage people the marvels related of the missions of Paraguay and the first ages of Christianity. Father Bataillon became first Vicar-Apostolic of Central Oceania, and died in his much-loved island of Wallis on March 11, 1877, after forty years of missionary labours. Another of the first band was Father Chanel, who was placed at Futuna, an island inhabited by cannibals of the worst type. The preaching and example of the missionary proved alike ineffectual; the conversion of this people demanded the blood of a martyr. Father Chanel fell a victim to their hatred of the faith on April 28, 1841. Almost instantaneously the whole island, moved by Divine grace, embraced the Catholic faith. Dr. Epalle, at first missionary in New Zealand, and afterwards named Vicar-Apostolic of Melanesia and Micronesia, was not spared to display his zeal in the new field assigned to him by the Holy See. He was massacred on the island of Isabella by the savage tribes to whom he was carrying the gospel of peace. In this same Vicariate Apostolic several Marist missionaries have fallen victims to the cannibals.

Dr. Douarre, bishop of Amata, started for another Vicariate Apostolic in New Caledonia. This archipelago was occupied by tribes engaged in constant warfare with one another, prompted by their appetite for human flesh. The courageous apostle, undaunted by the dangers, made an attempt to carry out his object, but failed. A missionary was killed, and the establishment completely destroyed. Obliged to quit the unfriendly land, the missionaries left, but with the intention of coming back; and at a later period they did return, to recommence and pursue the work of civilization and the salvation of souls. They have now 36 stations in New Caledonia.

In New Zealand Marist missionaries were the first to announce the true faith to the Maories. Since 1889 the mission forms a separate province, with an archbishop, a bishop, and 70 priests. The province of Oceanica, erected in 1898, has five vicariates, besides a house in Sydney and three missions in Australia itself, with 200 priests. The province of the United States has one archbishop and more than 100 priests. Lastly, the Anglo-Irish province has eight houses with about 50 priests.

The work of the Order continues to be what it was at the beginning: missions at home and abroad, the education of youth, and the conduct of ecclesiastical seminaries. ("Life of Ven. Fr. Colin"; Sollier in "Cath. Enc.")

The Society of Mary, besides possessing an order of teaching Brothers [see the preceding art.], and another of Sisters, in virtue of an Apostolic brief, bearing date September 8, 1850, established a third order, for pious persons living in the world.

MARIST SISTERS. This congregation owes its origin to Père Colin (see preceding art.). Founded in 1817, and approved in 1884, it has now convents in England and elsewhere to which boarding-schools for girls are attached.

MARONITES. There has been much dispute on the origin of the name, but the following is probably the true account. Maro, a Syrian monk, contemporary with St.

Chrysostom, settled on Mount Lebanon, and after his death a monastery, called after him the monastery of St. Maro, was founded between Apamea and Emesa, on the Orontes. A monk belonging to this house, and known as John Maro, was named bishop of Botrys in 676 by Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, who was afterwards deposed as a Monothelite by the Sixth General Council. John Maro thus became the spiritual and temporal head of the Christian population of Mount Lebanon, and contended successfully both against Saracens and Melchites. On the destruction of the old monastery of St. Maro by the Imperialists, another was founded at Kefr-Nay, in the district of Botrys, and thither the head of St. Maro was brought. Partly from the John Maro who died in 707, partly from St. Maro, the patron of the monastery, the Monothelite Christians on Mount Lebanon were called Maronites.

In 1182 a Latin Patriarch of Antioch united them to the Catholic Church. A schism was caused through Greek influence and a Maronite Patriarch fell away. But the rent was healed in 1216, and ever since the Maronites have been steadfast Catholics. Originally the Maronites acknowledged their Patriarch as civil ruler, but after a brief space they were governed on a feudal system by an Emir chosen by the aristocratic families, and he in turn nominated the Sheiks. In 1842 an arrangement was made by which the government of the Lebanon was divided between two Emirs, one chosen by the Maronites, another by the Druses, the former having a Druse, the latter a Maronite, assessor. The terrible massacres of Maronites by the Druses in 1860 (16,000 Maronites were slain, 100,000 were driven from their homes) led to fresh changes. Lebanon was placed under one governor nominated by the Turks; feudal rights were abolished, but each nation has its own Sheiks. In 1913 the number of Maronites was about 330,000.

The Patriarch is chosen by the bishops, the Pope confirming and sending the pallium. He is subject to Propaganda. He appoints and consecrates the bishops. He alone consecrates the holy oils and chrism. No translation from Syriac into Arabic can be made without his approval. Every three years he must summon the bishops to a synod. His title (conferred by Alexander IV. in 1254) is Patriarch of Antioch, and he always adds the name of Peter to his own. His income consists of 100,000 piastres derived from three monasteries, with about 100,000 more from a poll-tax levied on all adult Maronites, a tax of five piastres each levied from the priests, tithes, and a subsidy from bishops and religious houses.

Metropolitan is a mere title of honour. Formerly the faithful of each diocese recommended a candidate for a vacant bishopric. Since 1736 the Patriarch has nominated with the advice of his bishops and also of the clergy and nobles of the vacant diocese. The bishops alone give the sacrament of Confirmation. There are also titular bishops, two of whom are the Patriarch's vicars, another administers his diocese, another is his agent at Rome, &c. The diocesan bishops are supported by lands belonging to the diocese, reserves in the taxes and tithes collected for the Patriarch, and stole fees. Since 1736 there have been only nine bishoprics, counting that of the Patriarch, of which Beyrout, Tripoli, Aleppo, Damascus, Sidon, Cyprus are archiepiscopal, Gibail and Botri (the Patriarch's bishopric) and Baalbek episcopal sees. The archdeacon, *oeconomus, periodeutes* or *bardut*, arch-priest and chorepiscopus are the officials of the diocese.

The parish-priests, usually married, are chosen by the people. There are 898 parishes, 1371 secular priests, and more than 300 regulars. The parish-priest is allowed to till land, and his income consists in offerings of corn, oil, silk, &c., and stole fees. There are three lower or minor orders—viz. psaltist, reader and subdeacon, three greater or higher, deacon, priest, bishop. The tonsure is given before the minor orders. There are three general and several diocesan seminaries, the latter of recent origin. There is also a Maronite college at Rome. Education is given in Arabic, the vulgar, and in Syriac, the liturgical, language, and also of course in the theological sciences.

The Maronite religious follow the rule of St. Anthony. Down to 1757 there were only two congregations, one of St. Isaias, another of St. Anthony or St. Elisaeus. The statutes of both congregations were approved by Clement XII. But in 1770 Clement XIV. approved the subdivision of the latter congregation into that of Aleppo and that of the Baladites or "natives" belonging to Mount Lebanon. These Baladites are chiefly laymen. Each of the three congregations has a general superior, chosen for three years and independent of the Patriarch, and a procurator at Rome. Fourteen monasteries belong to the congregation of St. Isaias, four to that of Aleppo, nineteen to that of the Baladites. There are seven nunneries of the strict observance. There are also many irregular monasteries and nunneries where the rule is less strict, and the superior must belong to the founder's family. In one convent of Maronite nuns, a Western rule, that of the Visitation, is observed. The Maronites follow a Syrian rite, in Syriac, of the type of the Liturgy of St. James, but with many modifications in the Roman direction. Thus, they use unleavened bread and receive communion under one kind, and the ancient epiklesis is reduced to a prayer for the spiritual benefit of the communicants [see LITURGIES: *Liturgy of*

St. James, p. 529]. Many modern Roman devotions are common among the Maronites: Benediction, Stations, Rosary, &c. (See Assemani, "Bibliotheca Orientalis," i. 496 *sqq.*; the articles of Vailhé in "Échos d'Orient"; Neher in "Kirchenlex."; Labourt in "Cath. Enc." The statistics given by the above writers differ considerably from those of Streit, "Atlas," 123.)

MARRIAGE. I. *The Nature of Marriage as such.*—Marriage is a natural contract between man and woman, which Christ has raised to the dignity of a sacrament. Heathens may be, and are, united in true marriage, and their union is of course a lawful one, sanctioned and blessed by God Himself, who is the author of nature as well as of grace. But it is only among baptized persons that the contract of marriage is blessed and sanctified in such a manner as to become a means of conferring grace, so that we must distinguish between marriage in itself or according to the natural law on the one hand and the sacrament of marriage on the other. Theologians commonly give the following definition of marriage, taken from the Master of the Sentences. It is "viri mulierisque conjunctio maritalis inter legitimas personas individuam vitae societatem retinens." It is "conjunctio viri et mulieris"—*i.e.* the union of man and woman, the persons between whom the contract is formed; it is "maritalis"—*i.e.* it implies the giving to each power over the person of the other, and so is distinct from the union of friend with friend, man with man in business, and the like; it is "inter legitimas personas"—*i.e.* between those who are not absolutely prevented by lawful impediment from contracting such a union; "individuam vitae societatem retinens," it binds them to an undivided and indissoluble partnership during life, and so is distinct from such unhallowed unions as are contracted for a time or may be ended at will. If we add "gratiam conjugibus conferendam significans"—*i.e.* being an (efficacious) sign of grace to be bestowed on the persons contracting—we have the full definition of marriage as a sacrament. Of course, the definition gives the bare essentials of marriage, for it ought to include the most perfect union of heart and soul, sympathy and interest.

Two points in the above definition may cause some difficulty, since it assumes that even in the law of nature a man can only have one wife (and of course a woman only one husband), and further that by the same law the marriage tie lasts till death.

With regard to the former point, polygamy according to St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 65 a. 1) does not absolutely destroy the end of marriage, for it is possible that a man with several wives should protect them and provide for the education of his children. And therefore (as many theologians suppose, from the time of the Deluge) God allowed the Patriarchs and others, whether Jews or heathen, to have more wives than one. But polygamy cruelly injures the perfect union of marriage; it degrades man by sensuality and exposes woman to the miseries of jealousy and neglect; it endangers the welfare of the children, and so may be justly stigmatized as contrary to the law of nature. Moreover, monogamy alone is contemplated in the institution of marriage: Gen. ii. 24, "Therefore a man will leave his father and his mother and will cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh." The legislation in Deut. xxv. 5 *seq.* appears to assume that monogamy was the rule among the Hebrews; so does the book of Proverbs throughout, and particularly the beautiful description of the good wife in ch. xxxi.,[1] and the same idea pervades the noble poetry of Ps. cxxviii. (see also in the Deutero-canonical books, Tob. i. 11; Ecclus. xxvi. 1). It was not till A.D. 1020 that a law of Rabbi Gershon ben Judah in the Synod of Worms absolutely prohibited polygamy among the Western Jews. It was practised by the Jews of Castile even in the fourteenth century, and still survives among the Jews of the East (Kalisch on Exodus, p. 370; on Levit. p. 374). But our Lord Himself expounded and enforced the natural law of marriage, and recalled men to the idea of marriage given in Genesis. It is worth notice that He quotes the Septuagint text, which is more express in favour of monogamy than the Hebrew: "And *the two* shall be one flesh." (So also the Samaritan, והיה משניהם "and there shall be from the two of them one flesh"; the New Testament invariably, Mk. x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Ephes. v. 31; and the Vulgate. The Targum of Onkelos, on the other hand, exactly follows the Hebrew.) Again, since Christ spoke generally of all mankind and not simply of those who were to be members of his Church, theologians hold that He withdrew the former dispensation, and consequently that polygamy is unlawful and a violation of natural law even in heathen. (Billuart, "De Matrimon." diss. v. a. 1.)

The same principles apply to the second point of difficulty. Moses, our Lord declares, permitted divorce because of the hardness of men's hearts, *i.e.* to prevent greater evils; and in consequence of this dispensation it was perhaps lawful for the heathen to imitate the example of the Jews in this respect also. But here, too, Christ has recalled all mankind to the primitive institution. The apparent exception which our Lord makes will be considered below, and certain cases in which marriage may be really dissolved

[1] The estimate of women is high throughout the Old Testament. We need only remind the reader of Mary, the sister of Moses, Deborah, Hannah. See also Prov. xiv. 1; xviii. 22; xix. 14 (even xxi. 9, 19, are not really different in spirit). The most unfavourable judgment is that of Eccles. vii. 28.

have been explained in the article on DIVORCE.

II. (*a*) *The Sacrament of Marriage.*—A sacrament is an outward sign, and nobody doubts that in marriage, as in all other contracts, some outward sign on the part of the contracting parties is necessary. They must signify their consent to the solemn obligation of living together as man and wife. It is plain, too, that marriage may be called a sacred sign, for it typifies, as St. Paul (Ephes. v.) assures us, the mysterious union between Christ and the Church, which is His bride. But is it an efficacious sign of grace? That is, is the contract of marriage accompanied by *signs* which not only betoken but necessarily, in consequence of Christ's institution, convey grace to all baptized persons who do not wilfully impede the entrance of the grace into their hearts? This is a question on which Catholics are divided from Protestants, and which was agitated among Catholics themselves late even in the Middle Ages. St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 42, a. 3), though he assumes that marriage is a sacrament of the new law, inquires whether it "confers grace," and mentions three opinions: first, that it does not do so at all, and this opinion he dismisses at once; next, that it confers grace only in the sense that it makes acts lawful that would otherwise be sins (this opinion he also rejects, but in a less summary way); and thirdly, that when "contracted in the faith of Christ," it confers grace to fulfil the duties of the married state, and this opinion he accepts as "more probable." It is plain that all which the second opinion attributes to marriage may be truly said of marriage as a natural contract, and does not by any means amount to a confession that marriage is a Christian sacrament in the sense of the Council of Trent. What St. Thomas gives as the more probable opinion is now an article of faith, for the council (sess. xxiv. De Sacram. Matr.), after stating that Christ Himself merited for us a grace which perfects the natural love of marriage and strengthens its indissoluble unity, solemnly defines (Can. 1) that marriage is "truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law instituted by Christ."

The same council speaks of Scripture as "hinting at" or "alluding to" (*innuit*) this truth, and more can scarcely be said. One text, indeed, as translated in our Douay Bible, would certainly seem to settle the question—viz. Ephes: v. 31, 32, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall adhere to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." But we venture to think that this is not the true sense of the Vulgate "Sacramentum hoc magnum est; ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia," which exactly answers to the original Greek, except that "in Christo et in ecclesia" would be better rendered, as in the old Latin of Tertullian ("Contr. Marc." v. 18, PL, ii. 518; "De Anima," 11), "in Christum et in ecclesiam." "Sacramentum" need not mean a "sacrament" any more than the Greek μυστήριον which it represents, and to prove this we need not go beyond the text of the Vulgate itself, which speaks of the "sacramentum" of godliness, 1 Tim. iii. 16; the "sacramentum" of the seven stars; the "sacramentum" of the woman and the beast, Apoc. i. 20, xvii. 7. Indeed, though the word "sacramentum" occurs in fifteen other places of the Vulgate, it cannot possibly mean a sacrament in any one of them. We translate, accordingly, "This mystery is great, but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church"—that is, the words, "For this cause shall a man leave," &c., contain a hidden or mysterious sense,[1] in virtue of which St. Paul regards Adam's words about the union between man and wife as a type or prophecy of the union between Christ and his Church. We have the authority of Estius for this interpretation, which is that generally adopted by modern scholars, and he denies that the ancients appealed to this text to prove marriage a sacrament.

On the other hand, St. Cyril Alex. ("Lib. ii. in Joann.," PG, lxxiii. 223) says that Christ was present at the wedding in Cana of Galilee that He might sanctify the principle of man's generation, "drive away the old sadness of child-bearing," "give grace to those also who were to be born"; and he quotes the words of St. Paul, "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away."

St. Augustine ("Tract. 9 in Joann." cap. 2, PL, xxxiv. 1458) holds similar language. This theory, however credible in itself, certainly does not lie on the surface of St. John's narrative.

More may be made of 1 Tim. ii. 11 *seq.*: "Let a woman learn in quietness, in all subjection. But teaching I do not permit to a woman, nor to have authority over a man, but to be in quietness. For man was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived hath fallen into transgression; but she shall be saved through her child-bearing,[2] if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with temperance." St. Paul excludes women from the public ministry of the Church, and reserves that for men. But he assigns them another ministry instead. They are to save their own souls by the faithful discharge of their duties as

[1] The formula, "This is a great mystery," is a common Rabbinical one, רא רזא יקירא. See Schoettgen, *Horæ*, p. 783 *seq.*, and the same Chaldee word *for* "mystery" is preserved in the Peshito rendering of the verse.

[2] Ellicott, *ad loc.*, translates "through the child-bearing"—*i.e.* through the birth of Christ. It seems to us incredible that St. Paul, if he really meant this, should have expressed it by an allusion so obscure and abrupt.

wives, and to be the source of the Church's increase, for it cannot subsist without marriage any more than without the sacrament of order. Women are to be the mothers of children, whom they are to tend and train for the service of Christ. And just as a special grace is given to those whom God calls to the priestly state, so is "the state of marriage placed under the protection and blessing of a special grace, as being dedicated to the Church and subserving its continual growth and expansion." Thus the intercourse of the sexes, which is apt to become a source of fearful corruption, is blessed and sanctified, more even than in its primitive institution, and directed to a still higher end, that of carrying on the Church's life on earth. The natural union is holy and beautiful: Christ perfects the union of heart and soul and makes it still more holy and beautiful by sacramental grace; and, hallowed by a sacrament, marriage becomes the perfect antitype of Christ's union with his Church. He cleansed His Church that He might unite it to Himself. He sanctifies Christian man and woman in their union that it may be "a hallowed copy of His own union with His Church" (see the eloquent passage in Döllinger, in "First Age of the Church," Engl. transl. pp. 361, 362).

The reader must remember that we do not allege this last passage as in any way conclusive from a controversial point of view, though we do think it fits in well with the Catholic doctrine. Many authorities are alleged from tradition, one or two of which we have already given in speaking of the marriage at Cana. St. Ambrose ("De Abraham." i. 7, PL, xiv. 443) says that he who is unfaithful to the marriage bond "undoes grace, and because he sins against God, therefore loses the share in a heavenly mystery (*sacramenti coelestis consortium amittit*)." St. Augustine ("De Bono Conjugali," cap. 24, PL, xxxvi. 394) writes: "The advantage of marriage among all nations and men lies in its being a cause of generation and a bond of chastity, but as concerns the people of God, also in the holiness of a sacrament (*in sanctitate sacramenti*)." Here the distinction drawn between natural and Christian marriage, and still more the comparison made between the "sacramenta" of Marriage and Order,[1] seem to warrant our rendering of "sanctitate sacramenti."

(β) *The Nature of the Sacramental Grace &c.* Marriage, then, is a sacrament of the new law, and as such confers grace. The sacrament can only be received by those who have already received baptism, the gate of all the other sacraments; and marriage is not, like baptism and penance, instituted for the cleansing of sin, so that grace is conferred on those, and those only, who are at peace with God. Christians who are in mortal sin may contract a valid marriage, but they receive no grace, though they do receive the sacrament and therefore have a claim and title to the sacramental grace when they have amended their lives by sincere repentance. Christians, on the other hand, who contract marriage with due dispositions receive an increase of sanctifying grace, and, besides, special graces which enable them to live in mutual and enduring affection, to bear with each other's infirmities, to be faithful to each other in every thought, and to bring up the children whom God may give them in His fear and love. They may go confidently to God for every help they need in that holy state to which He has deigned to call them, for He Himself has sealed their union by a great sacrament of the Gospel. Theologians are not agreed about the time when Christ instituted the sacrament. Some say at the wedding in Cana; others, when He abrogated the liberty of divorce (Mt. xix.); others, in the great Forty Days after Easter.

(γ) If we ask, further, how this grace is conferred, or in other words *who are the Ministers of the Sacrament*, what are the words and other signs through which it is given, the answer is far from easy. It is evident that there must be a real consent to the marriage on both sides, otherwise there can be no contract and therefore no sacrament. But is the expression of mutual consent enough? The great majority of mediaeval theologians, though William of Paris is quoted on the other side, answered yes. They held that, wherever baptized persons contracted marriage, they necessarily received the sacrament of marriage also. On this theory, the parties themselves are the ministers of the sacrament; the matter consists in the words or other signs by which each gives him or her self over to the other; the form, which gives a determinate character to the matter, consists in the acceptation of this surrender by each of the contracting parties. Hence (apart from the positive enactments of Trent, for which see *Clandestinity*, under IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE), wherever Christians bind themselves by outward signs to live as man and wife, they receive the sacrament of marriage. No priest or religious ceremony of any kind is needed. A very different view was put forward in the sixteenth century by Melchior Canus ("Loci Theol." viii. 5). He held that the priest was the minister of the sacrament; the expressed consent to live as man and wife the matter; the words of the priest, "I join you in marriage," or the like, the necessary form. A marriage not contracted in the face of the Church would, on this theory, be a true and valid marriage, but not a sacrament. Theologians and scholars of the greatest learning and highest reputation, Sylvius, Estius,

[1] He says the "sacramentum ordinationis" remains in a cleric deposed for crime, and that so the bond of marriage is only loosed by death. However, cap. 18 proves that St. Augustine did not use the word "sacramentum" in its precise modern sense, for he calls the polygamy of the Jews "sacramentum pluralium nuptiarum," as typifying the multitude of converts to the Church.

Tournely, Juenin, Renaudot, &c. (see Billuart, "De Matrim." diss. i. a. 6) embraced this opinion. In its defence an appeal might be made with great plausibility to the constant usage of Christians from the earliest times, for they have always been required to celebrate marriage before the priest. But it is to be observed that Tertullian ("De Pudic." 4, PL, ii. 987), strong as his language is against marriages not contracted before the Church, says that such unions "are in danger" (*periclitantur*) of being regarded as no better than concubinage, which implies that they were not really so. Nor does he make any distinction between the contract of marriage in Christians and the sacrament, though it would have been much to his purpose could he have done so. Besides, the language of the Fathers quoted above points to a belief that Christ elevated the contract of marriage to a sacrament, not that He superadded the sacrament to marriage. Moreover, Denzinger ("Ritus Orientales," tom. i. p. 152 *seq.*) shows that the Nestorians, who have retained the nuptial benediction from the Church and believe in the obligation of securing it, still consider that marriage, even as a sacred rite, may be performed by the parties themselves if the priest cannot be had; and he quotes from Gregorius Datheviensis this dictum: "Marriage is effected through consent expressed in words, but perfected and consummated by the priest's blessing and by cohabitation." Now, at all events, the former of the two opinions given is the only tenable one in the Church. Pius IX. in an allocution, September 27, 1852, laid down the principle that there "can be no marriage among the faithful which is not at one and the same time a sacrament"; and among the condemned propositions of the Syllabus appended to the Encyclical "Quanta Cura" of 1864, the sixty-fourth runs thus:—"The sacrament of marriage is something accessory to and separable from the contract, and the sacrament itself depends simply on the nuptial benediction." Whether, supposing a Christian (having obtained a dispensation to that effect) were to marry a person who is not baptized, the Christian party would receive the sacrament as well as enter into the contract of marriage, is a matter on which theologians differ. Analogy seems to favour the affirmative opinion.

(δ) *The Conditions for the Validity of Marriage* are mostly identical with the conditions which determine the validity of contracts in general. The consent to the union must be mutual, voluntary, deliberate, and manifested by external signs. The signs of consent need not be verbal in order to make the marriage valid, though the rubric of the Ritual requires the consent to be expressed in that manner. The consent must be to actual marriage then and there, not at some future time; for in the latter case we should have engagement to marry or betrothal, not marriage itself. Consent to marry if a certain condition in the past or present be realised (*e.g.* "I take you N. for my wife, if you are the daughter of M. and N.") suffices, supposing that the condition be fulfilled. Nay, it is generally held that if a condition be added dependent on future contingencies (*e.g.* "I take you N. for my wife, if your father will give you such and such a dowry") the marriage becomes a valid one without any renewal of the contract, whenever the condition becomes a reality. The condition appended, however, must not be contrary to the essence of marriage—*e.g.* a man cannot take a woman for his wife to have and to hold just as long as he pleases. (See Gury, "Theol. Moral." De Matrimon. cap. iii.)

III. *Indissolubility of Marriage.*—The law of Israel (Deut. xxiv. 1) allowed a man to divorce his wife if she did not find grace in his eyes, because he found in her some shameful thing (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, literally the "nakedness or shame of a thing"; LXX, ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα; Vulg. *aliquam foeditatem*), and the woman was free at once to marry another man. The school of Shammai kept to the simple meaning of the text. Hillel thought any cause of offence sufficient for divorce—*e.g.* "if a woman let the broth burn"; while R. Akiva held that a man might divorce his wife if he found another woman handsomer. (See the quotation from "Arbah Turim Nilchoth Gittin," i., in McCaul, "Old Paths," p. 189.) The Pharisees tried to entangle Christ in these Rabbinical disputes when they asked Him if a man might put away his wife "for any cause." In Athens and in Rome under the Empire the liberty of divorce reached the furthest limits of Rabbinical licence. (For details see Döllinger, "Gentile and Jew," Engl. transl. vol. ii. p. 236 *seq.*, p. 254 *seq.*) Our Lord, as we have already seen, condemned the Pharisaic immorality, annulled the Mosaic dispensation, and declared: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and he who marrieth her when she is put way committeth adultery" (Mt. xix. 9). The Catholic understands our Lord to mean that the bond of marriage is always, even when one of the wedded parties has proved unfaithful, indissoluble, and from the first Christ's declaration made the practice of Christians with regard to divorce essentially and conspicuously different from that of their heathen and Jewish neighbours. Still it was only by degrees that the strict practice, or even the strict theory just stated, was accepted in the Church. And before we enter on the interpretation of Christ's words we will give a sketch of the history of practice and opinion on the matter.

Christian princes had of course to deal with the subject of divorce, but they did not at once recast the old laws on Christian prin-

ciples. Constantine, Theodosius the Younger, and Valentinian III. forbade divorce except on certain specified grounds; other emperors, like Anastasius (in 497) and Justin (whose law was in force till 900), permitted divorce by mutual consent, but no one emperor limited divorce to the single case of adultery. Chardon says that divorce (of course *a vinculo*) was allowed among the Visigoths in Spain till the thirteenth century, in France under the first and second dynasties, in Germany till the seventh century, in Britain till the tenth. (Chardon, 1050 *sqq.*)

It would be waste of labour to accumulate quotations from the Fathers in proof of their belief that divorce was unlawful except in the case of adultery. But it is very important to notice that the oldest tradition, both of the Greek and Latin Churches, regarded marriage as absolutely indissoluble. Thus the "Pastor Hermae" (lib. ii. Mand. iv. c. 1), Athenagoras, "Legat." 33 (whose testimony, however, does not count for much, since he objected to second marriages altogether), and Tertullian ("De Monog." 9, PL, ii. 940), who speaks in this place, as the context shows, for the Catholic Church, teach this clearly and unequivocally. The principle is recognized in the Apostolic Canons (Canon 48, *al.* 47), by the Council of Elvira, held at the beginning of the fourth century, Canon 9 (which, however, only speaks of a woman who has left an unfaithful husband), and by other early authorities.

However, the Eastern Christians, though not, as we have seen, in the earliest times, came to understand our Lord's words as permitting a second marriage in the case of adultery, which was supposed to dissolve the marriage bond altogether. Such is the view and practice of the Greeks and Oriental sects at the present day. And even in certain parts of the West similar views prevailed for a time. Many French synods (*e.g.* those of Vannes in 465 and of Compiègne in 756) allow the husband of a wife who has been unfaithful to marry again in her lifetime. Nay, the latter council permitted re-marriage in other cases: if a woman had a husband struck by leprosy and got leave from him to marry another, or if a man had given his wife leave to go into a convent (Canons 16 and 19). Pope Gregory II., in a letter to St. Boniface in the year 726, recommended that the husband of a wife seized by sickness which prevented cohabitation should not marry again, but left him free to do so provided he maintained his first wife. (Quoted by Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii. p. 376.) At Florence the question of divorce was discussed between the Latins and Greeks, but after the Decree of Union, and we do not know what answers the Greeks gave on the matter. The Council of Trent confirmed the present doctrine and discipline, which had long prevailed in the West, in the following words: "If any man say that the Church is in error because it has taught and teaches, following the doctrine of the Gospels and the Apostles, that the bond of marriage cannot be dissolved because of the adultery of one or both parties, let him be anathema." (Sess. xxiv. De Matrim. can. 5.) The studious moderation of language here is obvious, for the canon does not directly require any doctrine to be accepted; it only anathematizes those who condemn a certain doctrine, and implies that this certain doctrine is taught by the Church and derived from Christ. It was the Venetian ambassadors who prevailed on the Fathers to draw up the canon in this indirect form, so as to avoid needless offence to the Greek subjects of Venice in Cyprus, Candia, Corfu, Zante, and Cephalonia. The canon was no doubt chiefly meant to stem the erroneous views of Lutherans and Calvinists on divorce.

Our Lord's utterances on the subject of divorce present some difficulty. In Mk. x. 11, 12, Lk. xvi. 18, He absolutely prohibits divorce: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her; and if a woman put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery." But in Mt. xix. 9, 10, there is a marked difference: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and marry another, committeth adultery; and he who marrieth a woman put away committeth adultery." So also Mt. v. 32. Protestant commentators understand our Lord to prohibit divorce except in the case of adultery, when the innocent party at least may marry again. Maldonatus, who acknowledges the difficulty of the text, takes the sense to be—"Whoever puts away his wife except for infidelity commits adultery, because of the danger of falling into licentiousness to which he unjustly exposes her, and so does he who in any case, even if his wife has proved unfaithful, marries another." He takes St. Mark and St. Luke as explanatory of the obscure passage in St. Matthew. Subsequent scholars, we venture to think, have by no means improved on Maldonatus. Hug, who is never to be mentioned without respect, suggested that Christ first (in Mt. v. 32) forbade divorce except in case of adultery; then (Mt. xix. 9, 10) forbade it altogether, the words "except for fornication" in the latter place being an interpolation—a suggestion perfectly arbitrary and followed by nobody. A well-known Catholic commentator, Schegg, interprets the words "for fornication" (*ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*) to mean "because the man has found his marriage to be null because of some impediment, and so no marriage at all, but mere concubinage." In this event there would be no occasion for or possibility of divorce. On Mt. v. 32 (*παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, save where fornication is the motive reason of the divorce)

he thinks Christ took for granted that the adulteress would be put to death (according to Levit. xx. 10) and so leave her husband free, an hypothesis which is contradicted by the "pericope of the adulteress" (Jn. viii. 3 *seq.*). Döllinger's elaborate theory given in the Appendix to his "First Age of the Church" is less ingenious than that of Hug, but scarcely less arbitrary. He urges that πορνεύειν can only refer to "fornication," and cannot be used of sin committed after marriage; but πορνεία and πορνεύειν are used of adultery (1 Cor. v. 1; Amos vii. 17; Ecclus. xxiii. 33), so that we need not linger over Döllinger's contention (which has no historical basis, and is objectionable in every way) that antenuptial sin on the woman's part annulled the union and left the man free, if he was unaware of it when he meant to contract marriage.[1]

IV. *The Unity of Marriage.*—The unlawfulness of polygamy in the common sense of the word follows from the declaration of Christ Himself, and there was no room for further question on the matter. With regard to reiteration of marriage, St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 39, 40) distinctly asserts that a woman is free to marry on her husband's death. Still there is a natural feeling against a second marriage, which Virgil expresses in the beautiful words he puts into Dido's mouth (Aen. iv. 28, 29):

"Ille meos, primus qui me sibi junxit, amores
Abstulit; ille habeat secum servetque sepulcro."[2]

And this feeling, of which there are many traces among the heathen, was yet more natural in Christians, who might well look to a continuance in a better world of the love which had begun and grown stronger year by year on earth. Moreover, the Apostle puts those who had married again at a certain disadvantage, for he excludes them (1 Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 6) from the episcopate and priesthood. And the Church, though she held fast the lawfulness of second marriage and condemned the error of the Montanists (see Tertullian, "De Monog.," "Exhortat. Castitatis"), and of some Novatians (Concil. Nic. i., Canon 8), treated such unions with a certain disfavour. This aversion was much more strongly manifested in the East than in the West.

Athenagoras ("Legat." 33) says Christians marry not at all, or only once, since they look on second marriage as a "specious adultery" (εὐπρεπὴς ἐστι μοιχεία). Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." iii. 1, p. 551, ed. Potter) simply repeats the Apostolic injunction, "But as to second marriage, if thou art on fire, says the Apostle, marry." (In iii. 12, p. 551, he is referring to simultaneous bigamy.) Early in the fourth century we find Eastern councils showing strong disapproval of second marriage. Thus the Council of Neocaesarea (Canon 7) forbids priests to take part in the feasts of those who married a second time, and assumes that the latter must do penance. The Council of Ancyra (Canon 19) also takes this for granted, and the Council of Laodicea (Canon 1) only admits those who have married again to communion after prayer and fasting. Basil ("Ad Amphil." c. 4; PG, xxxii. 673) treats this branch of Church discipline in great detail. For those who married a second time he prescribes, following ancient precedent, a penance of one year, and of several years for those who re-marry more than once. (See the references in Hefele-Leclercq, i. 522; "Beiträge," i. p. 50 *seq.*) Basil's rigorism had a decided influence on the later Greek Church. A Council of Constantinople, in 920, discouraged second, imposed penance for third, and excommunication for fourth marriage. Such is the discipline of the modern Greek Church. At a second marriage the "benediction of the crowns" is omitted, and "propitiatory prayers" are said; and although some concessions have been made with regard to the former ceremony, Leo Allatius testifies that it was still omitted in some parts of the Greek Church as late as the seventeenth century. A fourth marriage is still absolutely prohibited.[1]

The Latin Church has always been milder and more consistent. The "Pastor Hermae" (lib. ii. Mandat. iv. 4) emphatically maintains that there is no sin in second marriage. St. Ambrose ("De Viduis," c. 11, PL, xvi. 254) contents himself with saying, "We do not prohibit second marriages, but we do not approve marriages frequently reiterated." Jerome's words are: "I do not condemn those who marry twice, three times, nay, if such a thing can be said, eight times (*non damno digamos, imo et trigamos, et, si dici potest, octogamos*)," but he shows his dislike for repeated marriage (Ep. xlviii., "Apol. pro libris adv. Jovin.," PL, xxii. 499). Gregory III. advises Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, to prevent, if he can, people marrying more than twice, but he does not call such unions sinful. Nor did the Latin Church impose any penance for reiterated marriage. We do, indeed, find penance imposed on those who married again in the penitential books of Theodore, who became archbishop of Canterbury in 668. But Theodore's view came from his Greek nationality; and if Herardus, archbishop of Tours, speaks of third marriage, &c., as "adultery," this is probably to be explained by the Greek influence which had spread

[1] Döllinger objects to the instance from 1 Cor. v. 1, because he says there is no Greek word for "incest," so that the Apostle was obliged to use πορνεία. Why πορνεία rather than μοιχεία? As to Amos vii. 17, "Thy wife will commit fornication in the city," he urges that this defilement was not to be voluntary on the woman's part, and therefore was not adultery. This argument proves too much. If it was not adultery because not wilful, no more was it "fornication."

[2] He who first wed me, he took all my love,
And he shall keep it till we meet above.

[1] The Oriental sects (Copts, Jacobites, Armenians) are even stricter than the Greeks. The Nestorians, however, are, as might have been expected, free from any spirit of strictness on this point. Denzinger, *Rit. Orient.* i. p. 180.

from England to France. Anyhow, this is the earliest trace of such rigorism in the West.

The Latin Church, however, did exhibit one definite mark of disfavour for reiterated marriage. The "Corpus Juris" contains two decretals of Alexander III. and Urban III. forbidding priests to give the nuptial benediction in such cases. Durandus (died 1296) speaks of the custom in his time as different in different places. The "Rituale Romanum" of Paul V. (1605–1621) forbids the nuptial benediction, only tolerating the custom of giving it, when it already existed, if it was the man only who was being married again. The present rubric permits the nuptial benediction except when the woman has been married before.

V. *Ceremonies of Marriage.*—From the earliest times and in all times Christians have been wont to celebrate their marriages in church and to have them blessed by the priest; nor can they celebrate them otherwise without sin, except in case of necessity. "It is fitting," Ignatius writes ("Ad Polycarp." 5), "for men and women who marry, to form this union with the approval of the bishop that their union may be according to God." "What words can suffice," Tertullian says ("Ad Uxor." ii. 9), "to tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church unites, the oblation confirms, and the blessing seals, the angels announce, the Father acknowledges!"

In the form approved for England the priest in surplice and white stole questions the man and woman as to their consent. Then each party expresses this consent at length and in the vulgar tongue, with joined hands:—"I N. take thee N. to my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death us do part, [if Holy Church will it permit,][1] and thereto I plight thee my troth." "I N. take thee N. to my wedded husband," &c. Whereupon the priest, "I join you into marriage in the name of the Father, and the Son," &c. The bridegroom then places gold and silver on a plate or on the book which he afterwards gives to the bride, and a ring which the priest sprinkles with holy water and blesses. The bridegroom takes the ring from the priest and gives the money to his wife, saying, "With this ring I thee wed, this gold and silver I thee give, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow"; then he puts the ring on the thumb of his wife's left hand, saying, "In the name of the Father"; on her second finger, saying, "and of the Son"; on her third finger, saying, "and of the Holy Ghost"; and on her fourth finger, where he leaves it, saying "Amen." The Nuptial Mass is then celebrated, and the priest gives the nuptial benediction after the Paternoster and again after the "Ite Missa." Nothing can exceed the grace and tender beauty of these prayers of benediction.

Many of these ceremonies belonged originally to the betrothal. [See ESPOUSAL.] The ring, or *annulus pronubus*, was used to plight troth before Christian times by the Romans. So again, espousing with gold and silver, called *arrhae*, certainly existed among the Franks previous to their embracing Christianity, also among the Jews, whence it may have passed into the Greek ritual. The joining of hands (once accompanied by a kiss) is alluded to by Tertullian ("De Virg. Veland." 11). St. Isidore of Seville, PL, ii. 904 (1019), quoted by Chardon, says the ring was put on the fourth finger of the left hand, because it contains a vein immediately connected with the heart. This sage reason was the current one in the Middle Ages.

The words of the priest, "Ego jungo" ("I join you into marriage"), are of comparatively recent origin. "Anyone," says Chardon, 1024, "may convince himself of this by looking through the extracts from ancient Sacramentaries and Missals published by Father Martène." They are omitted, the same author continues, in a Pontifical of Sens (only) 300 years old, and they are wanting in the "Ordo ad faciendum sponsalia" reprinted by Maskell from a Sarum "Manuale" of 1543. On the other hand, two striking ceremonies mentioned by Nicolas I. in his answer to the Bulgarians, and both older than Christianity itself, are now unknown among us. These are the solemn veiling of the bride and the wearing of crowns by the married couple. The Greeks have kept this latter rite: indeed, "crowning" among them is a common word for the nuptial benediction. The marriage service according to the old English use of Sarum is substantially the same as the modern Roman one, but more elaborate. The couple stood at the church door till the man had placed the ring on the woman's hand (the right hand, by the way), and certain prayers had been said over them. Additional prayers were said over them at the altar steps: then, before Mass began, they were placed in the presbytery—"that is to say, between the choir and the altar" (rubric of Sarum Manuel). The rubric of the Hereford Missal directs them to hold lights in their hands. The Nuptial Mass was "of the Trinity," with prayers for the occasion. After the Sanctus, four clerics in surplices held a veil (*pallium*) over them while they lay prostrate, and the special benediction was given after the Fraction of the Host. At the "Agnus Dei" the *pallium* was removed, both rose, the bridegroom received the pax from the priest and kissed his wife. There is nothing in the Sarum Manual which answers to our nuptial prayer after the "Ite Missa est," though the Hereford Missal gives a special form of benediction

[1] The words in parenthesis are omitted from the latest editions of the "Ordo Administrandi, &c."

with the chalice. After Mass, bread and wine, or some other liquor, were blessed and tasted by the newly-married couple. At night the priest blessed the nuptial couch.

It must not be thought that these rites, even so far as they differ from those now in use, were in any way peculiarly English. They occur almost exactly in the same order and form in a Ritual of Rennes and a Pontifical from the monastery of Leri, from which Chardon (*loc. cit.*) gives copious extracts. But we can find no parallel for the placing of the ring on the bride's right hand.

In the Greek Church the marriage service is known as *ἀκολουθία τοῦ στεφανώματος*, the office of crowning. After the espousals, in which two rings, one of gold and another of silver, are placed on the altar and given by the priest to bridegroom and bride respectively, the persons to be married enter the church, preceded by the priest with the incense. After Psalm xxxi. and various prayers the priest puts a crown on the head of each with the words, "The servant of God N. crowns the servant of God N. in the name," &c. There is no mention of Nuptial Mass in the modern Greek Euchologies, and Greeks are usually married in the evening. From more ancient MSS., however, Goar found that the bridegroom and bride used to receive Communion from a particle of a Host previously consecrated and placed in a chalice with ordinary wine. The offices of marriage among the other Orientals are given by Denzinger. The nuptial blessing, from the receiving of which widows are debarred, has hitherto been subject to the condition that a Nuptial Mass be celebrated. The Sacred Congregation of Rites now (1914) permits the bestowing of it in a slightly altered form even when no Mass is said. (The sacrament is treated by the dogmatic and moral theologians and by the canonists, "De Matrimonio," *e.g.* Palmieri, Ballerini (vol. v.), Cardinal Gasparri; for the rites and ceremonies see Chardon, 1016–1034; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," 428–434; Martène, "De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus," ii.; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

MARTYR (*μάρτυς*, then *μάρτυρ*, which was originally the Aeolic form). A witness for Christ. In early times this title was given generally to those who were distinguished witnesses for Christ, then to those who suffered for Him;[1] lastly, after the middle of the third century, the title was restricted to those who actually died for Him. The very first records of the Church which we possess tell us of the honours done to the martyrs. It was the martyrs who, first of all, were regarded as saints; the relics of the martyrs which were first revered; to the martyrs that the first churches were dedicated. The name "martyrium" (*μαρτύριον*), which at first meant the church built over a martyr's remains, was given to churches generally, even if dedicated to saints who were not martyred, though this usage was partly justified by the fact that a church was not consecrated till the relics of some martyr had been placed in it.

Benedict XIV., in his work "De Canonizatione" (lib. iii. cap. 11 *seq.*), gives the modern law of the Church on the recognition of martyrdom with great fulness. He defines martyrdom as the "voluntary endurance of death for the faith, or some other act of virtue relating to God." A martyr, he says, may die not only for the faith directly, but also to preserve some virtue—*e.g.* justice, obedience, or the like, enjoined or counselled by the faith. He mentions the dispute among theologians whether a person who died for confessing the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, which in his time had not been defined, would be a martyr. He gives no decided opinion on the point, but says that "in other cases the safe rule is that one who dies for a question not yet defined by the Church dies in a cause insufficient for martyrdom." Further, he explains that to be a martyr a man must actually die of his sufferings or else have endured pains which would have been his death but for miraculous intervention. (See Allard, "Ten Lectures on the Martyrs," tr.; Leclercq, "Les Martyrs.")

MARTYROLOGY. A list of martyrs and other saints, and the mysteries commemorated on each day of the year, with brief notices of the life and death of the former. It is these brief notices which distinguish a Martyrology from a mere calendar. It is read in monastic orders at Prime after the prayer "Deus, qui ad principium." It is followed by the versicle "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints," and by a petition for the intercession of the heavenly court; and these words are retained even in the secular office when the Martyrology is not actually recited. Maskell has collected many proofs that in England the Martyrology used to be said in the monastic chapter, not, like the office, in the choir. This custom, however, was in no way peculiar to England, as may be seen from the notes of Meratus on the subject (Part II. sect. v. cap. 21). After Prime, or sometimes after Tierce, the monks adjourned to the chapter, heard the Martyrology and said the prayers which now form part of Prime, "Deus, in adjutorium meum"; "Dignare, Domine,

[1] *Μάρτυς* and the cognate words begin to assume their later technical sense in Acts xxii., Apoc. ii. 13. This technical sense is probably intended in Clem. Rom. 1, *Ad Cor.* 5; certainly in Ignat. *Ad Ephes.* 1; Mart. Polyc. 19, Melito (*apud* Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 26); Dionys. Corinth. (*ib.* ii. 25); Hegesippus (*ib.* ii. 23, iv. 22; *Epist. Gall.* (*ib.* v. 1, 2); *Anon. Adv. Cataph.* (*ib.* v. 16); Iren. i. 28, 1 &c.; though at the same time the words were also used of testimony which was not sealed by death. The epistle of the Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons just quoted distinguishes between confessors (*ὁμόλογοι*) and martyrs, but in Clement Alex. (*Strom.* iv. 9, p. 596) and even in Cyprian the distinction is not observed. The Decian persecution tended to fix it.

die isto," &c., before setting out to their daily labour.

Gregory the Great speaks of a Martyrology used by the Roman Church in his day, but we do not know for certain what it was. A Martyrology attributed to Jerome is printed, *e.g.* in Vallarsi's edition of his works. It has undergone many revisions and later editions. It is quite possible that Jerome may have collected a Martyrology from the various calendars of the Church, and that the Martyrology which goes by his name, as we have it, is the corruption of a book used in St. Gregory's time at Rome. The lesser Roman Martyrology was found at Ravenna by Ado, archbishop of Vienne, about 850. A third Martyrology is attributed (erroneously, Hefele says) to Bede, and the foundation of the work may probably come from him. All Western Martyrologies are based on these three. We have Martyrologies from Florus, Ado, Usuard, in France; from Rabanus and Notker of St. Gall, in Switzerland.

The Roman Martyrology mentioned, as we have seen, by Gregory the Great is mentioned again at the English Council of Cloveshoe. Such a work is of course subject to constant alterations from the addition of new feasts, &c. A revision of the Roman Martyrology was made by Baronius and other scholars in 1584. It was revised again under Urban VIII. (See Laemmer,[1] "De Martyrologio Romano," Ratisbonae, 1878; De Smedt, "Introductio Generalis ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam," 127–158; Delehaye in "Cath. Enc.")

MARY (Μαριάμ,[2] מִרְיָם). The object of this article is to sum up and justify the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church in her devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Catholics do not stand alone in this devotion, for the schismatic Greeks and most of the ancient Oriental sects agree with Catholics in magnifying Mary's dignity and seeking her intercession. Protestants, on the other hand, are all but unanimous in condemning the Church's devotion, and have often denounced it as idolatrous. Some points which concern us here will be passed lightly over, because we have considered them elsewhere. The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION is discussed in a special article. We have endeavoured to show (see BEATIFIC VISION and ASSUMPTION) that Mary and the other saints already see God face to face; we assume further that she and they are able to hear our prayers, reserving the treatment of that question to the article SAINTS.

I. *Mary in Scripture.*—It may be fairly alleged that the Bible begins with Mary. When God cursed the serpent, He said, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." Of course those who think the serpent was only a serpent will see no prophecy or anything more than a prediction of the strife in Eastern lands between man and the serpent, his deadly and insidious foe, the serpent stealthily aiming at the man's heel, the man aiming at the serpent's head. But Protestants who believe, as the Apocalypse implies, that the serpent was the devil, and that our Lord is the promised "seed of the woman" who was to crush the serpent's head, are logically bound to understand the woman who is to be at enmity with the serpent as Mary. The woman and her seed are put close together—the "enmity" of the one is compared with that of the other, and to what woman is all this applicable except to Mary? She was the virgin[1] (this is not the place to discuss the meaning of the word in the original) who was to bear a child, and that child was to be called Emmanuel, "God with us."

This prediction was fulfilled, and Mary received the highest dignity possible to a mere creature. She was not indeed the mother of the Godhead, but she was the mother of God, for the simple reason that Christ her Son was God and man in one person. True, her Son did not take His divine nature from her, any more than a son who is mere man receives his soul from his mother. The soul is infused by God, but as body and soul are united in one human person we reasonably speak of a woman as the mother of her son, not merely as the mother of a human body. And granting this, it is strange that sincere

[1] This scholar classifies Martyrologies thus: (1) that attributed to Jerome; (2) *Martyr. Rom. Parv.* published by Rosweyd in 1613, and written in Rome about 740; (3) a genuine Martyrology of Bede, with interpolations from Florus of Lyons; (4) that of Usuard, dedicated to Charles the Bald, used from the ninth century, not only in Benedictine houses, but throughout the West. In the fifteenth century no other was in use except in St. Peter's, and even there the Martyrology was but a translation of Usuard.

[2] The nominative and vocative of Mary, the Mother of our Lord, is always Μαριάμ (Mt. xiii. 55; Lk. i. 27, 30, 34, 38, 39, 46, 56; ii. 34; Acts i. 14), the only exception being i. 19, where the reading is doubtful. Sometimes the genitive is Μαρίας; sometimes it is indeclinable, as in Lk. ii. 5, 16. The word Μαριάμ, or Mary, is of course identical with Miriam, the name of the sister of Moses. The meanings, "bitterness" (from Heb. מֹר), "lady" (from Chaldee and Syriac מָרָא, מָרְיָן, the same word which is familiar to all in *Maranatha*, "our Lord cometh," 1 Cor. xvi. 22), must certainly be abandoned on philological grounds. There can scarcely be a doubt that the derivation generally accepted among scholars from מָרָה, "to rebel," is correct; so that "Mary," or "Miriam," = "rebellion." The mediaeval notion that the word "Mary" was connected with the Latin "mare" is curious. The last syllable "yam," יָם does mean the sea. But how St. Bernard came to think "Mary" meant "star of the sea" we cannot say (מָאוֹר יָם, "light of the sea"?). No part of the word resembles any word for "star" in Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, or, so far as we are aware, in any language. It might easily (though, of course, quite wrongly) be taken to mean "Lord of the sea," and perhaps this led to the notion that it meant "star," unless our suggestion in parentheses be right.

[1] Too much is made by some Catholic writers of the article in the Hebrew of Is. vii. 14, "Behold *the* virgin with child and bringing forth a son." Probably "the virgin" means the virgin standing before the prophet in vision. Besides, the definite article is used in Hebrew where we should not employ it in English. See, *e.g.*, Num. xi. 27, lit. "*the* lad ran and told Moses," though this is the first mention of any lad (Ewald, *Gram.* § 277 *a*).

Christians should stumble on the language in which the Church speaks of Mary. She is exalted above the angels, for surely God's *mother* is nearer to Him than the angels who stand before the throne. From her Christ took the blood He was to shed for her and for us all. Moreover, whereas the two great dignities of virginity and maternity are, according to God's ordinary law, incompatible, in Mary's case they were united. Joseph "took unto him his wife, and he knew her not until she brought forth her first-born son: and he called his name Jesus" (Mt. i. 24, 25). We do not know where to find more beautiful or more impassioned language used by the Church about Mary than the words which occur in the "Common" of the Breviary office:—"Holy and stainless virginity, with what praise to extol thee I do not know; He whom the heavens cannot contain was contained in thy bosom. Blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." Yet these words, strong as they are, simply state a primary tenet of the Christian faith. Her virginity, her divine maternity, her position as the sole parent of Him who had no man for his father—these are the deeply-laid foundations of Mary's glory.

But Mary was not merely the passive instrument of the Incarnation. By the free use of her own will she co-operated in our salvation, and was associated with her divine Son. It depended on her will whether or no the divine economy by which the Incarnation and our redemption were accomplished was to be frustrated, as the first dispensation had been by the disobedience of Adam and Eve. The account in Lk. i. 26–38, and especially Mary's question, "How will this be, seeing that I know not man?" are proof of the deliberate way in which Mary chose her part, and the freedom of the consent is expressed in her words, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word." And so her cousin, St. Elizabeth, acknowledges not only Mary's dignity as the Mother of the Messiah—"Whence is this unto me that the mother of my Lord should come unto me?"—but also Mary's personal holiness and share in the work of our salvation. "Blessed is she who believed, because" (or perhaps "that") "there will be an accomplishment of the things spoken to her by the Lord" (Lk. i. 43–45).

Mary maintains and exercises her rights and privileges as the mother of Christ throughout the Gospel history. It is she who bore the Light of light into the world in the stable at Bethlehem. She nourished at her breast and with a mother's love that human life which her divine Son had condescended to take from her. He Himself has told us how grateful He is, how bountiful His reward for a cup of water given in His name. It was Mary's privilege to minister to Him directly and, first by herself, then in union with St. Joseph, actually to support Christ's life during His early years. To her and to St. Joseph He, the Lord of all, "was subject" (Lk. ii. 51). Not less but more "subject" than ordinary sons, because He was "made under the law," and came to give a perfect example of the way that the law which commands filial obedience should be kept. In her company Christ spent thirty out of the three-and-thirty years of His earthly sojourn, At her request He made the water wine, and so inaugurated His public ministry and manifested His glory. When nearly all the Apostles had fled she stood at the foot of His cross, suffering surely as no other mother ever suffered, and drinking, as no other creature ever drank, the chalice of Christ's Passion.

There is no hint in Scripture of any sin or imperfection *on Mary's part*. No doubt our Lord, when she told Him at the wedding that there was no wine, answered, "Woman, what is there to me and to thee? Mine hour is not yet come." (The translation is that of Dr. Westcott.) The passage is confessedly a hard one. Possibly Christ may have meant that there was *nothing* in common between His divine and her human nature. She could not fathom the counsels of His omniscience. The hour of full triumph which she naturally and innocently desired had not yet come, was not to come till that hour which St. John again and again calls Christ's own (Jn. vii. 30, viii. 20, xiii. 1), the hour of His weakness, His passion, and His death. Be this as it may, two things are certain: First, in the word "woman" (we quote the same distinguished Protestant scholar) there "is not the least tinge of reproof or severity. The address is that of courteous respect, even of tenderness." Next, Mary cannot possibly have been guilty of fault in asking, or rather suggesting, the very thing that Christ did.

Nor does the New Testament ever imply that Mary ceased to be a virgin; on the contrary, it confirms, though it nowhere states, the Catholic dogma of her perpetual virginity. We read of our Lord's brethren, but the same word is used in Genesis xiii. 8, xxix. 15, for the relationship between Abraham and Lot, Laban and Jacob, and yet we know that they were uncles and nephews, not brothers in the strict sense. Again, those who press the word "brother" against the virginity of Mary must be reminded that St. Joseph is called the "father" of Jesus, and that not only by those who knew no better, but by the Blessed Virgin herself, who knew all (Lk. ii. 48). The evangelist himself calls Joseph the father of Jesus (Lk. ii. 33), and Mary and Joseph (Lk. ii. 41, 43) His "parents," and it is interesting and most instructive to note that later scribes have taken offence and altered the reading in each of the three cases. Another objection to the Catholic doctrine is often drawn from the

words of St. Matthew, i. 25: Joseph "knew not" his wife "till she brought forth a son" (the word "first-born" is wanting in the best MSS.); and of St. Luke ii. 7: Mary brought forth her "first-born son." But St. Matthew's evident purpose is to accentuate the *fact* that Mary was a virgin at Christ's birth; he asserts and implies nothing as to what happened afterwards. In St. Luke the prominent idea is the consecration of the first male child, and this appears from v. 23 of the same chapter, "As it has been written in the law of the Lord, every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord." With him the first-begotten is equivalent to the "male opening the womb," [1] and has nothing to do with subsequent children. St. John furnishes positive evidence, urged, Bishop Lightfoot writes, "with fatal effect," against the view that Mary had other children than Jesus. Our Lord on the cross (Jn. xix. 26, 27) commended His mother and St. John to each other's care. Why, if she had children of her own? Even Meyer admits that it will not suffice to say that Christ's "brethren" did not believe in Him (Jn. vii. 5) for "the speedy overcoming of this unbelief (Acts i. 14) could scarcely be concealed from" Christ. And indeed it is inconceivable that Christ should appear to one of Mary's supposed sons, that this son should be specially entrusted with the administration of the Mother Church of Jerusalem and Mary herself should join in worship with her "sons" (Acts i. 14), and yet all the time live in the house and under the care of a comparative stranger. We may add that this interpretation of Scripture has approved itself not only to Catholics and High Churchmen like Pearson and Mill, but also to recent Protestant scholars who cannot be suspected of undue bias in the matter—viz. to Westcott (see the Commentary on John, *ad* vii. 3, xix. 26), and to Lightfoot (on Galatians, p. 253).[2]

Mary, then, was the Virgin Mother of God. She remained in perpetual virginity; she was associated with a closeness impossible to other creatures in the work of her divine Son. She was faithful and obedient to her Son and Saviour at the first, faithful and obedient to the end. Scripture is silent about her later life and its close. But Christians believe that life here is a preparation for the better life to come, and from the greatness of Mary's work and dignity on earth they learned to conceive her greatness in power in heaven, where her love is made perfect and she is for ever with her Son. Naturally, therefore, they came to discover in the Apocalypse—the one book of the New Testament which can hardly fail to have been written after Mary's death—a picture of Mary in heaven. "The only passage," says Cardinal Newman—"Development," p. 414—(but see Wisdom, ii. 23, 24)—"where the serpent is directly identified with the evil spirit occurs in the twelfth chapter of Revelation; now, it is observable that the recognition, when made, is found in the course of a vision of 'a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet:' thus, two women are brought into contrast with each

[1] Not, of course, in so strict a sense as to exclude the *integritas carnis post partum*.

[2] It would require a treatise to give the reasons alleged for the different views on the "brethren of the Lord," because these reasons depend on a number of details, most of which must be given at length or not at all. Here we can do little more than state the views themselves, with the history of their reception or rejection. (1) Helvidius, who lived at Rome, maintained, about 380, that these "brethren" were the sons of Joseph and Mary. This theory was supported about the same time by Bonosus, Bishop of Sardica, and apparently also by Jovinian, a monk probably of Milan. It was condemned soon after it appeared, in Synods at Rome and Capua. It has no support in antiquity, except perhaps from Tertullian, and is regarded by all Catholic writers as heretical. Thus Petavius calls it "detestable to Christian ears, and sacrilegious, according to the judgment of the ancient Fathers"; nay, heretical, since even general councils call Mary ἀεὶ παρθένος (*De Incarnat.* xiv. 3). It has, however, been adopted by very many Protestants. (2) "Nearly all the Greeks," according to Maldonatus, besides Hilary and Ambrose, held that the "brethren" were sons of Joseph by a former marriage, and consequently that "James, the brother of the Lord," was a different person from James, the son of Alphaeus, one of the twelve. In reality, as Lightfoot shows, this theory was common to all writers, Greek and Latin (except, of course, those who held the heretical view mentioned first), down to Jerome's time, and after his time to all Greek writers, except Chrysostom in his latest works and Theodoret.* It is incorporated in the Greek offices, which distinguish between James, "the Lord's brother," and the son of Alphaeus. Maldonatus (see Mt. xii. 46) rejects but does not censure this view. Petavius simply says it is "more probable that Joseph had not been previously married." In modern times this hypothesis has found a powerful advocate in Bishop Lightfoot. This older opinion afforded a ready explanation of the term "brethren." All who took Joseph for our Lord's father would look on his sons by a former marriage as our Lord's half-brothers and speak of them as his "brethren." The use of the word is possible, but not nearly so natural, on the view to be mentioned next. At the same time it must be admitted that Catholic feeling, especially during the last three centuries, has attached itself strongly to the virginity of St. Joseph, as most in keeping with his office as the guardian of our Lord and the Blessed Virgin. (3) Jerome advocated and to all appearance started a third view—viz. that the "brethren" were sons of a sister of the Blessed Virgin also called Mary. The "brethren" of Jesus were James, Judas, Joseph or Joses, and Simon (Mk. vi. 3). Now, of these, James, the Lord's brother, is said by St. Paul (Gal. i. 19; this interpretation, however, is doubtful) to have been an Apostle. But the only James in the apostolic lists whom St. Paul can mean and name here is James, the son of Alphaeus, James the son of Zebedee being dead long before the Apostle wrote (Acts xii. 2). Therefore, James the Lord's brother was the son, not of Joseph, but of Alphaeus. But we can also ascertain the name of his mother, since in Mt. xxvii. 56, Mk. xv. 40, we read that Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and therefore the wife of Alphaeus, was present at the crucifixion. This Mary is to be identified with Mary the wife of Clopas and the sister of the Blessed Virgin, who St. John says was present by the cross (Jn. xix. 25). It is very doubtful whether St. John means to say that the Blessed Virgin had a sister also called Mary ("his mother—and his mother's sister, Mary of Clopas—and Mary Magdalene"), or whether he mentions four women at the foot of the cross ("his mother and his mother's sister—Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene"). Anyhow, Jerome's theory is rendered still more plausible by the fact, for so it may be fairly regarded, that "Alphaeus" and "Clopas" (this is the true reading in Jn. xix. 25; "Cleophas," in Lk. xxiv. 18, is another name altogether) are two forms of the same Aramaic name "Chalpai" (חַלְפַּי). This view that our Lord's brethren were his cousins became the accepted one in the Latin Church, which in her Mass and office only recognizes two Jameses, one the son of Zebedee, the other the son of Alphaeus, "brother" of the Lord and bishop of Jerusalem. Among Protestants, Dr. Mill, of Cambridge, has defended it with great learning and ingenuity in a treatise entitled *The Accounts of our Lord's Brethren in the N.T. vindicated* (Cambridge, 1843).

[* Theophylact's opinion—viz. that, Clopas dying childless, Joseph raised up children to him—is obviously only a modification of the common Greek theory.]

other. Moreover, as it is said in the Apocalypse, 'The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went about to make war with her seed,' so it is prophesied in Genesis: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. He shall bruise (?) thy head, and thou shalt bruise (?) his heel.' Also the enmity was to exist, not only between the serpent and the seed of the woman, but between the serpent and the woman herself; and here too there is a correspondence in the Apocalyptic vision. There is," then, "reason for thinking that this mystery at the close of the Scripture records answers to the mystery in the beginning of it, and that the woman mentioned in both passages is one and the same, and that she can be none other than" Mary. We need not be at a loss to imagine the way in which Mary exercises her great power in heaven. Once the body of Christ was entrusted to her care, surely in heaven she cannot fail to intercede for his mystical body—for all those who are her children because they are the brethren of her Son. And this Son is her Son still; He hears her prayers with filial love and tenderness, since—as the Scripture, and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, assures us—Christ has carried his human nature to the right hand of the Majesty on high, and He cannot continue to be man if he has ceased to be a son. When Protestants assert that the relation of son and mother ceased to exist between Jesus and Mary when his earthly years were over, they thereby do away with all claim on our part to the human sympathy of Christ. Yet it is this human sympathy of his in heaven to which great prominence is given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and to which devout Protestants, who will not hear of devotion to Mary, cling as their comfort and stay.

II. *The Tradition of the Church on Devotion to Mary.*—It would be vain to deny that devotion to the Blessed Virgin was far less prominent in ancient than in modern times and we shall have occasion shortly to show how easily this difference may be explained. But it would be a gross mistake to suppose that Catholics at any time doubted her great place in the work of redemption or ignored her dignity, as most Protestants do. The latter have always and almost universally, shrunk from using the title "Theotocos," or Mother of God. We believe we are not wrong when we say that the use of this expression would serve of itself to mark the person who employed it as a Catholic.[1] Yet "it was familiar to Christians from primitive times, and is used, among other writers, by Origen, Eusebius, St. Alexander, St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssen, and St. Nilus" (Newman's "Development," p. 145). It is the universal doctrine of the early Church that Mary was the second Eve (see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION). St. Irenaeus says that "Mary, being obedient, became both to herself and to all mankind the cause of salvation"; that "the knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by Mary's obedience"; that "what the Virgin Eve bound by unbelief this the Virgin Mary unbound by faith"; that "as by a virgin the human race had been given over to death, by a virgin it is saved" (Iren. iii. 22, 4; v. 19, 1, PG, vii. 959); thus absolutely excluding the common Protestant notion that Mary was merely a passive instrument in the Incarnation, to whom no special gratitude is due. Further, he says that "she was drawn to obey God, that of the Virgin Eve the Virgin Mary might become the advocate" (v. 19, 1, PG, vii. 1175). In the last place, St. Irenaeus speaks of Mary as "prophesying for the Church" when she uttered her "Magnificat," and it is certain that from the second century at latest Mary was taken as a type of the Church of Christ. Thus, the "Virgin Mother" is a title given to the Church in the letters written by the Christians of Vienne and Lyons in the year 177 (see Euseb. "H.E." v. 1, 45, and by Clem. Alex. "Paed." 1, 6). And this language was adopted by Marcus, a Gnostic heretic of the same period, who made the Virgin hold the place of the Church in his symbolical system (Iren. i. 15, 3). It is important to notice this, for it proves that when Catholics go to Mary as to their mother, a title and office which also belong to the Church, their practice is consonant with the spirit of ancient Christianity. Nor, again, does it by any means follow that because the Fathers take the woman in Apoc. xii. 1 to represent the Church, we are really following an opposite interpretation if we believe the Blessed Virgin to be primarily and directly intended.[1]

We have two instances of Mary's interposition from heaven in favour of Christians on earth, preserved from the scanty literature of the first three centuries. St. Gregory Nyssen, in the fourth age, relates that his namesake Gregory Thaumaturgus, in the third, was pondering theological doctrines shortly before he was made priest; that the Blessed Virgin appeared, and bade St. John disclose to the young man the "mystery of godliness," and that St. John answered, "that he was ready to comply in this matter with the wish of the Mother of the Lord, and enunciated a formula well turned and complete, and so vanished."[1] So, St. Gregory Nazianzen records an incident contemporaneous with that just given—viz. that a Christian woman had recourse to Mary,

[1] Of course we put the Greeks, &c., out of count, and also that modern school in the Church of England which studiously imitates Catholic phraseology. And even among these the popular use of the words "Mother of God" is, we imagine, very recent, if it exists even now.

[1] Erasmus denied that any of the early Fathers understood the woman in Apoc. xii. to be the Blessed Virgin. The passage quoted against him from St. Augustine by Ballerini in his *Sylloge of Documents on the Immaculate Conception* is not regarded as genuine by the Benedictine editors.

and so obtained the conversion of a heathen who was trying to pervert her by magic. (See Newman, "Development," pp. 417, 418.) We need not defend the truth of these stories. True or false, they prove that in the fourth century devotion to the Mother of God was well established and already regarded as ancient; and in both instances "the Blessed Virgin appears especially in that character of Patroness or Paraclete which St. Irenaeus and other Fathers describe, and which the mediaeval Church exhibits—a loving Mother with clients." (Newman, *ib.*)

But till the last part of the fourth century there were strong reasons which kept devotion to the Blessed Virgin in the background. There was the danger of scandal to the heathen, who, with their own inadequate notions of worship, might misconstrue the honour paid to Mary; and then there was the long struggle with Arianism, when the Church was contending for the very centre of the faith. When once the belief in the full Godhead of the Son had been fenced round by formal definition, when once it had been decided that no exaltation of the Son would suffice unless He was confessed to be the one eternal God, then there was no longer any danger of confusing Mary's honour with that of her Divine Son. To honour Mary was not idolatry, unless the Arians, who had employed far higher language of Christ than Catholics have ever used of his Blessed Mother, were orthodox in their belief. Nay, it became clearer than ever that the belief in Mary was necessary to a right belief in Christ. Nestorius denied the unity of His Person. He allowed that God dwelt in him, but not that the man Christ Jesus was God; and this was tantamount to denying the Incarnation altogether, and reducing the difference between Christ and his creatures to a matter of degree, since God dwells in the hearts of all the just. In order, therefore, to secure right faith in the manhood of the Eternal Son, the Church defined at Ephesus, what she had held everywhere and from the beginning, that Mary is the Mother of God. Cardinal Newman has collected a catena of patristic passages ("Development," p. 145 *seq.*) on the Blessed Virgin, which date from the conclusion of the main controversy with the Arians and the rise of that with Nestorius. Augustine will allow no question of sin to be raised when Mary is concerned. Antiochus calls her "the Mother of Life, of Beauty, of Majesty," "the Morning Star"; St. Proclus, "the Fair Bride of the Canticles," "the Stay of Believers," "the Church's Diadem." "Let us make confession," says an early writer, probably one of the Fathers of Ephesus, "to God the Word, and to his Mother . . . Hail, Mother, clad in Light! . . . Hail, all-undefiled Mother of Holiness! . . . With her is the fount of life, and breasts of the spiritual and guileless milk, from which to suck the sweetness we have even now earnestly run to her," &c. We have only taken a few words here and there from Newman's quotations, but surely we have done enough to show that the Church of the fifth century addressed the same language to Mary as the Church of the nineteenth.

It is true that the great Fathers, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Alexandria sometimes express themselves in a very different tone. Newman has considered these passages in his "Letter to Dr. Pusey" ("Diff. of Angl." vol. ii. p. 128), and we will only venture on one remark. It may sound paradoxical, but we believe it true, that these passages tend to confirm Catholic belief in Mary's spotless sanctity. Some great Father alleges that the sword which was to pierce Mary's heart was doubt in her Son's divinity which took possession of her soul beneath the cross, and again, that Christ reprehended His mother for some fault, of haste or the like, at the Marriage of Cana. We do not think any sober Protestant scholar would approve of such exegesis. And when individual Fathers argued in such a way, the Church was justified in disregarding their opinions, great saints and doctors though they were. Common sense, as well as the sense of the faithful, was against them, and they had neither right nor power to arrest the stream of devotion to Mary. The stream grew, no doubt, in its course through the ages, but its source was in the Eternal Hills.

Evil, indeed, would this devotion be, if it diminished or obscured, ever so little, that supreme devotion to God, who is over all, and to Jesus Christ whom He has sent. But one who dared to put Mary on an equality with God, or to deny that Christ is the "one mediator between God and man"—*i.e.* the sole author of our redemption, the beginner and the finisher of our faith—would, by that very fact, cease to be a Catholic. Every Catholic child is taught that Mass can be offered to God alone, and the obligation of hearing Mass every Sunday, the adoration paid to the Blessed Sacrament, &c., keep the supreme character of the worship due to God constantly before the mind. We are far, of course, from any wish to defend exaggerated or imprudent language. One of the greatest of the Church's theologians, among whose many virtues a tender devotion to the mother of God was not the least, protests against extravagant and ill-founded praise of Mary. "This kind of idolatry," he writes, "secret, and, as Augustine says, natural to the human heart, is far removed from the grave character of theology—that is, of heavenly wisdom." And he quotes certain "golden words" of Gerson, also a devout client of Mary, in which he (Gerson) "restrains immoderate licence in setting forth the praises of the Blessed Virgin, and confines it within the limits of a sober and manly piety" (Petav. "De Incarnat." xiv. 9).

Admonitions to the same effect may be found in the work of another famous Catholic scholar—highly esteemed by Benedict XIV. and Clement XIV.—Muratori, "De Moderamine Ingeniorum." We would only urge that the effect of Catholic devotion to the Blessed Virgin must not be judged on *a priori* grounds but tested by experience. It is among Protestants who have repudiated this devotion, not among Catholics, who have retained it, that imperfect and false ideas on the divinity of Christ have struck root.

(There is a vast literature on this subject. We would specially notice, in addition to the works mentioned, the chapters of Petavius in his treatise on the "Incarnation"; Franzelin, "De Verbo Incarn." Thes: xv., xxix.; Cardinal Newman, "Development," and "Letter to Dr. Pusey"; "Jesus, the Son of Mary," by J. B. Morris—a work full, not only of recondite learning, but also of deep thought, and which, marred though it is by eccentricities, will well repay careful study; and a short but masterly rationale of the doctrine and devotion in Father Ryder's "Catholic Controversy:")

MARY, FEASTS OF. Benedict XIV., quoting a note of Mabillon on St. Bernard, says that, even as late as the twelfth century, four feasts only of the Blessed Virgin were celebrated in the Church—those of the Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, and Nativity. At present, the number of her feasts has risen to about twenty. An account has been given, in separate articles, of those which relate to events in the Blessed Virgin's history—viz. to her Immaculate Conception, Nativity, Name, Presentation, Espousals, Annunciation, Visit to St. Elizabeth (Visitation), Purification, Dolours, and Assumption. There are other feasts which commemorate Mary's interest in the Church militant on earth, and these will be mentioned here.

(1) *Feast of Mary the Help of Christians*, May 24—in the Supplement of the Breviary. The title "Help of Christians" was added to the Litany of Loreto by Pius V. after the naval victory of Lepanto over the Turks. The feast was instituted by Pius VII., who attributed his deliverance from a captivity of five years at Savona and his return to Rome, out of which he had been twice driven by violence, to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

(2) *Feast of "The Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel."*—For the connection of the Carmelite order with Mount Carmel, see CARMELITES, and for the privileges attached to the Carmelite scapular see SCAPULAR. The feast was approved for the Carmelites by Sixtus V. in 1587. Paul V. inserted new lections in the office, which was revised by Bellarmine. Benedict XIII. extended the feast to the whole Church. A further change in the lections was made by Leo XIII.

(3) *St. Mary of Snow* (*Dedicationis Ecclesiae S. Mariae ad Nives*).—The church of this title in Rome is sometimes called, from the Pope who is said to have founded it, the Liberian Basilica; the Sixtine Basilica, because Sixtus III. enlarged, or, as Tillemont thinks, founded it; the Church of St. Mary of the Crib (*B. Mariae ad Praesepe*), because the relics of the crib in which Christ is believed to have been laid were brought there about the middle of the seventh century; and, most commonly, the Church of St. Mary Major, a name given to it from the eighth century, because of its magnificence and its rank. The name *ad nives* given in the Martyrology and Breviary is due to the following story. John, a Roman patrician, and his wife, being childless, wished to spend their fortune in honour of the Blessed Virgin. She signified to them and to Pope Liberius in dreams that she wished a church dedicated to her on the Esquiline Hill, and told them that the site would be marked out by snow. Next day it was found that the promised snow had actually fallen, though the month was August and the heat intense. Benedict XIV. collected all the evidence for the story, his oldest authority being Pope Nicholas IV. in 1287. The commission appointed in 1741 for the reformation of the Breviary recommended that the legend should be struck out and the ancient title of the feast, *Dedicatio S. Mariae*, restored.

(4) *Our Lady of Mercy*[1] (*de Mercede*), September 24.—The order of Our Lady of Ransom was founded by St. Peter Nolascus, St. Raymond of Pennafort, and James, King of Arragon, with the object of freeing Christian captives from the Turks. The feast was approved first of all for the order itself, then extended to Spain, next to France, and lastly by Innocent XII. to the whole Church.

(5) *Feast of Our Lady of the Rosary.*—The victory of Lepanto was won by Don John of Austria, October 7, 1571, while the members of the Confraternity of the Rosary at Rome were making special supplication for the success of the Christian arms, and Pius V., then Pope, ordered that an annual commemoration should be made of "St. Mary of Victory." Gregory XIII. instituted the feast of Our Lady of the Rosary on the first Sunday in October for all churches with a chapel or altar dedicated to the Blessed Virgin under that title. Clement X. extended the feast to all the dominions

[1] "Ransom" would, of course, be the natural translation. But "Our Lady of Mercy" is the common rendering in our English Calendars; and so in German "von der Barmherzigkeit." And this appears to be correct, for, according to Ducange, "merces," in mediaeval Latin, is used for "misericordia" (*merci, pitié*). "One of the commonest titles (given to the Blessed Virgin) is that of Our Lady of Pity, both in England and in Scotland. In Latin it is written 'de Pietate'; but as piety and pity have sometimes the same meaning in old English, I do not think that by Our Lady of Pity our ancestors meant our Lady of Compassion, in reference to her dolours, but simply our Lady of Compassion or Mercy." (Bridgett, *Our Lady's Dowry*, p. 261.)

of the Spanish king. The Emperor Leopold begged Innocent XII. to extend the feast to the whole Church, but the Pope died before he was able to do so. At last Clement XI., after another victory over the Turks had been obtained in 1710 by the Emperor Charles VI., and Corfu been freed from Turkish besiegers in the same year, made the feast of universal observance. The lections of the Second Nocturn, which contain a history of the origin of the feast, were added under Benedict XIII., and were revised by Leo XIII., who also added the invocation "Regina Sacratissimi Rosarii" to the Litany of Loreto. The feast is now kept on October 7, the anniversary of Lepanto.

(6) *Patronage of the Blessed Virgin.*—The feast was approved for Spain in 1679, for the States of the Church by Benedict XIII., in order to celebrate the power of the Blessed Virgin's intercession. It is now usually kept in churches which have permission to celebrate it on the second, not, as at first, on the third Sunday in November.

(7) *The Feast of Our Lady's Expectation* (*Expectatio partus*). [See EXPECTATION.] (Chiefly from Benedict XIV., "De Festis.')

Other feasts of the Blessed Virgin are celebrated by permission in certain parts of the Church. Such are the feasts of the *Divine Maternity* and of the *Purity of the Blessed Virgin*; the *Prodigies of the Blessed Virgin*, kept at Rome and some other places on July 9; the *Mother of the Divine Pastor*, kept in Tuscany on the first Sunday in May by leave of Pius VII.; *Our Lady of Consolation*, on the first Sunday in July; *Our Lady of Peace*, on the fourth Sunday in October. (See "Manuale Decret. S. Rit. Cong." No. 2139 *seq.*) But the Constitution "Divino Afflatu" has enjoined that the office of the Sunday should be said in spite of any occurring festival (with certain exceptions); and hence these minor feasts of the Blessed Virgin are not often celebrated.

MARY, FEAST OF THE NAME. The real and supposed meanings of the name have been explained in the article on the Blessed Virgin. The Feast of the Name arose at Cuença, in Spain, and its local celebration was approved by the Pope in 1513. This permission was withdrawn by Pius V. and restored by Sixtus V. Originally the feast seems to have been kept on September 22; afterwards on the Sunday within the Octave of the Blessed Virgin's Nativity (September 8), but now on September 12. Innocent XI., after the victory obtained against the Turks and the consequent relief of Vienna from siege in 1683, extended the feast and office to the whole Church.

MARY, OFFICE OF, SATURDAY. The office of the Blessed Virgin is said on all Saturdays; not, however, when a feast of Nine Lessons falls on that day, nor during Advent and Lent, on ember days, vigils, or ferias on which the lessons of a previous Sunday have to be said at Matins. In this office of the Blessed Virgin the ferial psalms are said, and there are only three lessons, the last, however, being followed by the *Te Deum*. This rule was authorized by Urban II. at the Council of Clermont in 1096. The office was composed and issued under Pius V. Clement VIII. revised it, and substituted a lesson from St. Jerome instead of the previous one from St. Epiphanius for the month of April. Mystical reasons are given by liturgical writers for this commemoration of the Blessed Virgin on the Sabbath—*e.g.* that the Eternal Word rested in her. All this question of the office of Our Lady on Saturdays is obscure. It is only Radulphus Tungrensis who asserts that Urban II. made a Decree respecting it at Clermont. The Acts of that Council are practically lost (see Hefele-Leclercq, v. 399), and we have nothing to go upon. Hardouin (quite as good as Mansi) has no such Decree. That in the Middle Ages there was just the tendency there has been in our own day to substitute shorter votive offices for the longer ferial rite is obvious enough. Thus Micrologus says that in many places they had the Holy Cross on Fridays, Our Blessed Lady on Saturdays, and so forth. Some went so far as to do away with the Sunday office in favour of the votive office of the Blessed Trinity. But there was always opposition from the more distinguished churches. The old pre-Tridentine MS. Breviaries did not recognize the office B. Mariae in Sabbato as a substitute for the ferial office, but only as an addition to it. On the other hand, the Sarum and others admit it, and if the Saturday is impeded, direct that it should be said on some free day in the week. Anyway, it was a devotion more than anything else. The present arrangement is due to St. Pius V. and Clement VIII., who probably made it obligatory as a compensation for the doing away with the *daily* recitation of the Little Office superadded in the Middle Ages to the Canonical Hours. (Gavantus on the Rubrics of the Breviary.)

MARY, SERVANTS OF. [See SERVITES].

MASS. The Catholic doctrine on the sacrifice of the Mass has been explained in the article EUCHARIST [see also SACRIFICE], the general history of the Roman Mass under LITURGY, and the history of the component parts of the Mass under special articles, CANON, COLLECT, INTROIT, KYRIE, and the like. Here we confine ourselves to matters of terminology and special regulation.

I. *The Word "Mass."*—About its meaning and derivation there is not the least room for reasonable doubt. Attempts have been made to find its origin in Hebrew. Asa (עָשָׂה) means "to do," and sometimes "to perform

a sacred action, to sacrifice" (like ἱερὰ ῥέζειν in Homer), and it was suggested that a noun, Misah (מְעִשָׂה), might be derived from the verb. Such a formation is a sheer impossibility in Hebrew, and cannot be thought of without a shudder. Maaseh (מַעֲשֶׂה) is the proper form. A Hebrew word "Missah" (מִסָּה) does occur Deut. xvi. 10,[1] and an attempt was made to derive the Latin word from it, though the Hebrew word in question means "number," "rate," &c., and has nothing to do with sacrifice. It only occurs once, and if the Church had wished to adopt a Hebrew word for "sacrifice," she would have chosen, we may be very sure, one of the numerous Hebrew words which occur times without number in the Old Testament, and one of which, "corban," occurs in the New (Mk. vii. 11; *cf.* Mt. xxvii. 6), and is frequently used in the Peshito or chief Syriac version for "sacrifice." Besides, if the early Church had adopted the word from the Hebrew, as it did adopt other Hebrew words, such as "Hosanna," "Amen," "Alleluia," "Sabaoth," we should find some trace of it in the Greek and Oriental Churches. We should expect to find it above all in Syriac, a language closely allied to Hebrew, and which has in its New Testament version three words for sacrifice as close to the corresponding Hebrew words as, *e.g.*, the French *homme* is to *homo*. But no trace of "Mass" can be found except in Latin, and the languages which are daughters of Latin. Here and there we find μίσσα in Greek, but in such a way as shows at once that it is merely a Latin word written in Greek letters. Thus the "Chronicon Paschale," written about 600, describes Justinian as dismissing the officers of the palaces and bidding them keep their houses. The words are: καὶ ἔδωκεν εὐθέως μίσσας τοῖς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ λέγει τοῖς συγκλητικοῖς, Ἀπέλθατε, ἕκαστος φυλάξει τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ —"and straightway he *gave their dismissals* to the officials of the palace and said to the senators 'Go away: let each keep his house.'" The word μίσσας is here clearly taken from the Latin, just as "Palatium" is. We are ashamed to linger so long over such a question, but unhappily the class of people who think that any word can be derived from any other word a little like it is not yet extinct.

The word "Missa," then, is of purely Latin origin and comes from "mittere," "to send." St. Thomas (3ª q. 83, a. 4 ad 9)[2], suggests, among other explanations, that "Missa" may mean prayers sent to God; and a similar explanation—viz. that "Missa" means the sending or offering up of the sacrifice to God—has been defended with great learning in recent times by a professor at Würzburg, the late Hermann Müller, in a treatise on "Missa: the Origin and Meaning of the Name" ("Missa, Ursprung und Bedeutung der Benennung," Wertheim, 1873). This writer proves that "mittere" is sometimes used by classical writers in connection with "inferiae," the sacrifices of the dead. But this is not enough to explain why the Church adopted an obscure and scarcely intelligible word for "sacrifice," when plain and familiar terms, "sacrificium," "oblatio," &c., were at hand. Moreover, the history of the word is adverse to any theory which connects it with the notion of sacrifice. We may, then, dismiss this account also and give the accepted explanation.

"Missa" is only another form of "missio," "dismissal." A good instance of a similar form is supplied by "repulsa" (= "repulsio") in the line of Horace (Od. III. ii. 17) "Virtus repulsae nescia sordidae"; and many more examples present themselves from the Latin of a later period—"ascensa" for "ascensio," "collecta" for "collectio," "confessa" for "confessio," and last of all "remissa" for "remissio," &c. About the year 500 Avitus of Vienne, writing to the Burgundian king Gundobald (Ep. 1; PL, lix. 186), who wished for an explanation of the words "non missum facitis" in the old Latin version of Mk. vii. 11, 12, says that in churches and law-courts "Missa fieri pronuntiatur, cum populus ab observatione dimittitur" ("dismissal is announced when the people are let free from [further] attendance"). This derivation of "Missa" from "mittere" was clear to St. Isidore of Seville ("Etymolog." vi. 19). Now, in the liturgy there were two solemn dismissals—first, of the catechumens after the Gospel and sermon; next, of the faithful at the end of the service. The word for dismissal then came to denote the service from which the persons in question were dismissed. The first authority for this use of Missa for the liturgy, putting aside a spurious letter of Pius I., is St. Ambrose (Ep. 20, 4, PL, xvi. 995). He uses the words "Missam facere." More than two hundred years later St. Gregory of Tours uses the modern phrase, "Missam dicere." And it must be remembered that, so far from the word Missa having any necessary connection at the first with the Eucharist, it was employed not only, as we have already seen, in law-courts, but also for church services which had nothing to do with the Eucharist. Matins, as Sirmond in his "Notes on St. Avitus" (Ep. 1) shows, were called "Missae matutinae," Vespers "Missae vespertinae." "Missa" also occurs in a canon of the ninth century in the sense of festival.

This is all very well about the derivation of the word; but the crux

[1] מִסַּת נִדְבַת יָדְךָ. Here מסה comes next a word which does mean "free-will offering," and the Vulgate rendering, "oblationem spontaneam manus tuae," is probably the innocent cause of confusion.

[2] Müller (p. 87) quotes Peter of Clugny (lib. ii. *Mirac.* 28): "Sacrificium offerimus, quod et usu jam veteri tracto nomine, quia Deo mittitur, Missam vocamus."

remains: How can that which was the central and perhaps only object of the gathering be called the "dismissal" of that meeting? There is no proof whatsoever that before the Offertory the words used in dismissing the catechumens contained the word Missa. "Si quis non communicet, det locum," quotes St. Gregory. There was never any greater prominence given to the words "Ite missa est" than there is now. One is tempted by the following theory:

In the sixth and seventh centuries when the word Missa began to be used in its present sense, the number of private Masses was very great, and they appear to have been said, as a rule, at the close of the Canonical Hours (whence our present Missa post Tertiam, post Nonam, &c.). Some of the Missae Vespertinales were said after Vespers, and there are instances of Masses after Compline. These Masses were affairs of ten minutes or so, being reduced possibly to the mere Canon. They finished up a service something like our Benediction does now. Hence, they were a veritable "Dismissal." It is a curious feature in the Rule of St. Benedict made for monasteries when the Solemn celebrations which we call High Masses did not take place, that whereas he is careful in all other details, giving for instance every single Psalm and Versicle of the Divine Office, and again insists on there being priests (not *a* priest) in each monastery and warns the monks that if they go to Communion they must fast till the Masses at which they communicate are over; in regard to saying or hearing Mass there is no single word in the very voluminous rule. Only after each of the Canonical Hours, having laid down Hymn, Psalms, Little Chapter, Versicle, Prayer, he finishes "*Et fiant Missae*." The exception is for Matins and Lauds. Then after the Prayer of Lauds, he says simply "Et completum est." The commentators of course explain "Et fiant Missae" as signifying, "The monks are dismissed"; but are they right? A good deal may be urged against the theory that St. Benedict meant Masses, say from the *Peregrinatio Etheriae*, certain monastic rules in the South of France, and so forth; but it appears to be at least plausible.

II. *Customs and Regulations concerning Mass.*—Some of these are given in separate articles—*e.g.* under ALTAR, VESTMENTS, COMMUNION. Others may be mentioned here.

(*a*) *The Frequency of Celebration.*—In early times the bishop and priests celebrated together. [See CONCELEBRATION.] This custom seems to have continued in Rome long after it had ceased elsewhere, being mentioned by Amalarius of Metz in the ninth century, and later still by Innocent III. It has not yet entirely died out among us, for at the Mass of Ordination the newly-ordained priests say Mass jointly with the bishop, though they do not partake of the same Host or of the Precious Blood. In churches outside the city, priests celebrated independently; on the other hand, the priests of the Roman tituli, practically equivalent to urban parishes, used the Host consecrated and sent to them by the Pope.

Ordinarily speaking, then (an exception will be noted presently), there was but one Mass each day in the same church, and this is still the custom of the Greeks and Orientals, unless where, as in the case of Uniates, they have been influenced by Western practice. Nor was Mass said everywhere on all days of the week. It may perhaps be inferred from Acts ii. 42, 46, that the Apostles celebrated the Agape ending with the Eucharist daily. Justin, however ("Apol." i. 67, PG, vi. 430), only speaks of the Eucharistic celebration on Sunday. St. Augustine (Ep. 54, "Ad Januar.," PL, xxxii. 200) informs us that in some places there was Mass daily, in others only on Sundays, in others on Saturdays and Sundays. Mass was said daily in Africa (Cyprian, Ep. lviii. ed. Hartel, p. 657), in Rome and Spain (Jerome, Ep. lxxi. "Ad Lucin."), at Milan (Le Brun quotes Ambrose, lib. ii. ep. 14, "Ad Marc."), at Antioch and Constantinople (Chrysostom, "In Ephes." Hom. iii. d.[1]). But at Caesarea St. Basil tells us Mass was said only on Sundays, Fridays, and Saturdays, and the feasts of the Martyrs. Of course, when we speak of Mass every day, we except Good Friday and Holy Saturday in the Roman Church, and all the days of Lent except Saturdays and Sundays in the Church of Constantinople.

On many occasions Mass was reiterated by the same celebrant where now one Mass would be said and a commemoration made or more than one Mass said by different celebrants. We have spoken of this custom in the article on CHRISTMAS DAY, and need not dwell on it longer here. Apart from this, a twofold spirit prevailed in the Middle Ages. Some priests said several Masses daily out of devotion. "Priests were allowed to celebrate," says Meratus (Pars I. in Rubr. Gener.), "several times a day, as often as they thought good, so that one would say Mass twice, another three times, another as often as he pleased on the same day, believing that God was inclined to mercy as often as Christ's Passion was brought to mind"; and he quotes Walafrid Strabo, "De Rebus Eccles." cap. 25, who relates that Pope Leo III. sometimes celebrated nine times in one day. Pope Alexander II. forbade any priest to say Mass more than once in the day, and his enactment is incorporated in the "Decretum" of Gratian. The Pope, however, mentions, and apparently without disapproval, the habit of saying two Masses

[1] Tillemont has shown that these homilies were delivered there, and Montfaucon is of the same opinion.

daily, "one of the day, another for the dead." St. Anselm and St. Albert are said by Meratus to have done so. Maskell ("Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," p. 158) collects many English canons prohibiting the repetition of Mass on the same day by the same priest. Thus a Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Langton prohibits anyone from celebrating more than once a day except on Christmas and Easter Sunday, and on occasion of a funeral in the church; and one of the last injunctions published among us before the change of religion was that "no priest say two Masses in one day, except Christmas Day, without express licence."

Devotion led some holy persons at the same period in quite an opposite direction. St. Thomas of Canterbury did not celebrate daily; and a contemporary, noting this, says the practice of priests on this point varied, that those who celebrated often were to be commended for the purity of their lives; those who acted like St. Thomas, for their humility (Fleury, "H.E." livr. lxx. § 64). Mass was said rarely among the Carthusians, and St. Francis of Assisi, in his "Testament," wished one priest only to celebrate each day in his convents. The other priests were to content themselves with hearing Mass (Fleury, livr. lxxix. 25).

By the present law priests are strictly prohibited from saying Mass more than once on any day except Christmas Day and All Souls' Day (Nov. 2), when three Masses may be said. Bishops, however, have often leave to celebrate, or allow their priests to celebrate, twice on a Sunday or holiday of obligation, if a large number of people would otherwise be unable to hear Mass; and most English priests hold faculties renewed at intervals, to this effect. The ablutions must not be taken at the former Mass. Pope Leo XIII., moved by the necessity of the case, permitted bishops in Mexico to have three Masses celebrated by one priest on the same day. No law requires a priest, as such, to celebrate daily, and it is commonly held that he is not bound to do so except on the more solemn feasts (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." lib. vi. § 313). A parish priest must say Mass, whenever at least the people are bound to hear it. Modern saints—*e.g.* St. Ignatius and St. Francis of Sales—strongly encourage priests to celebrate daily, and this is now the common, though by no means the universal, custom.

(β) *The Hour of Mass* was subject to no special regulation down to the middle of the fifth century, though it was usually said early in the morning. Le Brun thinks that the custom of saying Mass at tierce (*i.e.* at 9 A.M.) began with the monks. It is mentioned by Cassian, Sidonius Apollinaris, a Council of Orleans in 511, and St. Gregory of Tours. On the stations—*i.e.* Wednesday and Friday and in Rome on Saturday (all usually fasting days)—it was said at Sext—(*i.e.* noon); on other fasting days after None—(*i.e.* three o'clock); at ordinations the fast was continued through Friday or Saturday till the early morning of the day following, when the Mass was said. (See Le Brun, tom. iii. diss. i. art. 9.) According to the present law Mass must not be said before dawn or later than midday, and it is a serious matter notably to transgress these limits except in virtue of Apostolic indult. But in winter the rule as to the earlier limit is not strictly observed. The rule which requires the priest to have said Matins and Lauds previously is not so strict. There are special rules on the relations of Office and Conventual Mass, Mass of Requiem, &c., in the rubrics of the Missal.

(γ) *The Application of Mass.*—The Mass is a sacrifice of adoration, of praise and thanksgiving; it is also a sacrifice of propitiation for sin, and a means of obtaining all graces and blessings from God. In the Canon of the Roman Mass and all other liturgies the sacrifice is always offered specially for certain persons—*e.g.* for those present in the church, for those who contributed the bread and wine for the consecration, &c. Theologians, following Scotus, recognize a threefold fruit of the sacrifice. There is the general fruit, in which all the faithful participate, the more special fruit, which belongs to those for whom the priest specially offers the sacrifice, and the most special fruit, proper to the celebrant himself. The Canon of the Mass recognizes this distinction, and so bears witness to its antiquity. The celebrant offers "for thy holy Catholic Church"; again he speaks of those "on whose account we offer to Thee, or who offer to Thee, this sacrifice of praise"; he also calls the Mass "the oblation of our ministry," and in an earlier part of the liturgy offers the Host "for my numberless sins and offences and negligences." Theologians dispute how far and in what way the effect of the oblation is limited, very many denying that there is any such limit except in the capacity of those for whom the offering is made, so that, *e.g.*, Mass said for a hundred persons would profit each as much as if said for one only. Practically, however, a priest has to act on the opinion that the effect of the sacrifice is limited by the ordination of Christ, or in some other manner over and above the limitation already mentioned. Here, then, it suffices to say that in "saying Mass" for a person or persons a priest applies in their interest the more special fruit of the sacrifice. If under an obligation of making this application, he must not extend it to others save with the implied condition that he does not intend to interfere with the rights of those who have the first claim. But of course he always offers generally for the whole Church, and reserves the special fruit of the Mass to himself. The

following regulations exist with regard to the application:—

All bishops and priests with cure of souls are bound to say Mass for their people on Sundays and holidays of obligation. If the holiday of obligation has become a day of devotion, the duty of saying Mass for the flock continues. Missionary priests, such as those in England and Scotland, are without cure of souls in the strict sense. They are not therefore bound to offer the sacrifice on these days for the people in their district, though charity makes it fit that they should do so. In all cathedrals and collegiate churches the Conventual Mass (see below) must be said daily for benefactors; and chaplains, &c., are bound to say Mass daily for the founder of the chaplaincy or benefice, unless it appear from the terms of the foundation that this was not intended. Lastly, a strict obligation of saying Mass for the donor's intention is incurred by priests who accept an alms on that condition. This alms or stipend is meant for the celebrant's support, and corresponds to the offerings of bread and wine made by the faithful in old days. The bishop fixes the amount of this stipend or tax, as it is called, and the priest must not ask, though he may accept, more. If he has leave to duplicate or say two Masses he must receive alms for one only, and if he asks another priest to say the Mass in his stead he must hand over the whole alms. Many rules have been made, particularly of late, to prevent any appearance of traffic or avarice in this matter. Moreover, Benedict XIV. points out that the rich have no unfair advantage over the poor because of their greater power to have Masses said for them. All souls are God's, and He can give the poor a special share in the general prayers of the Church, and supply their wants in a thousand ways. Riches and poverty are each, if rightly used, the means of salvation.

III. *Names of different kinds of Masses.*—(*a*) *High Mass*, in Latin *Missa solemnis*, is Mass with incense, music, the assistance of deacon and subdeacon, &c. It is usually sung, when there is a sufficient number of clergy, at least on Sundays and great feasts. Meratus quotes the term *Missa alta* from Rymer's "Foedera," and the term, Maskell says, seems to have been chiefly in use in England. But the fact that in Dutch and Flemish exactly the same term—viz. *Hoogmis*—is used, while the Germans have *Hochamt*, surely proves that *Missa alta* must have been familiar in other countries. "*Missa dominica*" and "*aurea*" were mediaeval names for Masses of special solemnity. Under solemn Masses, Meratus classes Pontifical Masses, celebrated by the bishop with his insignia, and Papal Masses, celebrated by the Pope on certain great feasts with special rites. The Pontifical Mass (the thing, not the name) is mentioned in a Roman Ordo supposed to belong to the former part of the eighth century. Meratus refers to a treatise on Papal Masses by Marcellus, archbishop of Corcyra—"Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive S. Caerimoniarum S. Romanae Ecclesiae."

(*β*) *Low Mass*; *Missa bassa*; in French and English documents, *Messe Basse*; *Missa plana* in the "Caerimoniale Episc.," Mass said without music, the priest at least saying, and not singing, the Mass throughout.

(*γ*) *Missa cantata*; also called *media*. A Mass sung, but without deacon and subdeacon and the ceremonies proper to High Mass. In some English dioceses the use of incense is permitted at such Masses.

(*δ*) *Missa publica* (sometimes *communis*) a Mass to which the faithful of either sex are admitted. Hence Gregory the Great prohibited such Masses in monasteries. From the sixth century at least, nine o'clock was the time fixed for such Masses. The decree on this point attributed to Telesphorus in the second century is of course a forgery.

(*ε*) *Missa privata* (also *secreta*, *familiaris*, *peculiaris*) is difficult of definition. Meratus gives one explanation which identifies it with Low Mass; another according to which it is any Mass at which the priest alone communicates. It would be convenient if we could use this word or had another word to describe Mass which the priest says chiefly for his own devotion or that of his friends, and not to satisfy the wants of a parish, college, &c. In all private Masses the priest must have at least a server to represent the body of the faithful. Solitary Masses were once celebrated by indulgence or privilege in monasteries. They are now strictly forbidden.

(*ζ*) *Missa parochialis*: the "Assembly of the faithful in which they offer public prayers and sacrifice by the ministry of their pastor, and learn from him what they should do and not do for their own salvation and the edification of their neighbours." The Council of Trent directs bishops to warn the faithful that they should hear Mass in their parish churches at least on Sundays and greater festivals.

(*η*) *Chapter* (*Capitular*) *Mass* is the High Mass in collegiate churches.

(*θ*) *Conventual Mass* is that which "the rectors of cathedral and collegiate churches are bound to have celebrated every day solemnly and with music after tierce." It must, as we have already seen, be applied for benefactors. It is also known among regulars as *Missa canonica*, *tertiae*, *publica*, *communis*, *major*.

(*ι*) *Votive Masses* are those which do not correspond with the office of the day, but are said by the choice (*votum*) of the priest. On all days except Sundays, feasts of double and more than double rank, and certain other days specially excepted, a priest may say a Votive Mass of the Trinity, the Angels, St. Peter and St. Paul, the Holy Ghost, for the

dead, &c., &c., instead of that assigned for the day.

(κ) A *Requiem Mass* is a Mass for the dead, and is so called from the opening words of the Introit: "Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine."

(λ) *Missa adventitia* or *manualis* is a Mass said for the intention of a person who gives an alms; and is opposed to a *Missa legata*, said for a special intention in consequence of a legacy or foundation. Thus *Missa adventitia* or *manualis* is a "chance" Mass—one which "comes to hand."

(μ) The *Missa praesanctificatorum* is really not a Mass at all. Some account of it will be found under HOLY WEEK.[1] Still more remote from the true idea of Mass is the *Missa sicca*, a celebration without either consecration or communion, very common in the Middle Ages in the presence of the sick, at sea, and on other occasions when a true Mass could not be said. St. Louis of France used habitually to have this *Missa sicca* said at sea. Sometimes it was celebrated with all the ceremonies of High Mass. It is now fallen out of use, except that persons learning the ceremonies of Mass sometimes say a *Missa sicca* before ordination. A real Mass was sometimes said at sea. Gavantus (Pars I. tit. xx. f.) disapproves the practice because of the danger that the chalice may be overturned. Mass cannot be said at sea, even if there seems to be no danger of irreverence, without an Apostolic indult. (Sac. Congreg. Rit., Mar. 4, 1901.)

(The number of books upon the Mass from different points of view is very great. See Cabrol, 'Introduction aux Études Liturgiques." Only a few can be mentioned here. Lebrun, "L'Explication littérale, historique et dogmatique des Prières et Cérémonies de la Messe"; Benedict XIV., "De Sacrosancto Sacrificio Missae"; Bona, "Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo"; Rock, "Hierurgia," and "Church of our Fathers"; Duchesne, "Christian Worship"; Gihr, "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," Eng. tr.; Fortescue, "The Mass"; Lucas, "Holy Mass." For the rubrics: Le Vavasseur, "Manuel de Liturgie"; De Herdt, "Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis." For the devotional point of view: Bona, "De Sacrificio Missae Tractatus Asceticus.")

MASTER. [See DEGREES.]

MASTER OF THE SACRED PALACE (*magister sacri palatii*). This is a dignity of the Roman Curia [CURIA ROMANA], and is said to have been first conferred on St. Dominic, who, observing that the attendants of cardinals, while their masters were transacting business with the Pope, for want of employment used to indulge in idle and frivolous pastimes, obtained permission of Honorius III. to form them into a class and explain the Bible to them. Originating thus, the office gradually became one of greater importance, until it included the right of nominating the preachers before the Pope on certain great festivals, that of acting as consultor to several congregations, that of conferring the degree of doctor in theology and philosophy, with other privileges, as well as the duty of examining and licensing all books published in Rome. (Montier, "Hist. des Maîtres Généraux"; Walsh, in "Cath. Enc.")

MASTER OF THE SENTENCES. Peter Lombard, the author of the great theological text-book, "Sententiarum Libri Quattuor." He became bishop of Paris, and died 1104. From that time until the Reformation all the mediaeval theologians lectured and wrote commentaries on the "Sentences." The work is divided into four books: I., on the Trinity; II., on Creation; III., on the Incarnation; IV., on the Sacraments. Each book was later divided into "Distinctions." Peter Lombard has no claim to originality; he is merely a compiler. His chief merit is that he introduced system and order into the study of theology. His very want of originality and his keeping an open mind upon matters controverted enabled his book to become a text for opposite schools. Though some of his opinions have been condemned or generally rejected he is as a rule most orthodox, and he has the great glory of being mentioned by name in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council, c. 2: "Nos autem, sacro approbante concilio, credimus et confitemur, cum Petro Lombardo, &c." There is a handsome edition by Vivès, Paris, 1892. (R. B. Vaughan, "St. Thomas of Aquin," i. 337, 474; De Ghellinck, in "Dublin Rev." 1910 and "Cath. Enc.")

MATINS. [See BREVIARY.]

MATRICULA (dim. of *matrix*, a roll or register). The roll containing the names of the clergy permanently attached to a cathedral, or a collegiate, or a parish church; also, the list of the names of the students regularly admitted into any university.

MATRICULATION (*matricula*). The act of entering the name of a student upon the *matricula* or roll of a university, which in ordinary cases is not done till the candidate for admission has proved his competency by passing an examination in certain prescribed subjects.

MATURIN FRIARS. [See TRINITARIANS.]

MAUNDY THURSDAY. [See HOLY WEEK.]

MAUR, DAMES DE SAINT. The official name of this religious institute is the Congregation of the Holy Child Jesus. It was founded at Rouen in 1662 by a holy Minim named Nicholas Barré. The object was the education of young girls of all classes. The mother-house was removed to the Rue S. Maur in Paris, from which the

[1] The thirty-sixth canon of Aelfric, in 957, shows that one office of the Presanctified on Good Friday was used in England a thousand years ago (Maskell, *Ancient Lit.* p. 214).

congregation derives its popular name of "Dames de Saint Maur." In the seventeenth century, as St. Francis of Sales and St. Vincent of Paul found to their cost, all nuns were compelled to remain within the cloister. Father Barré's object could not be carried out under these conditions. Accordingly, he dispensed with vows, and required the members of the congregation to make simple promises. The "Dames de Saint Maur" flourished greatly up to the time of the Revolution. In 1789 they possessed more than 100 convents, including the famous royal foundation of Saint Cyr. In those days of terrible trial every one of the nuns refused the "Constitutional Oath" and suffered persecution. After the Revolution the institute was reorganized and allowed to take vows. The final approval was given by Pius IX. in 1872.

Among the leading members of the congregation, two are especially worthy of mention: Mother Haller, the first General, and Mother de Faudoas, the fourteenth. The latter, indeed, may be looked upon as the second foundress, as it was through her that the reconstitution and approval were brought about.

At the present time, excluding France, there are houses in England, Ireland, Italy, and Spain; also seven in British Further India, one in Siam and three in Japan. (Anon. "The Congregation of the Holy Child Jesus, commonly called Les Dames de St. Maur.")

MAURISTS. The famous congregation of St. Maur, an offshoot of the Benedictine order [BENEDICTINES], took its name in honour of the favourite disciple of St. Benedict so called, who extended the order greatly in France in the sixth century, and founded the Abbey of Glanfeuil, called after him St. Maur-sur-Loire. Hence, in these northern countries the Benedictine rule was regarded as having him for its author almost equally with St. Benedict himself; *cf.* Chaucer's—

"The reule of seynt Maure or of seint Beneyt."
(*Prol. C. T.*)

In the sixteenth century, much relaxation having crept into the monastic observance of Benedictine houses in the South of Europe, various enterprises of reform were set on foot by monks in whom the ancient fervour still glowed. There was established in Lorraine, by Dom Didier de la Cour, the austere congregation of St. Vannes. Many convents in France desired to embrace this reform, and it was solemnly adopted at the monastery of St. Augustine at Limoges in 1613. Here and at other French houses the congregation of St. Vannes planted monks who might teach their principles and procedure. But, Lorraine being at that time politically separate from France, it was thought expedient that a new congregation should be erected for the latter. This being effected in 1618, the new institute, of which Dom Bénard was the chief propagator, took the name of St. Maur, and being supported by Card. de Retz, and afterwards by Richelieu, rapidly extended itself among the Benedictine convents in France. In and near Paris they eventually had three great houses, the Blancs Manteaux, St. Germain des Prés, and St. Denis. The rule was at first observed in its full strictness in the houses which adhered to the congregation; and in union with this religious movement an enthusiasm for literature and learning developed itself, which modified all the arrangements adopted. A general, appointed for life, governed the whole institute, which, at the time when Hélyot wrote (about 1720), comprised one hundred and eighty abbeys and priories, grouped in six provinces. In every province there were one or two noviciates; on leaving which, the young novice was admitted to profession in some monastery, and trained in piety and ecclesiastical knowledge during two years. After that he was engaged for five years in the study of philosophy and theology, and finally for one year, called the "year of recollection," in the exercises and studies designed to fit him for receiving the priesthood at the end of it. If we may judge by the fruits, the preparation must have been exceedingly well fitted to train men for successfully engaging in the pursuits of literature and criticism. Those "Benedictine editions" of the Fathers, which scholars know so well and value so highly, all came from members of the congregation of St. Maur. Among their colossal labours may be mentioned "Gallia Christiana," the "History of French Literature," the "Recueil" of the historians of France, Mabillon's "Annals of the Benedictine Order" and "Lives of Benedictine Saints," Tassin's literary history of the congregation, Martène's "Amplissima Collectio," &c., &c. The majority of their own countrymen appear to be in haste to forget them; but the rest of the world will not soon forget the gentle, pious, genial, indefatigable Mabillon, the Venerable Bede of these later times; nor Edmond Martène, that model of exact and thorough research; nor Montfaucon, whose vast erudition illustrated by the engraver's art the whole field of Graeco-Roman antiquity and founded the science of archaeology; nor Ruinart, the historian of the Martyrs; not to speak of Rivet, Bouquet, Lami, Labat, Luc d'Achéry, Le Nourri, Ménard, Martianay, and many more, whose names all suggest priceless services rendered in this or that field to the cause of secular and sacred learning.

The later history of the congregation, from the time of Hélyot to their suppression in 1792, is more chequered. Jansenism insinuated itself into some of the convents; and in the controversy which grew out of the publication of the Constitution "Unigenitus"

(1713), although the general and the superiors remained loyal to the Holy See, many of the monks joined the party of opposition. After some time, relaxations of the rule, such as the abandonment of the old habit, modification of the prohibitions respecting food, and the curtailment of the midnight office, were demanded in many convents, and to a great extent conceded. The pseudo-philosophic spirit that was abroad infected even a congregation which had commenced as an austere reform not two centuries before; and, if Hélyot's continuator may be trusted, a Freemasons' lodge was established at Glanfeuil in 1775, and the prior of the Maurist monastery there became the *venerable* of the lodge. Nevertheless, the congregation, though it no longer produced minds of the calibre of those which adorned it at the beginning of the century, continued to be devoted to learning and literature. The "Academy of Saumur," established in the abbey of that town, achieved a wide reputation. In education also their colleges and schools were most successful, and attracted, particularly after the suppression of the Jesuits, pupils of the best blood of France; among these cólleges were Sorèze in Burgundy—re-opened in our times by Lacordaire—Tiron, Pont Levoy, St. Germer, and Auxerre. After 1780 the dissensions which had long troubled the peace of the congregation grew more violent, and would probably have led to its dissolution even if the Revolution had not occurred and turned them out of their monasteries. (Hélyot, continued by Badiche.)

MAY. In recent times, a custom has arisen of addressing public prayer to the Blessed Virgin, decking her altar with flowers, singing hymns in her honour, &c., daily during the month of May. The prayers used are from books of popular devotion, for the Church does not recognize this "Month of May" by any change in the Mass or Office. However, Pius VII. in a brief, March 21, 1815, granted an indulgence of 300 days daily to those who practise this devotion at home or in church, and a plenary indulgence any one day in the month on condition of confession, communion, and prayer for the intention of the Pope. An Italian Father of Charity, Dr. Gentili, introduced the celebration of May devotions among us in England some sixty years ago.

MECHITARISTS. This congregation, which exists for the purpose of instructing and improving the scattered members of the Armenian nation, was founded by an Armenian named Mechitar, who was born in 1676 at Siwas, the ancient Sebastia, a town near the source of the Halys, on the borders of Pontus and Cappadocia. His family appears to have belonged to the section of the Armenian nation which has always adhered to the Catholic Church. From the time when he was ordained priest, in 1699, the desire of labouring for the temporal and eternal welfare of his countrymen possessed itself of his whole nature. He went to Constantinople, and formed an association there to carry out his design; but, being opposed by some of the schismatic Armenians, he transferred his operations to Modon in the Morea, which at that time belonged to the Republic of Venice. Here he and his companions worked on for fourteen years; but in 1715, war having broken out between the Porte and the Republic, Modon was taken by the Turks, and Mechitar's convent was broken up. He then retired to Venice, and obtained from the Government the island of San Lazzaro, which lies in the lagune between the Lido and the city. Here he founded that Armenian convent which travellers from foreign lands never fail to visit and unanimously and cordially admire. Literary labours which have for their object to perfect and regularise the Armenian language, and to translate into it the more important works of the various European literatures, have always been, and are still, zealously prosecuted here by these intelligent Orientals. Branches from the mother house have been founded at Vienna and Trieste, and at several places in Hungary. The *Allgemeine Zeitung* (December 17, 1850) thus writes of the Mechitarists: "When one takes a near view of their labours at Vienna and Venice, one is amazed at the powerful influence which the literary activity of these learned monks exerts on the Armenian nation scattered throughout the East. The reviews, the books, the numerous translations of works on history, geography, philology, natural science, and voyages and travels, which are printed in the Mechitarist presses of Vienna and Venice are carried far beyond Persia to the banks of the Indus and the Ganges, and have everywhere called forth among the Armenians the desire of knowledge and a taste for reading, and set on foot a literary movement which was before entirely dormant in a people till lately essentially and exclusively commercial." (Kalemkiar in "Kirchenlex.")

MEDALS, RELIGIOUS. Pieces of metal, stamped with some religious emblem, picture, or portrait. As mentioned in the art. AMULET, the pagan custom of wearing some material object as a protection against evil was stripped of its superstitious meaning and tolerated by the Church. (Newman, "Development," 373.) De Rossi has shown that the coin-like objects discovered in the catacombs are genuine religious medals. During the Middle Ages they seem to have been in little use. It is only when we come to the Renaissance period that the custom of wearing them became common. Here, again, the beauty of the secular coins and medals of this age naturally suggested that such art might be sub-

servient to the purposes of religion. If paintings and statues might be venerated, why not medals? The Council of Trent was careful to guard the faithful against attaching any superstitious efficacy to mere representations of holy persons and things (sess. xxv.). Once the limits of the veneration were fixed, and the practice of blessing and attaching indulgences to medals came into use, the number of these pious objects rapidly increased. It would be impossible to give an account of the number and variety. Two only may be noticed here. The use of a blessed medal to be worn instead of the brown or other scapulars was sanctioned by Pius X. The other medal to be mentioned is the so-called "Miraculous Medal" of the Immaculate Conception, said to have been revealed to a Sister of Charity in 1830. Pius IX. approved of the medal, and Leo XIII. instituted an Office and Mass of the apparition to be kept on November 27. (See Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Pachinger, "Wallfahrts-Bruderschafts und Gnaden-Medaillen"; Schrod in "Kirchenlex."; Migne, "Encyclopédie," xxxii., *Numismatique*.)

MEDIATOR (*μεσίτης*, "sequester Dei et hominum Christus" in Tertull. "Adv. Prax." 27, PL, ii. 192). St. Paul (1 Tim. ii. 5) speaks of Christ as the "one mediator between God and man," and it is plain that he vindicates this office as one proper to Christ alone, for the passage runs: "There is one God, one mediator also between God and men, a man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself also a ransom for all," &c. Christ is the one mediator, because He alone could draw near to God in virtue of merits which were His own and independently of the merits of any beside Himself. He alone could offer a propitiation infinite in value for the sin of man, and obtain in return all the gifts of salvation. This He did as man; not, however, as mere man, but as man who was also God, so that He was able to make full and perfect atonement. Further, St. Thomas points out (3ª, q. 26, a. 2) that a mediator, from the very fact that He comes between, must be distant from each extreme. Now "Christ as man is far from God (*distat a Deo*) in nature, and from men in the dignity of grace and glory." Again, a mediator's office is to join the two extremes, and this Christ does "by setting before men the commandments and gifts of God, by making satisfaction to God for them, and by interceding for them. Christ, therefore, as man is most truly called mediator."

The Arian error on this point lay in their belief that the Word in His superhuman nature came between God and creatures. Creatures "could not bear the hand of God," and "a mediator became necessary that things generated might come to be." St. Athanasius ("Defens. Fid. Nic." cap. iii. § 8, PG, xxv. 437) shows the illogical character of the error, for if the Son is a creature, then on the Arian theory another mediator must have been required to create Him; if not a creature, He is true God.

The Protestant mistake consists in interpreting St. Paul's words as if they excluded the mediation of the saints. Assuredly there is only one mediator of redemption, and the saints, says Estius (*ad loc.*), are "mediators in an imperfect way—*i.e.* they intercede for us with God, just as all persons do who in prayer commend our salvation to God." "Whoever beseeches God for others constitutes himself after a manner a medium and an intercessor between them and God, though he does this leaning not on his own merits, but on another's—viz. Christ's. For whatever the saints seek for us in prayer, they only seek through Christ." In this imperfect sense St. Paul calls Moses a "mediator" (Galatians iii. 19, 20). This is his common title in Jewish writers, and his mediatorial office clearly appears, *e.g.* Deut. v. 2, 5—"I stood between the Lord and you"; and the doctrine of angelic mediation is asserted in a beautiful passage of Elihu's speech (Job xxxiii. 23)—

> "If there be for him an angel *to mediate*,
> One of a thousand,
> To declare to man what is right for him,
> Then He (God) is gracious to him and says:
> 'Loose him from going down to the pit,
> I have found a ransom.'"

There can be no doubt about the meaning of the word italicised (מְלִיץ). "An angel interceding with God on behalf of men, a *μεσίτης*," is Gesenius' commentary. So Delitzsch, "Mittler," "mediator" (he, however, understands the "angel of the covenant.") The Targum rendering is Paraclete, advocate (פָּרַקְלִיטָא). The LXX entirely misses the sense; the Vulgate has "loquens pro eo."

We may remark by the way that the doctrine of angelic mediation prominent in the Book of Job has not, so far as we know, received due attention from Catholics[1]; observe the words in the first speech of Eliphaz (v. 1):

> "Call. Is there one to answer thee?
> To which of the holy ones (*i.e.* angels) wilt thou turn?"

On which passage an eminent Protestant scholar comments thus: "They [angels] appear as intercessors for men with God, bringing men's needs before Him, and mediating in their behalf. This work is easily connected with their general office of labouring for the good of men, especially of the pious; still it is here for the first time ascribed to them" (Dillmann, on Job, p. 44). (See SAINTS; also the dogmatic theologians,

[1] St. Thomas, however, refers to this very passage (*Suppl.* q. 72, a. 2).

"De Incarnatione," *e.g.* Petavius, lib. xiv.; Humphrey, "The One Mediator.")

MEDITATION AND MENTAL PRAYER. Meditation in its narrower and technical sense may be defined as the application of the three powers of the soul to prayer—the memory proposing a religious or moral truth, the understanding considering this truth in its application to the individual who meditates, while the will forms practical resolutions and desires grace to keep them. It is distinguished from vocal prayer, because in meditation no words are used, and from the higher forms of mental prayer (*e.g.* affective prayer, contemplation, &c.), because in these there is no methodical use of the reason. Mental prayer of some kind must be as old as the human race, but it was St. Ignatius of Loyola who reduced the rules of meditation to system, and contributed to the spread of meditation at a regular hour and for a fixed space of time. Thus St. Benedict supposes that some of his monks will pray after the vocal prayers of the office with tears and application of heart (Rule, c. 25, quoted by Fleury, "H.E." xxxii. 15), and an incident in his life (c. 4, Fleury, *loc. cit.*) shows that the religious used to pray in private after the chanting of the psalms. So St. Columban admonishes his religious on the duty of private prayer and the continual application of the mind to God. ("Poenit." n. 19; Fleury, xxxv. 10.)

Modern ascetical writers are much more precise, and in all communities of men and women, in all seminaries, &c., a time is set apart daily for mental prayer, which is imposed by rule. The practice of mental prayer is recommended to secular priests, and also to lay persons if they have some education and desire to lead a perfect life. The method given by St. Ignatius in his Exercises is that generally recommended and used, at least till the person who meditates forms a method of his own. [See EXERCISES.] The best exposition of it is by Father Roothaan, General of the Society, "De Ratione Meditandi" (Romae, 1871). The Ignatian method has been simplified by St. Alphonsus, and the Sulpicians have a method of their own, propounded by M. Olier; another is given by the Carmelite John of Jesus-Mary. Books of meditation without number have appeared during the last three centuries, and we cannot pretend to mention even the principal names. Da Ponte, Avancini, Crasset, Lancicius, Challoner, Chaignon, are those which most readily occur to us.

Benedict XIV., in his work on Beatification, naturally rebukes the rashness of the Jesuit Hurtado, who maintained that the daily and formal practice of mental prayer was necessary for salvation. It is, however, a great and powerful help to self-improvement and advance in virtue.

After meditation comes affective prayer, in which the soul goes straight to God by affection of the will without need of formal discourse or reasoning. Next come higher degrees of prayer, which the experience of the saints proves to be most real but which are far removed from ordinary experience. Contemplation, we are told, is either natural or infused in an extraordinary manner by God, and in the latter the soul is said to be passive—*i.e.* to be in some special sense moved by God. It is important to notice that in the passive prayer "free will exercises itself in the whole of its extent." Catholic mystics insist on this, and wholly reject the false notions of absorption in the Deity, loss of personality, &c. Bossuet proves this at length from St. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, &c. See his "Instructions sur les Etats d'Oraison," traité 1, livr. vii. n. 13. This work makes the whole matter comprehensible, so far as it can be comprehended, and is full of learning. See Faber, "Growth in Holiness," ch. xv.

MELCHITES. The word, which comes from the Semitic word (Heb. מֶלֶךְ, Syr. ܡܠܟܐ Chald. מַלְכָּא, the Arabic is the same) for king, means royalists. When multitudes of Christians in the East, and especially in Egypt, fell away from the Church after the Council of Chalcedon, and clung to the Monophysite creed, the Church of Constantinople and the Byzantine Court remained orthodox, and the Emperors exerted their influence on the Catholic side. Hence the name of Melchites was given to those Christians in the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem who held to the definition of Chalcedon.[1] These were of course closely connected with the patriarchate of Constantinople; they adopted its liturgy, and when Constantinople was severed by schism from the Catholic Church they lapsed also. In fact, both from a dogmatic and liturgical point of view, the Melchites are simply Greeks living in Egypt and Syria. And just as Jacobites, Copts, or Nestorians, when they return to the Church, retain their ancient rites, so the Melchites who have recovered Catholic unity retain the liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, and the canon law to which they have been accustomed.

The Melchite or Greek Catholic Church of Antioch dates from 1686,[2] when the Greek Patriarch Athanasius IV. of Antioch submitted to the Pope. From Antioch the Catholic Melchites spread to the patriarchates of Alexandria and Jerusalem.

The Patriarch of Antioch is chosen by the bishops of the patriarchate. The election, however, must be examined and ap-

[1] On the same principle the orthodox called the Monothelites of Mount Lebanon "maradaei," from ܡܪܕ "to rebel."

[2] Or rather 1720, when Ignatius, who had resigned, was restored to his see.

proved by Propaganda and confirmed by the Pope. If the election is pronounced invalid, the Pope nominates, and the Pope may appoint, if necessary, a coadjutor with right of succession. The Patriarch, who is subject to Propaganda, lives at Damascus and Ain Teraz, in the seminary for priests. The bishops are elected by the clergy of the diocese, the right of confirmation and consecration resting with the Patriarch. The bishops may be taken from the secular clergy, if unmarried. The secular priests, who are educated at a seminary on Mount Lebanon, may continue to live as married men if married before receiving Holy Orders. The Patriarch has subject to him the archdioceses of Damascus (which he himself administers), Tyre, Bosra and Hauran, Homs and Hama, and Aleppo, besides eight other dioceses.

A Greek Patriarch of Alexandria made his submission and received the pallium from Clement XI. in 1713, but he had no Catholic successors, and the Alexandrian patriarchate is administered by the vicar of the Patriarch of Antioch. This vicar is a bishop *in partibus*, and lives at Cairo. There are two Greek Catholic churches at Cairo, one at Rosetta, a hospice at Damietta. Another bishop *in partibus*, also a vicar of the Patriarch of Antioch, administers the patriarchate of Jerusalem.

The Melchite religious follow the rule of St. Basil, with modifications. The monks are divided into two congregations. The congregation of St. Salvator was founded in 1715, and is ruled by an abbot-general, who lives at Deir-el-Mukhallis, a few miles north-east of Sidon. There are 500 monks, eight monasteries, and twenty-one hospitia. This congregation has a house at Rome—Sta. Maria in Carinis. Most of the parishes are supplied by these monks. The other congregation, of St. John Baptist ("Mar Johanna-el-Shuweir"), erected early in the eighteenth century, has also a hospice at Rome—Sta. Maria in Domnica, detta la Navicella. This congregation, which is recruited from Aleppo and Lebanon, was subdivided, by authority of Gregory XVI. in 1832, into the congregation of Aleppo, with four monasteries and two hospices, and that of the Baladites, with the same number of monasteries and hospices, besides the hospice at Rome. At this last, however, the procurators of both congregations reside.

The number of Catholics of this rite is about 173,000, and of priests not far short of 350. There are also five or six convents of nuns. ("Missiones Catholicae," 1901; Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients"; Werner, "Orbis Terrarum Catholicus"; Streit, "Atlas.")

MELETIAN SCHISM. The name is equivocally applied to two entirely different transactions.

I. *Schism of Meletius of Egypt.*—An admirable article by Hefele[1] throws light on this obscure and complicated affair, in which the principal actor figures to disadvantage in the writings of one saint, and to advantage in those of another. Meletius was bishop of Lycopolis in the Thebaid. At the time of the persecution of Diocletian, when many of the Egyptian bishops were in prison, and Peter, the Patriarch of Alexandria, absent from his see (perhaps he was in hiding), Meletius took upon himself to ordain priests in dioceses other than his own—a thing clearly against the canons—and, going to Alexandria, associated himself with Arius, then a layman, and ordained priests and episcopal visitors on his own authority, without reference to the absent patriarch. This conduct naturally occasioned a schism, which, beginning about 304, was not finally extinguished till the middle of the fifth century. It is not known in what year Meletius died. St. Athanasius mentions Meletius and the Meletians in several places of his writings, and says that the former sacrificed to idols during the persecution. Hefele thinks that with regard to this Athanasius must have been misled by a false report, since it is incredible that St. Epiphanius should have spoken in terms of commendation of Meletius if he had known him to have consented to this act of weakness. The Meletian schismatics joined the Arians in all their persecution of Athanasius. On the other hand, St. Epiphanius, in his work on Heresies, tells the story of the schism from a quite different point of view. It arose, according to him, out of a difference of opinion between the Patriarch Peter and Meletius, on the subject of the "lapsi," the former taking a lax view, and being willing to consent to their replacement in all their functions on terms by which the zealous piety of Meletius was scandalized. Hefele thinks it probable that this version of the schism was given to St. Epiphanius in his youth by some Meletian priests of Eleutheropolis, where Meletius is stated to have ordained clergy. The Council of Nicaea (325) took the matter in hand, and endeavoured, by means of a synodal letter, to dispose of it; but the cunning of the Meletians enabled them to elude, to a great extent, the conditions which it was sought to impose upon them. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 211, 488.)

II. *Schism of Meletius of Antioch:* [See EUSTATHIANS.]

MEMENTO. [See DIPTYCHS.]

MEMORIA. (I) A shrine or reliquary containing relics of some martyr or martyrs, which in primitive times it was customary to carry in procession. St. Augustine, in the twenty-second book of the "De Civitate Dei" (ch. 8), speaks of the "Memory" of the "Twenty Martyrs" at Hippo, and mentions several instances of "Memories"

[1] In *Kirchenlex.*

of the protomartyr St. Stephen, belonging to different churches, being carried in procession by the respective bishops, and becoming the occasion of miraculous cures. "Lucillus, bishop of Sinita," he says, "while carrying this holy burden (*pia sarcina*) was cured of an infirmity under which he had long laboured."

Abuses having arisen through the eagerness to obtain relics, a law of Theodosius ("Cod. Theod." ix. 17, 7) ordered that none should buy or dismember the bodies of martyrs or remove them from place to place.[1] This law cannot have been in force in Africa at the time when St. Augustine wrote as above.

(2) A church or chapel built in memory of a martyr or confessor, and often over his tomb. Such a chapel usually, if not always, contained relics of the martyr.

MENDICANT FRIARS, that is "begging" friars, who have no property even in common, and depend for support upon the alms of the faithful: This is their characteristic difference from monks. The four great mendicant orders were the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Austin Hermits. To these others were afterwards added. [See FRIARS; EVANGELICAL COUNSELS.]

MENOLOGY (Gr. *μήν*). A monthly register. By this name the Greeks designated the calendars inscribed with the names, primarily of martyrs, but afterwards of confessors also, which in the Latin Church were called Martyrologies. (See MARTYROLOGY.)

MENSAL FUND (*mensa*, table). That portion of the revenue of a church set apart for the support of those who serve it. Thus, the bishop and the chapter have each their "mensa," entirely distinct. A bishop at his consecration is required to swear that he will not in any way alienate his "mensa." The share of each canon in the chapter or mensa is his prebend (*q.v.*). (See Boudinhon in "Cath. Enc."; Taunton.)

MENTAL RESERVATION or restriction (*restrictio mentalis*) occurs where a person uses words in a sense other than that which is obvious and which he knows they are likely to convey. Thus, a man who tells a beggar that he has no money in his pocket, meaning that he has no money to give the beggar, uses mental reservation. He inserts mentally a qualification or restriction which is not expressed.

If the restriction is of such a nature that it cannot be perceived by the hearer, then the person who uses it certainly sins. So all Catholics are bound to hold. (See Prop. 26, 27, 28, among those condemned by Innocent XI.)

On the other hand, almost all theologians hold that it is sometimes lawful to use a mental reservation which may be, though very likely it will not be, understood from the circumstances. Thus, a priest may deny that he knows a crime which he has only learnt through sacramental confession. A man may deny a crime he has committed if interrogated and forced to answer by one who has no authority; or, again, according to St. Alphonsus, if asked to lend money, he may equivocate, and say "I wish I had it."

But it must be remembered that, as is allowed on all hands, just cause is needed to make equivocation lawful. A habit of equivocation is detestable to all good men, and the practice of perfect simplicity and straightforwardness is not only estimable and engaging and virtuous, but it is also the wisest course.

Next, St. Alphonsus says plainly that all equivocation is sinful when a man is put on his oath by just authority; that it is utterly wicked for tradesmen to affirm on oath that their goods cost more than they really did, and then shelter themselves under equivocation; that no equivocation must be used in contracts, or generally in matters concerning the interests of others.

Further, many even of the strongest opponents of mental reservation would allow equivocation in extreme cases: *e.g.* few would say that it was unlawful for a man to equivocate if a burglar asked him where his money was, or how much he had, or if a murderer asked him where he could find his intended victim. It may be mentioned that St. Alphonsus makes some difficulty about letting a servant say his master is not at home, when this is not true in its obvious sense. Yet this practice is common in England. If we admit, as many Protestant authorities have done, that equivocation is in some cases allowable, it is hard to settle what these cases are. No doubt, equivocation is always an evil, though not always a sin, and the less of it there is the better. With regard to St. Alphonsus's judgment on particular cases, it is well to bear in mind that no Catholic is bound to follow him throughout, and Cardinal Newman has recorded his own dissent from the saint's teaching on this matter. In some of his decisions on mental reservation there is high theological authority on the other side.

We may add that Catholic theologians justify the lawfulness of equivocation by an appeal to John vii. 8, where our Lord says, "I go not up to this feast" ("Tabernacles"). The argument cannot be pressed against Protestants, for the weight of documentary evidence favours another reading—"I go not up yet to this feast." (See St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." lib. iv.; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. 464; and Cardinal Newman, "Apologia," note G.

MERCY, SISTERS OF. This important and flourishing order was founded in 1827

[1] Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i. 354.

at Baggot Street, Dublin, by Catherine McAuley, for carrying on all the works of mercy, both spiritual and temporal. The foundress took the title of her order from that of St. Peter Nolasco; its rule, with some modifications, from that of the Presentation Nuns (*q.v.*). Except in the case of recent filiations, each convent is independent of every other, and is under the jurisdiction and control of the bishop of the diocese. Besides the three essential vows, the sisters take a fourth—to devote themselves for life to the service and instruction of the poor, the sick, and the ignorant. The order has many houses in England, Ireland, Scotland, Australia, and elsewhere; but nowhere has it prospered more than in the United States of America. ("Annals of the Sisters of Mercy"; Carroll, "Life of Catherine McAuley.")

MERCY, SPIRITUAL AND CORPORAL WORKS OF. In the Middle Ages seven great works of mercy to the souls and bodies of our fellow-men were enumerated, and called the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy. The classification constantly appears in works of art, and is retained in modern catechisms. The Seven Works of Corporal Mercy are, to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, visit prisoners, visit the sick, harbour strangers, bury the dead (Mt. xxv. 35, 36; Tob. xii. 12); of Spiritual Mercy, to convert sinners, instruct the ignorant, counsel the doubtful, console the afflicted, bear wrongs patiently, forgive injuries, pray for the living and the dead. They are all comprised in two rude hexameters—

"Visito, poto, cibo, redimo, tego, colligo, condo. Consule, carpe, doce, solare, remitte, fer, ora."

[See CHARITY, WORKS OF.]

MERCY, OUR LADY OF. [See MARY, p. 563; RANSOM, OUR LADY OF.]

MERIT, in its strict theological sense, is a quality which belongs to the moral actions of free and responsible agents and makes these actions worthy of reward. Merit implies a real proportion between the work done and the reward given. Thus, a man who labours well in the fields deserves, or merits, his day's wages from the master who hired him; while, on the other hand, a beggar who comes to receive a promised alms cannot be said to earn or merit it. To put it in another way, a man who merits can claim his reward as a matter of justice, but one who has been promised a reward out of all proportion to the work done may appeal to the fidelity and kindness, but not, strictly speaking, to the justice of the donor. In order to merit, a man must be free, since he cannot claim reward for a service which he has no power to withhold, and which, therefore, is not his to give; what he does must, obviously, be good; it must be done in the service of the person who is to confer the reward, and the latter must have agreed to accept the work done and to reward it, since nobody is bound to pay for work, however excellent, which he does not want. We have been speaking of merit in a sense strict and definite, but at the same time general—of merit as it may exist, *e.g.*, between man and man; and so far, we suppose, there is no matter for dispute between Catholics and Protestants.

The controversy begins, however, when we pass from the nature of merit to a consideration of the cases in which it exists. Protestants admitted that man might merit reward from his brother man, and that Christ merited eternal life for Himself and for all who believe in Him from the hand of God. But the Reformers denied that the good works of the just merited an eternal reward, and they were bound in consistency to do so, for they were committed to the theory that men were justified solely by the merits of Christ imputed to them or reckoned to their account, and they rejected the Catholic doctrine that God accepted sinners because they were renewed within by the grace of Christ, that He counted them just and good because they really had become just and good, because He Himself had washed and cleansed them and reformed their nature more wonderfully than He had formed it at the first. Hence Luther and Melanchthon held that the best works of good men were actually sinful—nay, that but for God's mercy they were mortal sins. "Every work of the just man," Luther writes, "is damnable and a mortal sin if it be judged by God's judgment." Melanchthon is just as decided. "Works which follow justification, although they proceed from the Spirit of God, who has taken possession of the heart of justified persons, yet, because done in the flesh which remains unclean, are themselves also unclean." "We have taught that we are justified by faith alone, that our works, that our strivings are nought but sin." Calvin, though his language is more moderate, maintains the same thesis in substance—viz. that the "good works of the faithful lack such perfect purity as can endure the sight of God, and are in a manner defiled."[1] In diametrical and conscious opposition to this estimate, the Council of Trent (sess. vi. De Justif. canon 32) declares that a man, if already justified, "through such good works as he does by the grace of God and merit of Christ, whose living member he is, truly merits increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual attainment of eternal life, if he dies in grace." This doctrine is limited in several ways, and it will be better to state these modifications and append the grounds of the

[1] The quotations are taken from Möhler's "Symbolism," chap. iii. § 22. His references are to Luther, *Assert. Omn. Art.*, Opp. tom. ii. fol. 325 *b*; Melanchthon, *Loc. Theolog.* pp. 108, 158; Calvin, *Opusc. De Necessitate Ref. Eccl.* p. 430; *Instit.* ii. 8, § 59, iii. 4, § 28.

Tridentine doctrine as we proceed. In great measure, indeed, the statement suffices to justify the doctrine.

(1) The just have no claim for a reward apart from God's merciful promise. This is plain from the very nature of merit, as we have already seen. Even from other men we cannot in strict justice claim a reward for services done, unless they have expressly or by implication agreed to remunerate them. But besides this we cannot profit God by our service. He is all-wise and almighty. His bliss is complete in itself, and He has no need of us and of our works. Besides, our service is already due to God by other titles. A slave looks for no reward from his master, and any recompense he may receive comes to him from liberality and not from justice. Thus, men condemned to penal servitude, which is a kind of slavery, work hard, but they have no claim at law for wages. But no slave can belong to his master so absolutely as man to his Creator. Our existence is God's gift: His strength supports us at each instant; His we are, and Him we have to serve. There would have been no injustice had God called us to serve Him without reward, and our service at the best would be imperfect. Hence our Lord reminds us of the manner in which God might have dealt with us. A slave, He says, has to work in the fields, and when he comes home he has to prepare his master's meal and take his own afterwards. "Does he thank that servant because he did the things he was bidden?" "So you also, when you do all that you are bidden, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done what we were bound to do" (Lk. xvii. 7 *seq.*). So, we say, God might have dealt with us, but as a matter of fact He has not done so.[1] He has graciously promised to reward our good works with life eternal; and since the promise has been made, since, further, there is a real proportion between the work done and the reward given, the reward is merited, or, in other words, God's justice, no less than His fidelity to His promise, is the warrant that it will be given. Scripture speaks on this point as plainly as the Council of Trent. "For the rest, there is reserved for me the crown of justice which the Lord will give in that day, the just judge" (2 Tim. iv. 8). Whatever the exact sense of "the crown of justice" may be, the last words, "the just judge," leave no room to doubt that St. Paul expected a reward from the justice of God. So again, in Hebrews vi. 10, the words are, "God is not unjust to forget your work and labour of love," and the justice consists in giving the reward of "salvation," as the preceding verse proves. The same truth follows from the reiterated assurance that "God will render to every man according to his works" (Rom. ii. 6).

(2) It is only works done in the friendship and by the grace of God which merit eternal life. St. Paul constantly asserts that no man can be justified by the works of the law. In the Epistle to the Romans he shows that the heathen (i. 18–32) and the Jews (ii. 1–29) were alike under condemnation before God, that justification came by the Gospel and through faith (iii. 21–26), and that all boasting is thereby excluded (iii. 27–31). In 1 Cor. xiii. we have the general statement, "If I give my body to be burnt and have not charity, it profits me nothing." The contrary doctrine—viz. that man "can be justified by his own works done through the strength of human nature or the teaching of the law,"—is anathematized by the Council of Trent (*loc. cit.* canon 1). The work of our salvation begins wholly from the grace of God and the co-operation of our free will; it springs from grace, not from merit; from the divine mercy, not from the divine justice. God moves the sinner to believe and to repent, and pours the Holy Ghost and divine love into his heart, not because of any merits which He sees in him, but because of His own infinite compassion. But when the sinner has passed from death to life, the least work done by God's grace merits heaven. Each is the fruit of Christ's Passion, each is done and can only be done by those "who have received power to become the sons of God." The Holy Spirit in the heart is a "fountain of water springing up to eternal life" (Jn. iv. 13). The smallest work of mercy, if done by Christ's indwelling grace, is from that very fact due to a principle which utterly transcends all earthly reward, and which, therefore, justly claims recompense in heaven. Hence St. Paul boldly tells the Colossians (i. 10) to "walk worthily of the Lord," and the Thessalonians (2 Ep. i. 5) so to suffer as to be "counted worthy" of the kingdom of God. To deny the merit of the just is to detract from the merit of Christ, in whose strength they act.

Nor can the doctrine of merit, so understood, fail to prove a powerful incentive to humility and gratitude. "What merits of his own," St. Augustine asks (Ep. 194, al. 105) "has [the sinner] set free to boast of, since, had he received according to his merits, he would have been condemned? Are there therefore no merits of the just? Evidently there are, because they are just. But there were no merits in order that they might become just, for they were made just when they were justified; but, as the Apostle says, 'justified *freely by His grace*.'" And further on in the same epistle "What merit, then, can there be in man, anterior to grace and on account of which he can receive grace, seeing that grace alone works in us all our good deserts, and seeing that God, when

[1] Those who quote Lk. xvii. 7 against the Catholic doctrine forget that Christ promises to do (Lk. xii. 37) the very thing which the master in the parable (Lk. xvii.) does not do.

He crowns our merits, crowns what are nothing else than His own gifts? For as from the beginning of faith we obtained mercy, not because we were faithful, but in order that we might be faithful, so in the end, when life will be eternal, He will crown us, as it is written, "in pity and in mercy." So not in vain do we sing to God, 'And His mercy will go before me,' 'And His mercy will follow me.' Whence also even eternal life, which, endless itself, will be attained at the end, and therefore is given after merits, is itself too called a grace, because these same merits of which it is the reward have not been done by us of our sufficiency, but have been done in us by grace, because it [eternal life] is given freely, not that it is not given in consequence of merits, but because the merits to which it is given are themselves a gift."

Again, the Catholic doctrine is utterly opposed to the legalism which expects measure for measure, so much reward in heaven for so much external service on earth. There is a Jewish saying, "God did not reveal the reward attached to each commandment, for had He done so man would keep some and neglect others."[1] It could not have arisen among Christians. To them "love is the fulfilling of the law." The love of God above all, and of men for His sake—that is the one indispensable work; and of itself, though all external works may be absent, it merits the kingdom of heaven. He who loves has passed from death to life; external good works can claim a reward so far, and so far only, as they spring from love, are the expression of love, serve to intensify love.

It is not worth while to show at length that the Fathers taught the Catholic doctrine on grace and justification, for the Reformers were conscious that they could not appeal successfully to tradition, and they professed to restore a belief contained, indeed, in Scripture, but forgotten even from early times in the Church. We may, however, refer the reader to Clem. Rom. 1 Ep. 30, cf. 32, PG, i. 269; Ep. Barnab. 19, PG, ii. 777; Iren. iv. 30, 3, PG, vii. 1066; Tertull. "Scorp." 12, PL, ii. 146. It was only the Gnostics in the first ages of the Church who denied the merit of good works. (See Iren. i. 23, 3, i. 25, 5.) It is more important to note that merit is sometimes used in a looser sense, and that theologians recognize an inferior or imperfect merit—viz. "Meritum de Congruo," merit of congruity. This latter is not, properly speaking, merit at all; it is a right founded in friendship and liberality, not in strict justice. Thus no one can merit the first grace or recovery from mortal sin, nor can a holy man merit the conversion of another,[1] or his own perseverance in grace. (See FINAL PERSEVERANCE.) It is, however, lawful to hold that a just man may merit a sinner's conversion *de congruo*, because it is congruous or fitting that God should hear the prayer of one who is admitted to His friendship. In other cases, Billuart denies that there is any place even for merit *de congruo*, unless we take it to mean merit in a still laxer and vaguer acceptation. Thus we may say, if we like, that a man who, moved by God's grace, believes, sorrows for his sin, resolves to begin a new life, hopes in God's mercy, &c., merits *de congruo* the further grace of justification, because these previous works dispose the soul to receive sanctifying grace. But if the question be asked in general terms, "Does a sinner, so disposed, merit God's pardon and grace?" the answer must be "no," and so the Council of Trent expressly defines. (See St. Thom. $1^a\ 2^{ae}$, qq. 109, 114; the dogmatic theologians "De Gratia"; Bellarmine, "De Justif." v. i.–xxi.; Suarez, "De Gratia," xii.; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. p. 256.)

MESSALIANS. (See EUCHITES.)

METROPOLITAN (*metropolita, metropolitanus*). The thirty-third of the Apostolic Canons says that the bishops in every country (*cujusque gentis*) ought to know which among them is the first, and take him to a certain extent as their head, and do nothing unusual without his consent. It was manifestly the intention of St. Paul that Titus should stand in a relation of this kind to all the bishops established in the cities of Crete;[2] and a comparison of 1 Tim. ch. iii. with Tit i. seems to justify the inference that Timothy held a similar rank among the bishops of Asia. This leading bishop among his brethren would naturally be, or come to be, the prelate of the most important city (*metropolis*) in the province or country. In the case of an entire country, such as Syria or Egypt, each with its dependencies, the bishop of the capital city (Antioch, Alexandria, &c.) was called the *patriarch*; in the case of a province, the *metropolitan*. The ecclesiastical divisions, for a long time after the conversion of Constantine, conformed themselves closely to the civil; the same chief city of a province contained the praetor as the head of the temporal, and the metropolitan as the head of the spiritual organisation. In process of time it often happened that the seat of the civil government was removed to another city,

[1] Quoted from Tanchuma on Ekeb, in the learned Jewish work, Hamburger's *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, p. 701, art. "Lohn und Strafe." There are noble rabbinical maxims on merit: *e.g.* "The reward of a commandment is a commandment (*i.e.* leads to the keeping of another commandment), and the wages of sin is sin" (*Aboth*, iv. 2); and by Antigonus of Soto (about 198 B.C.): "Be not as servants who serve their master to receive a reward, but be like servants who do not serve their master because of the reward: let the fear of heaven rule over you" (*Aboth*, i. 2). But there is nothing in the great collection of rabbinical dicta on the subject in the article referred to above which approaches ever so distantly to the spirit of Mt. xxii. 37–40; Rom. xiii. 10.

[1] Ps. xlix. 8 (in the Hebrew) may be quoted here, though it really speaks of redemption from temporal death: "Surely a brother cannot redeem a man; he cannot give to God an atonement for him; the ransom of his soul will be too precious, and he must let that be for ever."

[2] Tit. i.

while no corresponding change took place in things ecclesiastical; in such cases the name "metropolitan" ceased to be suitable, and was replaced by "archbishop."

In former times the power of metropolitans over their suffragans was great; they could hear and decide any charges made against them, and excommunicate them if they deemed it necessary. The Council of Trent reduced this power within strict limits. It enacted that criminal causes of a more serious kind, in which bishops were implicated, should be tried and decided only by the Supreme Pontiff, with the proviso, however, that if a previous local inquiry were necessary it should be committed to none but the metropolitans, or bishops specially delegated by the Holy See. The minor criminal causes of bishops are, under the same canon, to be tried by the provincial council or by persons deputed by it.[1]

Metropolitans cannot exercise ordinary jurisdiction in the dioceses of their suffragans, nor visit their cathedrals, or any portion of their dioceses, except on the mandate of the provincial council. Nor have they any jurisdiction, *proprio jure*, over monasteries situated within the dioceses of their suffragans.

On the rights, privileges, and dignities still annexed to the office of a metropolitan, see the article ARCHBISHOP. (Ferraris, *Metropolitanus*; Soglia, ii. 5, 49.)

MILITARY ORDERS. Hélyot enumerates between ninety and a hundred military orders. For the knights of CALATRAVA, the HOSPITALLERS, and the TEMPLARS, see those articles. For the knights of the Teutonic order, see MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN, *Thirteenth Century*. Of the remainder, particulars respecting a few of the more important are here subjoined.

(1) Of *Alcantara*.—Founded in Castile in 1177; its object was the subjugation of the Moors. The knights wore a white mantle embroidered with a green cross. For a century after their institution they did great service to the Christian cause; in the fourteenth century, their quarrels with the knights of Calatrava, resulting in actual war, no less retarded and disgraced it. The order became extremely wealthy; the rents of the grand-mastership in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella amounted to forty-five thousand ducats.[2] Castles, towns, and convents belonging to this and the other military orders were seen in every part of Spain. The election to the office of grand-master, involving the disposal of large patronage and the wielding of great power and influence, became the cause of infinite jealousy and contention; and by a prudent decision of the Pope (1494) the control of the order was granted to Ferdinand and Isabella for life. In the reign of Philip II. the grand-mastership was annexed in perpetuity to the crown; the subordinate dignities, having survived the object for which they were instituted, became the empty decorations of an order of nobility.

(2) The *Annunziata*, or the *Collar*.—Instituted by Amadeus, Count of Savoy, about 1360.

(3) The *Bath*.—So named from one of the ceremonies of knighthood according to the custom of England. The esquire who was to be knighted was put into a bath; while he was in it two other esquires, experienced in chivalry and its laws, came to him, and after explaining the duties which knighthood would impose upon him, poured water upon his shoulders and so left him. After the bath he was taken into a chapel, and continued in prayer the whole night, "asking the Lord and his blessed Mother that of their worthy grace they would give him power and strength to receive this high temporal dignity in honour of their holy Church, and of the order of chivalry."[1] At daylight he confessed to a priest, and afterwards heard Mass. After the completion of the ceremony by the king's striking him on the collar with his right hand and saying "Be a good knight," he was led up to the altar, knelt, and, placing his right hand upon it, promised to maintain the right of Holy Church all his life long. Geoffrey of Anjou, the father of Henry II., is said to have been knighted in this manner by Henry I. in 1128.

The honours of the Order of the Bath, though its religious meaning is now lost, are highly prized in England to this day. The dignities are—Knight Grand Cross (G.C.B.), Knight Commander (K.C.B.), and Companion (C.B.) In each grade there is a military and a civil division. The ribbon is crimson; the motto, "Tria juncta in uno."[2]

(4) Of *Constantine*.—This order seems to have been created by the Emperor Isaac Angelus Comnenus about 1190, probably in imitation of the orders among the Crusaders. Innumerable fictions and forgeries have been set on foot from time to time, in order to invest this and other military orders with the dignity of an antiquity to which they have no claim. Thus the order now in question, it was stoutly maintained, was first founded by Constantine the Great. In the opinion of Papebroch the Bollandist, no military order can prove that it originated before the twelfth century.

(5) The *Dannebrog*.—This Danish order, if it had a mediaeval origin at all, and was not, as Hélyot was inclined to suspect, manufactured in the seventeenth century, was founded by Waldemar II. about 1219. The number of knights must not exceed 19.

(6) The *Garter*.—Founded by Edward III. in 1347. According to the common story,

[1] Sess. xxiv. De Ref. c. 5.
[2] Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, i. 278.

[1] From Nicholas Upton's book, written about 1441, *De Re Militari*, as cited by Hélyot.

which, however, appears to have been unknown to Froissart, the Countess of Salisbury dropped her garter in the court at Windsor, which the king picked up and bound round his knee, and then, perceiving that the courtiers were inclined to laugh, said "Honi soit qui mal y pense." "Honi" is old French for *maudit*, accursed. The number of the knights, including the king, was fixed at twenty-six, and to this it was limited for several centuries. The number at the present time is forty-nine. The ancient dress was a blue mantle with a red cross on the left side, a collar whence depended a representation of St. George and the Dragon, called a "George" (*cf.* Shakespeare's "Now by my George, my garter, and my crown") and a blue garter round the left leg.

(7) The *Glorious Virgin Mary*.—Founded at Vicenza in 1233. The knights, who must be of noble blood, bound themselves (like a "vigilance committee" in modern times) to take up arms against the disturbers of the public peace, and against those who committed outrages and escaped punishment. They vowed conjugal chastity, obedience to their commander, and to protect widows and orphans. In course of time they became rich, and thought more of enjoying themselves than of anything else; whence the people called them in derision the "Joyous Brothers."

(8) The *Golden Horseshoe*.—Founded at Paris by a duke of Bourbon in 1414. Its object seems to have been to encourage duelling, since the seventeen knights of whom it was composed swore to fight with each other, on foot or *à outrance*, within two years, if they could not sooner find seventeen gentlemen outside the order who would fight with them.

(9) The *Thistle*.—Instituted by James V., King of Scotland, in 1534. The collar of the order is of thistles twisted together; from it hangs the badge of St. Andrew, with the motto "Nemo me impune lacessit." After the flight of Mary Stuart to England this institute fell into abeyance, but was revived by James II. at Windsor in 1687, when he made several great Scottish noblemen knights of the order. Again it came to nothing in consequence of the revolution of 1688, but was revived by Queen Anne in 1703, on a Protestant basis. The order, which numbers at present twenty knights, is accessible only to peers.

(10) The *Toison d'Or*, or *Golden Fleece*.—Instituted by Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, in 1429, with a distinctly religious and Catholic end. The original statutes say that out of the great and perfect love which Duke Philip had to the noble estate of chivalry, "in order that the true Catholic faith, the estate of Holy Church our mother, and the tranquillity and prosperity of the Commonwealth may be . . . defended, guarded, and maintained," he had instituted, and did institute, on that his wedding day, to the glory of God, in reverence of his blessed Mother, and in honour of the Apostle St. Andrew, "an order and fraternity of chivalry or amiable company of a certain number of knights . . . to be called the order of the Toison d'Or." Charles the Bold, son of the founder, required the knights to assume a magnificent dress of crimson velvet. The grandson of Charles, the Archduke Philip, marrying the heiress of Ferdinand and Isabella, transmitted the right of conferring the order of the Toison d'Or to the kings of Spain, who have ever since retained it. But the Emperor of Austria also claims the right. The figure of a sheep in gold, hung round the neck by a silken ribbon or a small gold chain, is the distinguishing decoration of the order.

In the long list of these military orders there are several which accomplished in their day real work, and work which could not have been accomplished so well by any other agency. When the organization of society as a whole was still imperfect, kings were glad to employ these partial organizations, in which the actuating principle was religious enthusiasm or love of fame, to check enemies abroad and abuses at home that otherwise could not easily have been reached. Yet it is impossible not to suspect that a large proportion of these institutions did more harm than good—by fostering aristocratic pride and exclusiveness, and pandering to social or personal vanity—thus raising barriers unnecessarily between class and class, and furnishing fuel to those smarting feelings of envy and alienation which are wont only to be appeased by revolution. (Hélyot.)

MILLENNIUM. In the Apocalypse (ch. xx.) it is said that, after the destruction of God's enemies, "the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies," with "the false prophet" and Satan himself, will be bound and cast into the pit. The saints are then to rise and reign with Christ a thousand years. At the end of this period Satan is to be loosed for a brief space. The nations deceived by him will gather against the "beloved city" in which the saints are encamped. Then fire will descend and devour the wicked; Satan will be cast for ever into hell, and the general judgment will take place. Many of the early Christians took this as a literal description of events which would occur at the end of the world's history. Those who held to such an interpretation were known as Chiliasts or Millenarians—*i.e.* believers in the reign of a thousand years. This belief was very common in the early Church. It was held by Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, early in the second century (Eusebius "H.E." iii. 39), by St. Justin Martyr ("Trypho," 81), by St. Irenæus ("Adv. Haer." v. 36), by Lactantius ("Div. Inst." vii. 24), by Tertullian and

Victorinus Petabionensis (see Jerome, "De Vir. Illustr." xviii., where he refers to a lost work of Tertullian). The opinion was, no doubt, Jewish in origin. (See Grabe, "Spicileg." vol. i. p. 231.) It was also held outside the Church in a gross and sensual form by the Judaizing Gnostic Cerinthus (Eusebius "H.E." iii. 28), and opposed by the Roman presbyter Caius (Euseb. *loc. cit.*). At Alexandria the allegorical mode of interpretation was of course unfavourable to Chiliasm. Still, even in the Alexandrian district, Nepos, bishop of Arsinoe, in the middle of the third century, was a vehement Millenarian. He wrote a "refutation of the Allegorists" (ἔλεγχος τῶν ἀλληγοριστῶν), directed particularly against Origen, and had a powerful following. Peace was restored by Dionysius of Alexandria, who held a council on the matter in 255. (See Eusebius, vii. 23, and Hefele-Leclercq, i. 193 *sqq.*). It was probably the fear of Millenarianism which partly occasioned the objections long prevalent in the East to the authority of the Apocalypse. After the establishment of Christianity, the belief in the reign of the saints for a thousand years almost died out. But St. Augustine ("Civ. Dei," xx. 7, PL, xli. 607 *seq.*) confesses that he once held it. It appeared from time to time in the Middle Ages, and is still advocated by some Protestants.

Muzzarelli (quoted by Jungmann, "De Novissimis," p. 303) sums up the common judgment of theologians on the subject. The theory as held by the early Fathers, he says, is not heretical, but, considering the weight of authority on the other side, it is at least improbable. (Franzelin "De Trad." 191.)

MINIMS (*Ordo Minimorum Eremitarum Sancti Francisci de Paula*). The name commonly applied to members of the order of Minim-Hermits, an austere order of mendicant friars founded by St. Francis of Paula. They were known in Paris before the Revolution as *Bons Hommes*—"Good Men"—because, as it is supposed, their convent in Paris had at one time belonged to the monks of Grand Mont, who had popularly been so called; and in Spain as "Brothers of Victory," on account of the victory which Ferdinand V. had gained at Malaga over the Moors as a result, according to the general belief, of the prayers of St. Francis of Paula. They were called "Minims" (*minimi*, the least, Mt. xxv. 40) by their founder, to humble them even below the Franciscans, who in humility call themselves *minores* (friars minor), the "less."

St. Francis, their founder, was born about 1416 in Calabria in Italy, at Paola, a small city on the western coast midway between Naples and Reggio. When a boy of thirteen, Francis was sent to a Franciscan convent in his native town, for he had already begun to display the extraordinary piety which gave indication of his future holy career. He showed a strong affection for the Franciscan rule, but it was not the will of God that he should become a member of that order. At nineteen he was living as a hermit in a solitary place near Paola, and the fame of his sanctity had already spread about in Calabria. Young as he was in years, his piety was so well assured that he was prevailed on, with the approbation of the ordinary of the diocese, to receive some disciples, and with them he began a religious community in Paola. In 1444 he established a colony at Paterno, and eight years later he finished on a more splendid scale his convent and church at Paola; the next year (1453) making a third establishment at Spezano Maggiore, and in 1460 founding still another convent at Cortona. So far the new religious order had been living without any rule, except such as their holy founder had from time to time given them by word of mouth and by the example of his own life. But from the first a perpetual Lent had been observed by them. In 1464 Francis founded the first house of his order in Sicily, at Milazzo, where he remained until his return to Calabria in 1468.

The fame of his sanctity having reached Rome, a strict examination was made into the history of his life and into the working of his communities, and in 1473 Pope Sixtus IV. approved the new congregation under the name of the "Hermits of St. Francis of Assisi." The following year Francis was named by the Holy See its first superior-general, and the congregation was exempted from the jurisdiction of the ordinaries. But Sixtus refused to sanction the perpetual Lent, though even this was afterwards accorded. In 1493 Francis composed his first Rule, which was approved by Pope Alexander VI., who changed the name of the order to the "Minim-Hermits of Francis of Paola," the name it has retained ever since. In 1495 the same Pope confirmed the privileges hitherto conferred on the order, also giving it all the privileges generally possessed by the mendicant friars. In 1501, having perfected his first Rule and having rearranged it, and having also established his perpetual Lent as a vow, and having prepared a Rule for people of either sex who live in the world—that is to say, Tertiaries—he submitted these two Rules to the Pope, who approved them the next year (1502). The Rules, being again modified, were confirmed by a bull of Alexander VI. which conferred new privileges; all of which was again confirmed in 1505 by Pope Julius II. Finally, the holy founder having put the finishing touch to his two Rules, and having added a third Rule for nuns, all three were approved and confirmed by a bull of the same Pope July 25, 1506. Besides these three Rules Francis composed a *Correctorium*, or manual of penances, and a *Ceremonial* for the recitation of the Divine Office, &c.

Francis was invited to France by Louis XI., whom he attended on his deathbed; and there he spent the rest of his days, founding numerous communities in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany. The first colony in Spain was made at Malaga in 1493; in Germany in 1497. The order was never established in the North of Europe, nor in England, Scotland, or Ireland, for the persecution which soon set in in all those countries rendered them unfit fields for so contemplative an order as the Minims. St. Francis died in his convent at Plessis-les-Tours, Good Friday, 1507, being then ninety-one, and was canonized by Leo X. in 1519. In 1562 the Huguenots, while sacking this convent, found the saint's body, and, having fastened a rope about its neck, dragged it to the chapel, where they burned it along with the crucifix of the high altar, but some Catholics afterwards recovered the saint's bones from the ashes.

On January 1, 1508, Father Francis Binet was elected general. At that time the order was divided into five provinces—Italy, Tours, France, Spain, and Germany—but it afterwards had thirty-one provinces. At first the general of the order was chosen for three years, but since 1605 he has always been elected for six years by the general chapter, which consists of the general, the colleagues-general, the provincial, and the procurator-general. Each province has its chapter also. The superior of a convent is called the corrector, because he is required to correct himself and those subject to him, and he is elected for one year, ordinarily not being eligible for re-election except after an interval of at least one year. Formerly there were visitors-general, but these were suppressed as unnecessary.

Like many other mendicant orders, the Minims consist of First, Second, and Third Orders so called—that is to say, of friars, nuns, and tertiaries, these latter being affiliated lay people living in the world. The Minim tertiaries never but once, and that for a short time only—at Toledo, in Spain—have lived in community. St. Francis of Sales is said to have been a Minim tertiary. The first nuns of the order took their vows in 1495 at Andujar, in Spain. The habit of the Minim friars consists of a gown of coarse woollen stuff, reaching to the ankles, and of the natural colour of the wool without any dye. The chaperon, or shoulder-piece of the cowl, of the same colour as the gown, reaches in front to about halfway between the waist and the knee. The girdle is a woollen, unbleached and undyed rope, and has five knots for the clerical and lay friars and four for the tertiaries. Formerly the Minims were barefoot, or at most wore sandals; but the custom was relaxed, and now all are shod. With the exception of the head-dress, which resembles that worn by most orders of nuns, the habit of the Minim nuns is similar to that of the friars. (See "Acta Sanctorum," April 2; Butler, "Lives of the Saints," April 2; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongr. der Kath. Kirche," ii. 527.)

MINISTER. Among the Franciscans and Capuchins the head of the order is the minister-general, and each province is placed under a minister-provincial. In the Society of Jesus the second in command in each house, who is usually charged with the internal discipline, commissariat, &c., is called "minister."

MINISTERS OF THE SICK. This order was first founded as a congregation of priests and lay brothers by St. Camillus of Lellis to serve the sick in hospitals. The approval of the Holy See was given in 1586; five years later Gregory XIV. constituted them a religious order, under the protection of Cardinal di Mondovi, with their principal establishment at the Church of St. Mary Magdalen at Rome and in the houses adjoining. The religious, besides the three ordinary vows, take a fourth vow to assist the sick in the hour of death. There is a general of the order elected for life, who is assisted by four consultors; the chapter-general meets once in six years. The dress is that of secular priests, with the addition of a large brown cross on the soutane, and another on the cloak. The noviciate lasts for two years; the religious are exempt from the obligation of singing office in choir, and from attending processions, on account of the absorbing nature of their duties beside the sick. They only fast on Fridays, in addition to the fasts prescribed by the Church. At the death of the founder in 1614, there were sixteen houses of the order, containing about three hundred religious. (Hélyot.)

MINORITES. [See FRANCISCANS.]

MINOR ORDERS. The inferior ranks of the sacred ministry—door-keepers (*ostiarii*), lectors, exorcists, and acolytes—are said to be in minor orders (see those articles). In the Greek Church there are only two minor orders, lector and subdeacon. Originally when a man became a clerk, he was irrevocably attached to the service of the Church (Con. Chalced., can. 7), but since the thirteenth century the Latin Church allows *simple clerks*, below the dignity of subdeacon, to quit the ecclesiastical profession if they so desire. (See ORDER, HOLY, p. 626; Ferraris.)

MIRACLES. The Latin word *miraculum* means something wonderful—not necessarily supernatural, for, *e.g.*, the "Seven Wonders of the World" were known as the "Septem Miracula." In theological Latin, however, and in English, the words *miraculum*, "miracle," are used commonly only of events so wonderful that they cannot be accounted for by natural causes. This use, as we shall see presently, is not sanctioned by the Vulgate translation of the New Testament, and is not thoroughly supported by the language of the

original Greek. It has its disadvantages as well as its advantages, though, of course, the established terminology cannot be altered now, even if it were possible—as we believe it is not—to find a more convenient word. It will be well, however, to say something on the Scriptural, and particularly the New Testament, phraseology.

(1) Miracles are called τέρατα (*prodigia*). See Exod. iv. 21, where it is the rendering of מוֹפְתִים, shining or splendid deeds)—*i.e.* prodigies, because of the surprise they cause. The Greek word θαυμάσια, which would exactly answer to *miracula*, is found in the New Testament once only (θαῦμα never[1]), Mt. xxi. 15; and there in a wider sense than "miracle." There is no great difference, from a theological point of view, between the words "prodigy" and "miracle." It is, however, well worth notice that the New Testament never uses the word "prodigy" by itself. It speaks of "signs and prodigies," &c., many times; of "prodigies" simply, never. Evidently, the wonder caused is not the only or even the chief feature in a miracle, and this the New Testament writers are careful to note.[2]

(2) Miracles are also frequently called "signs" (σημεῖα; an accurate rendering of אוֹתוֹת Ex. vii. 3), to indicate their purpose. They are "marvels" and "prodigies" which arouse attention, but the "wonder" excited is a means, and not an end, and the "miracle" is a token of God's presence; they confirm the mission and the teaching of those who deliver a message in His name (see Acts xiv. 3; Heb. ii. 4), and they are object-lessons (parables in action) of that teaching. Of course, it is only by usage that the word "sign" acquires this technical sense, and it does not always in the New Testament mean a supernatural sign.

(3) They are often described as "powers" (δυνάμεις),[3] inasmuch as they exhibit God's power. They are evidences that new powers have entered our world and are working thus for the good of mankind. God, no doubt, is always working, and He manifests His power in the operation of natural law. But we are in danger of looking upon the world as if it were governed by laws independent of God, and of forgetting that His hand is as necessary in each moment of the world's existence for each operation of created things as it was for creation at the first. In a miracle, God produces sensible effects which transcend the operation of natural causes. Men are no longer able to say, "This is Nature," forgetting all the while that Nature is the continuous work of God; and they confess, "The finger of God is here." In Christ, miracles were the "powers" or works of power done by Him who was Himself the power of God. And so miracles done through the saints flow from, and are signs of, the power of God within them. "Stephen, full of grace and power, did great prodigies and signs among the people" (Acts vi. 8).

(4) Christ's miracles are often called emphatically His "works," as if the form of working to be looked for from Him in whom the "fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily." They were the characteristic works of Him who came to free us from the bondage of Nature, to be our life, to overcome death, to lead us, first to a worthier and more unselfish life, and then to a better world in which sorrow and death shall be no more. They are the first-fruits of his power; the pledges of that mighty working by which, one day, He will subject all things to Himself and make all things new.

From a different point of view, then, the same event is a "prodigy" (effect), a "sign" (purpose), and a "power" (cause); each word presenting it under a distinct and instructive aspect. The three words occur three times together—viz. in Acts ii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9 (in the last passage, of the false miracles of Antichrist). In each case the Vulgate has kept the distinction with accurate and delicate fidelity (*virtutibus, et prodigiis, et signis*), and we cannot help expressing our regret that the Rheims version, and also the Protestant Authorized Version, should have obliterated the distinction and blunted the sense of Scripture by translating —*e.g.* Acts ii. 22—"by miracles and wonders and signs," as if "wonder" added anything to "miracle."[1]

We cannot pretend to consider here, in full, the objections made to the possibility of miracles, but can only give in brief the teaching of Catholic theologians, and particularly of St. Thomas, on the matter. The latter defines a miracle as an effect which "is beyond the order (or laws) of the whole of created nature"—"praeter ordinem totius naturae creatae" (1ª, q. 110, a. 4). He explains further that an event may transcend the laws of some particular nature and yet by no means be miraculous. The motion of a stone when thrown up in the air, to take his own instance, is an effect which exceeds the power which resides in the nature of the stone; but it is no miracle, for it is produced by the natural power of man, and does not therefore exceed the power of nature in its entirety. No natural law can account for the

[1] Never, *i.e.*, for a "wonderful thing." See Apoc. xvii. 7.

[2] The Hebrew נִפְלָאוֹת "wonderful things in the land of Cham" (Ps. cvi. 22), is the word nearest to "miracula."

[3] גְּבוּרוֹת "deeds of strength," is the Old Testament word which comes nearest δυνάμεις, and the Peshito has almost the same word, ܚܝܠܐ, but it is used, very inaccurately, for σημεῖα (Acts ii. 19, 43; v. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 12), for τέρατα (Acts xv. 12), for τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα (Acts ii. 22; iv. 30). In Acts vii. 36 there are three Syriac terms for two Greek. The text of the Peshito before us is that of Leusden and Schaaf.

[1] R.V., "mighty works, and wonders and signs."

sun's going back on the dial of Ahaz, for the resurrection of Lazarus, or for the cure of Peter's wife's mother by Christ when she was sick of a fever. All these things exceeded the powers of Nature, though in different degrees, and they are instances of the three grades of the miraculous which St. Thomas distinguishes (1ª, q. 105, a. 8). In the first case, the very substance of the thing done is beyond the power of Nature to effect ("excedit facultatem naturae, quantum ad substantiam facti"); in the second, the recipient of the effect stamps it as miraculous ("excedit facultatem naturae, quantum ad id in quo fit"), since natural powers can indeed give life, but not to the dead; in the third, it is the manner and order in which the effect is produced ("modus et ordo faciendi") that is miraculous, for the instantaneous cure of disease by Christ's word is very different from a cure effected by the gradual operation of care and medical treatment. The latter is natural, the former supernatural.

The definition given makes it unreasonable to deny the possibility of miracles, unless we also deny the existence of God. Usually, He works according to natural laws, and this for our good, since we should be unable to control natural agents and to make them serve us unless we could count on the effects known causes will produce. But God is necessarily free; He is not subject to natural laws, and He may, for wise reasons, make created things the instruments of effects which are beyond their natural capacity. A miracle is not an effect without a cause; on the contrary, it is a miracle because produced by God, the First Cause. It is not a capricious exercise of power. The same God who operates usually, and for wise ends, according to the laws which He has implanted in Nature, may on occasion, and for ends equally wise, produce effects which transcend these laws. Nor does God in working miracles contradict Himself, for where has He bound Himself never and for no reason to operate except according to these laws?

It is also clear from the definition given that God alone can work miracles. "Whatever an angel or any other creature does by his own power is according to the order of created nature," and therefore not miraculous according to the definition with which we started (1ª, q. 110, a. 4). It is quite permissible to speak of saints or angels as working miracles; indeed, Scripture itself does so speak. Still, we must always understand that God alone really performs the wonder, and that the creature is merely His instrument. Hence it follows that no miracle can possibly be wrought except for a good purpose. It does not, however, follow that persons through whose instrumentality miracles occur are good and holy. St. Thomas, quoting St. Jerome, holds that evil men who preach the faith and call on Christ's name may perform true miracles, the object of these miracles being to confirm the truths which these unworthy persons utter and the cause which they represent.[1] Thus the gift of miracles is in itself no proof of holiness. But, as a rule, miracles are effected by holy men and women, and very often they are the signs by which God attests their sanctity and the power of their prayer (2ª, 2æ, q. 178, a. 2). In all these cases, the miracle is a sign of God's will, and cannot, except through our own perversity, lead us into error.

It is otherwise with the "lying wonders" which, St. Paul says, Antichrist will work, or which Pharaoh's magicians are supposed by some to have done by the help of devils. Real miracles these cannot be, for God, who is the very truth, cannot work wonders to lead His creatures into error. But the demons, according to St. Thomas, are so far beyond us in knowledge and strength that they may well work marvels which would exceed all natural powers, so far as we know them, and would seem to us superior to any natural power whatsoever, and so to be truly miraculous (1ª, q. 114, a. 4). True miracles, then, are practically distinguished from false ones by their moral character. They are not mere marvels, meant to gratify the curiosity of the spectator and the vanity of the performer. They are signs of God's presence; they bring us nearer to Him with whom "we ever have to do"; they remind us that we are to be holy as He is holy, to cultivate humility, purity, the love of God and man. The doctrine which they confirm must appeal to us, apart from its miraculous attestation. "Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but His who sent me. If any man will do His will, he will know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself. He who speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him, he is true, and injustice is not in him" (Jn. vii. 16). So our Lord appeals, in answering John's disciples, to his miracles, not simply as works of power, but as stamped with a moral character, and in their connection with the rest of His work. "Blind see again and lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and deaf hear, and corpses are raised, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them; and blessed is he whosoever shall not be scandalized in me" (Mt. xi. 5 *seq.*). In short, there was a witness within, as well as without, to Christ's mission, and the miracles had no voice for those who were deaf to the voice within. Because they were deaf to this voice within, the Pharisees ascribed Christ's miracles to Beelzebub. They blasphemed, or were in danger of blaspheming, the Holy Ghost who spoke to their hearts. And precisely the same danger which

[1] Sylvius, one of the best-known commentators on St. Thomas, holds that heretics may work miracles; not, however, in confirmation of their heresy.

made men reject Christ's miracles will make them accept the marvels of Antichrist.

So far, many Protestants are with us; but whereas most of them consider that miracles ceased with, or soon after, the Apostolic age, the Catholic Church, not, indeed, so far as we know, by any formal definition, but by her constant practice in the canonization of saints, and through the teaching of her theologians, declares that the gift of miracles is an abiding one, manifested from time to time in her midst. This belief is logical and consistent. Miracles are as possible now as they were nineteen centuries ago. They were wrought throughout the course of the old dispensation and by the Apostles after Christ's death; and although miracles, no doubt, were specially needed, and therefore more numerous, when Christianity was a new religion, we have no right to dictate to the All-wise, and maintain that they have ceased to be required at all. Heathen nations have still to be converted. Great saints are raised up in different ages to renew the fervour of Christians and turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. The only reasonable course is to examine the evidence for modern miracles when it presents itself, and to give or withhold belief accordingly. This is just what the Church does. The Anglican Bishop Fitzgerald, at the end of a most thoughtful and useful essay on "Miracles" in Smith's "Bible Dictionary," asserts that, according to the confession of their ablest advocates, ecclesiastical miracles belong to the class "of miracles which may be described as ambiguous and tentative—*i.e.* the event, if it occurred at all, may have been the result of natural causes." Then, indeed, the question would be at an end. But anyone who looks into Benedict XIV.'s treatise on "Canonization," or into Cardinal Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties," will see what an extraordinary mistake this is. This able writer is wasting words and exposing the weakness of his own cause when he argues that the course of Nature cannot be interrupted "by random and capricious variation," that strong evidence *is* needed to make supposed miracles credible, and that the true miracles of Christianity at its birth may have occasioned spurious imitations of fanatical credulity. All this may be admitted, but it does not touch the question. And when Dr. Fitzgerald rests the belief in miracles upon the authority of inspired writers, and urges that there is no such authority for ecclesiastical miracles, he forgets that the first Christians must have believed the miracles of Christ and the Apostles before any inspired record of them had been made. In many cases, too, the belief in Apostolic miracles must have come first, that in Apostolic inspiration second.

It must be observed, however, that ecclesiastical and Scriptural miracles claim widely different kinds of belief. The Scriptural miracles rest on divine faith, and must be accepted without doubt. (Vatican Council, sess. iii. cap. 3, can. 4.) No ecclesiastical miracle can become the object of faith, nor is any Catholic bound to believe in any particular miracle not recorded in Scripture. He could not, without unsoundness in doctrine, deny that any miracles had occurred since the Apostolic age, and he owes a filial respect to the judgment of high ecclesiastical authority; but within these limits he is left to the freedom and to the responsibilities of private judgment.

Lastly, although there is a danger in incredulity, even when this incredulity does not amount to abandonment of the faith, Catholic saints and doctors have insisted on the opposite danger of credulity. To attribute false miracles, says St. Peter Damian, to God or His saints, is to bear false witness against them; and he reminds those who estimate sanctity by miraculous power that nothing is read of miracles done by the Blessed Virgin or St. John Baptist, eminent as they were in sanctity, and that the virtues of the saints which we can copy are more useful than miracles which excite our wonder (Fleury, "H.E." lxi. 2). Neander ("Kirchengeschichte," viii. p. 26 *seq.*), after speaking of the popular taste for legendary miracles in the Middle Ages, continues: "Men were not wanting to contend against this spirit, and a catena of testimonies may be produced from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries on the true significance of the miraculous in relation to the divine life, and against an exaggerated estimation of external miracles. Nor were such thoughts peculiar to enlightened men who rose above their age; they may be taken as an expression of the common Christian feeling in those centuries." The mediaeval biographer of Bernard of Tiron says that for the conversions of fallen women which he effected through God's grace he was more to be admired than if he had raised their dead bodies to life. And the biographer of St. Norbert writes: "It is the visible miracles which astonish the simple and ignorant, but it is the patience and virtues of the saints which are to be admired and imitated by those who gird themselves to Christ's service." (See the references in Neander, *loc. cit.*)

(St. Thomas, "Contra Gentiles," iii. 98–107. On the subject of miracles generally, Archbishop Trench's dissertation at the beginning of his "Notes on the Miracles" may be consulted. It is specially valuable for its Patristic references. The opinions of the Schoolmen on the nature of miracles are well given by Neander, vol. viii. p. 26 of the last German edition. Cardinal Newman's "Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles" is well known; Leroy, "La Contestation du Miracle"; G. H. Joyce, "The Question of Miracles," an admirable little work which goes thoroughly into the subject.)

MISERERE. The first word in the Vulgate translation of Ps. 50 (Heb. 51). There are two other psalms beginning with the same word "Miserere" (55 and 56), but the liturgical use of Ps. 50 is so prominent that the name has been appropriated to Ps. 50. Formerly it was the first psalm at Lauds in all the ferial offices throughout the year (Paschal tide excluded), and also in the Sunday office from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday; but in the new reformed psalter it is recited "in vigiliis communibus," in the ferial office at Lauds during Advent and during the period Septuagesima to Holy Week, and on the Sundays as before. Moreover, it is no longer recited in the *preces feriales* at Vespers as was formerly the case. It retains, however, its position at the end of the hours (before the prayer) on the last three days of Holy Week.

The "Miserere" is the fourth of the Penitential Psalms (*q.v.*) and occurs in many ceremonial functions of the Church; *e.g.* the burial of the dead, at various blessings and consecrations &c. (For the famous musical settings of the "Miserere" in the Tenebrae offices see Wiseman, "Holy Week," lect. ii., and Rockstro in Grove's "Dict. of Music," *Miserere.* For the psalm itself see B. John Fisher, "The Seven Penitential Psalms"; McSwiney, "Translation of the Psalms and Canticles, with Commentary.")

MISSAL. The book which contains the complete service for Mass throughout the year.

In the ancient Church there was no one book answering to our Missal. The service for Mass was contained in the Antiphonary, Lectionary, Book of the Gospels, and Sacramentary. This last, besides matter relating to other sacraments, gave the collects, secrets, prefaces, canon, prayer *infra canonem*, and post-communion, and from the eighth century at latest it was known as Missal or Mass-book. There were "Completa Missalia"—*i.e.* Missals which contained more of the service of the Mass than the Sacramentaries; but we do not know how far this completeness went, for "during the ages which intervened between the use of the Liber Sacramentorum and the general adoption of the complete book of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Missal was in a transition state, sometimes containing more, sometimes less of the entire office. Thus the MSS. which still exist vary in their contents" (Maskell, "Monumenta Rit." p. lxiii. *seq.*).[1] There are, of course, printed Missals according to the various rites—Missale Romanum, Ambrosianum, Missale ad usum Sarum (first printed edition known, Paris, 1487), and the various uses of religious orders (Dominicans, Benedictines, &c.). The Roman Missal was carefully revised and printed under Pius V., who carried out a decree of the Council of Trent on the matter, and strictly enjoined the use of this Missal, or faithful reprints of it, in all churches which could not claim prescription of two hundred years for their own use. It was revised again under Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. New Masses have of course been added from time to time, and to the Missal, as to the Breviary, a "Proper" may be added by permission of the Holy See, containing Masses for the saints venerated in a particular country, diocese, order, &c. (See MASS; Ebner, "Quellen und Forschungen zur Gesch. und Kunstgesch. des Missale Rom. im Mittelalter"; Lippe and Legg, "The Missale Rom. of 1474"; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

MISSION. Mission is inseparably connected with jurisdiction, so that he who is validly "sent" exercises a lawful jurisdiction in the place to which, and over the persons to whom, he is sent; and, *e converso*, any person exercising a lawful jurisdiction must be held to have received true mission. Mission precedes jurisdiction in the order of thought, but is coincident with it in practice.

A priest having the care of souls within a certain district must be sent to that district by the bishop, who has the general charge of all the souls within his diocese; he cannot appoint himself to it. "How shall they preach unless they be sent?"[1] In a parish properly so called there may be more priests than one engaged in ministerial functions, but one alone has the responsibility, as the *curatus*, of the souls within it. He has *ordinary*, not delegated faculties; other priests ministering within his parish have not ordinary faculties. In missions, as here in England, the head priest and the others usually differ only in this, that the latter receive their faculties to be exercised "cum dependentia" of the former. Priests, even parish priests, are not now held to have jurisdiction in the external forum (Soglia, ii. § 86), but only in the internal. [FORUM, &c.]

Again, the bishop from whom the mission of the *parochus* is derived does not assume his pastoral office of his own authority; still less, in consequence of a call from his flock; his recognition or confirmation, if not actual election, by the Pope as the successor of St. Peter constitutes his mission and the title of his jurisdiction. The mission of the Pope himself is from above, and rests on the divine promises, clearly expressed as they are in Holy Scripture, and certified by the tradition of the Church. [CHURCH OF CHRIST; POPE.]

"The mission of the priest," says Bendel,[2] "has its prototype in that of Jesus Christ: 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.' Jesus Christ was sent into the world to seek all the souls which were lost; the Apostles were sent by Jesus Christ to all parts of the earth

[1] The *Missale Plenarium* contains all the service for Mass—*i.e.* it is a Missal in the modern sense.

[1] Rom. x. 15.

[2] Art. "Missions," in Wetzer and Welte, first ed.

to continue His work in His name; the successors of the Apostles, without any break in the chain, are sent by the Church to fulfil their charge, and these send in their turn the confessors and pastors delegated by them to spread the beams of grace from the centre to the extremities, and cause every soul which desires it to participate in the benefits of their ministry." . . . . "The Church is the visible institute of salvation among men; through her alone power is given to the priest, by mission, to announce in the virtue of the Holy Ghost the word of God, as it has been all along preserved incorrupt by her, to transmit to the faithful the graces of which, through the merits of Christ, she is the depositary, and to direct them in the way of salvation in virtue of the sovereign authority which she represents. He who is not legitimately sent cannot be, in the full force of the words, 'a minister of the Church having charge of souls.'"

In non-Catholic denominations the mission to a particular locality usually proceeds from the governing body, such as the General Assembly in the Kirk of Scotland, or the Conference of a hundred ministers among the Wesleyans. But if it be asked whence such governing bodies derived their mission, it is invariably found that they derived it in the first instance from some heresiarch or other self-appointed individual, who made a breach in ecclesiastical unity, or else made a fresh schism in that which was itself a schism. Thus mission among the Presbyterians has Calvin and among the Methodists Wesley, for its fountain-head. In the Anglican Church mission is derived ostensibly from the Crown, which claims to be "in all causes and over all persons, ecclesiastical and civil," within the British Empire "supreme." Every bishop, on doing homage for his see to the sovereign, has to say, "I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the bishopric of it, and the possession of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the Imperial Crown of this your Majesty's realm." [1] Those who find this view too Erastian hold that mission is conferred along with consecration, in which case Anglican mission must be ultimately derived from Parker, Elizabeth's first bishop, who made a breach in ecclesiastical unity. [See JURISDICTION.]

MISSION (=*quasi-parish*). In countries where the majority of the population is non-Catholic, either through having lost the faith or not having yet been converted to it, the priests having charge of souls are not inducted into parishes, but stationed on missions. In England, after the change of religion, many such missions were entrusted to members of religious orders, which enjoyed in a normal state of things various privileges and exemptions. This led to a conflict of jurisdiction between the monastic superiors and the vicars-apostolic, and it was finally decided by Benedict XIV. that "regular missionaries in England are subject to the vicars-apostolic in all that concerns the care of souls and the administration of the sacraments," [1] notwithstanding the privileges of their orders. In what relates to the observance of their rule they are subject to their monastic superiors. Leo XIII. issued in 1881 the constitution *Romanos Pontifices*, which makes further regulations on the subject. Since the establishment of the hierarchy in England in 1850 the priests with quasi-parishes still remain mere missioners, removable at the bishop's will, with the exception of "missionary rectors" permanently instituted (see Acts of Prov. Council of Westm. I. App.), who, in virtue of decrees of Propaganda and synodal statutes confirmed by the Holy See, hold certain rights and privileges. But the status of missionary rectors and other rectors has lately been modified by the decree "Maxima Cura." [See RECTOR.] (Ferraris, *Missiones*; *Missionarii*; Taunton.)

MISSION OF DIVINE PERSONS. [See TRINITY, D, 5.]

MISSIONS, POPULAR. To quicken faith and piety among Christians whom their life in the world has made tepid and careless, is for the pastors of the Church an object of no less solicitude than to convert the heathen. In substance, mission-preaching has been employed in every age of the Church; it was applied with extraordinary fruit by St. Francis and St. Dominic; but its reduction to a system has been the work of comparatively recent times, and was commenced by St. Vincent of Paul, when (1617) he preached his first mission to the peasants of Folleville. [See LAZARISTS.] The Jesuits, Redemptorists, Passionists, and Rosminians have applied themselves with special earnestness to this branch of pastoral work (see those articles). The following sketch of a mission and of its fruits is from an article by Stemmer. [2] "A popular mission consists in a series of sermons and religious exercises, lasting over a certain number of days, directed by missionary priests with the approbation of the ordinary, in order to instruct and convert sinners, and rekindle Christian faith and Christian practice. This series or cycle of meditations, devotional exercises, and addresses, the general aim of which is to excite penitential feelings, treats of the destiny and end of man, of free will, of the need of grace, of the divine justice, eternity, the necessity of conversion, the heinousness of sin, its consequences, and the misery of impenitence; of the last things—hell, eternal punishment, and damnation. Together with these terrifying themes the preacher speaks of the mercy and love of God, the graces stored up in the Church, the sacraments of Penance

[1] Hutton, *The Anglican Ministry*, 1879, p. 504 *n*.

[1] Flanagan, *Church History*, ii. 373.
[2] Wetzer and Welte, "Missions" (first ed.).

and the Eucharist; usually also of loving our enemies, Holy Communion, the renewal of baptismal vows, and perseverance in doing good. In this way the sinner is brought to contrition, whence come hope and a moral change." After describing the availableness at this stage of the tribunal of Penance, the writer proceeds: "The mission is usually terminated by the renewal of baptismal vows," a general communion," the dedication of the parish to the Blessed Virgin, promises of amendment and thanksgiving before the altar, the erection of a cross or stations, the solemn publication of the indulgence attached to the mission, and the celebration of Mass for the souls of the relatives and friends of the faithful present. Thus do the few days devoted to a true popular mission, with all the truths which it proclaims, all the acts which it disposes to and realises, form a real source of benediction to the souls that are willing to profit by it. It is a work of teaching and conversion which undeceives those who are misled, convinces those who doubt, shakes the indifferent in their false security, and stops hardened sinners in full career; it is an extraordinary weapon with which falsehood and error are attacked directly, boldly, and persistently, to the destruction of erroneous systems and the triumphant erection of truth on their ruins. Deep-seated prejudices and inveterate faults, though attacked at intervals from the pulpit, always find some corner in the heart where they can hide themselves and hold their ground; but the man who attends a mission meets an assailant who deals blow after blow until the conviction of the enormity of his blindness and of his faults is forced upon the hearer's conscience. Ill-gotten gains are renounced, guilty practices and criminal connections are broken off, hatreds of old standing are appeased, separated couples reconciled, lawsuits amicably settled; the converted sinners show a change of conduct, and the face of family and parochial life is altered; through the whole district human existence is modified for the better; sanctification spreads; and where unbelief, immorality, discord, disobedience, and antipathy formerly prevailed, the serenity of Christian faith is now established, with union, love, and the peace of God."

MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN. The kingdom of God, beginning as a grain of mustard seed nearly nineteen hundred years ago, has grown into a great tree; the stages of its growth are here briefly noticed.

The multitude collected at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, from whom the first converts for the Christian faith were gathered, belonged for the most part to countries bordering on the Levant or lying still further east. They came from Persia, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Arabia, and North Africa; some were from Crete; the only western country indicated is Italy. These converts, when they returned to their homes, must have spread Christian belief around them. The seed thus sown needed tending; and the traditions as to the teaching of the Apostles, which tell us that the labours of most of them were confined to these very Eastern countries, are therefore in strict accordance with the report in Acts ii. St. Thomas, according to a probable tradition, visited India, and founded there the Christian community which still bears his name. The legend that St. James, the son of Zebedee, passed into Spain and founded a Church at Santiago in Galicia, is of little authority.[1] It must have been regarded in the Apostolic circle as a momentous step when St. Paul (Acts xvi. 6–10), crossing the Hellespont, carried the light of Christianity into Europe. St. Peter, after residing for some time at Antioch, fixed his see about A.D. 42 at Rome, which from that time became the centre of Christendom. But the full bearing and import of his primacy were only gradually discerned in the Church; and the Apostolic sees of Alexandria and Antioch, with, later on, Constantinople and Jerusalem, and generally the greater sees, acted as powerful secondary centres to diffuse the faith among the neighbouring countries. In Macedonia, at Athens and Corinth, and in Greece generally, Christianity was planted by St. Paul. A very ancient legend carries Lazarus and his sister Martha to the South of France, near Marseilles. A beautiful tradition, not however older than the Middle Ages, speaks of Joseph of Arimathea as visiting Britain and founding a flourishing Church at Glastonbury.

The preaching of the Gospel made its way through the Roman empire even during the lifetime of the Apostles. The work of the centuries which immediately followed was to consolidate and develop what they had begun. In spite of the terrible persecutions (see PERSECUTIONS) to which the Church was subjected, she continued to add to her numbers. By the end of the second century Tertullian could say: "We are but of yesterday. Yet we have filled all the places you frequent—cities, lodging-houses, villages, townships, markets, the camp itself, the tribes, town councils, the palace, the senate, the forum. We have left you nothing but your temples." (Apol. xxxvii., PL, i. 462.) And again: "On whom else have all the nations of the world believed but on the Christ who has already come? [After quoting Acts ii. 9 *sqq.*] With others as well as the different races of the Gaetuli, many of the tribes of the Mauri, all the confines of Spain, and various tribes of Gaul, with places in Britain which, though inaccessible to Rome, have yielded to Christ. Add the Sarmatae, the Daci, the Germans, the Scythians, and many remote peoples, provinces, and islands

[1] Hefele seems to reject it; see his article on Compostela in *Kirchenlex.*

unknown to us, which we are unable to enumerate." ("Adv. Jud." vii., PL, ii. 610.) "As for the stages of the mission and its history, the outstanding revivals subsequent to the life and labours of Paul are denoted by (1) the era of Commodus and his immediate successors, and (2) by the years 260–303 A.D. In both of these periods, particularly the latter, it is obvious that a large increase accrued to Christianity. The earliest period laid the foundation. House churches and town churches were established. The second period (subsequent to Commodus) saw Christianity a serious factor in the provinces and throughout the empire. In the third period it was prepared, as a universal religion, to assume control over the entire sphere of public religion" (Harnack, "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," ii. 31). To this work the reader may be referred for the study of the missions of the first three centuries The maps are especially valuable.

The next stage in the history of missions is the conversion of the different races of barbarians who overran the Roman empire in the fifth and the succeeding centuries. It was the Goths who were the first of the barbarians to catch something of Roman manners and culture, and they were the first to embrace Christianity. As early as the Council of Nicaea we find the Gothic bishop Theophilus taking his place beside the Greek Fathers. A little later another Goth, Ulphilas, was consecrated at Constantinople, and laboured with great success in spreading Christianity among his countrymen, though in the heretical form of Arianism. He belonged to the Visigothic or Western branch of that race, and they communicated the heresy to the Ostrogothic or Eastern branch. The Visigoths, driven out of Gaul by the Catholic Franks, founded a powerful kingdom in Spain, and were converted to Catholicity in 587 under King Recared.

Like the Visigoths, the Vandals found their way into Spain at the beginning of the fifth century, but they passed over to North Africa, and took possession of Hippo and Carthage. Like the Goths, they were Arians. During the long reign of Genseric (428–477) a fierce persecution raged against the Catholics, especially the bishops and the nobles. The once-flourishing church of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine was destroyed. The persecution continued under Genseric's successor until the Vandal kingdom was overthrown by Belisarius (533). For the conversion of the Irish and the Anglo-Saxons see IRISH CHURCH, ENGLISH CHURCH (Anglo-Saxon period). The Franks, who, under Clovis, had invaded Gaul from beyond the Rhine and destroyed every vestige of Roman domination, embraced Christianity along with their king in 496, after his great victory over the Alemanni.

The Burgundians, a Teutonic people, in alarm at the approach of the Huns, sought instruction in Christianity from the Romanized Gauls among whom they had settled; and having obtained it and embraced the faith, they defeated the invaders (about 439). They were, however, perverted to Arianism by the Visigoths. The conquest of Burgundy by the Franks finally destroyed the last remains of Arianism among them. Germany, like Britain, had received Christianity while still under Roman rule. The inroad of the Huns had first driven the Goths into the Roman provinces, and then destroyed whatever these barbarians had left. When the Huns had retired, the work of reconversion was first conducted by the Frankish saints Rupert, Emmeran, and Corbinian. In the early part of the seventh century Irish monks from Iona (St. Columba and St. Gall) laboured first among the Franks, and then worked their way as far as the Vosges. Thence they penetrated into Switzerland and Northern Italy. Another Irishman, Trudbert, evangelized the region of the Black Forest; and a little later, Killian, also an Irishman, laboured in Thuringia. In Northern Germany and Frisia the work of the Gospel was at first carried on by the Franks, but towards the end of the century it was taken up by Anglo-Saxon missionaries. St. Wilfrid of York preached there for a time, but it was his disciple St. Willibrord who was the true apostle of the Frieslanders. Though all these saints are held in veneration in different parts of Germany, the Germans as a whole look upon St. Boniface as the national patron. He was born in Devonshire about the year 680, and was originally known as Wynfrith. After nearly forty years of missionary labours he was martyred in Frisia in 755.

The last of the Teutonic tribes to embrace Christianity were the Saxons. Hatred of the Franks was partly the reason for refusing to listen to the missionaries, and indeed it was only by force that they were finally converted. During the long war of 772–804 Charlemagne compelled his captives to receive baptism, and removed them from their own country so as to plant them among Christian tribes. Alcuin of York, the emperor's preceptor, protested against this violence, and obtained that devout missionaries should be sent to instruct the nominal converts. When once the work of conversion was complete, the Saxons yielded to no other Germans in their zeal for the Christian faith.

The missionary efforts of the Church were now mainly directed to the rough Scandinavian north, and to the Slavonic peoples which everywhere bordered on the German tribes and the Byzantine empire. St. Anschar visited Sweden in 830 and made many converts. In 834 he was chosen archbishop of Hamburg, with which Bremen was afterwards united. Some progress was made under

Charlemagne in converting the Slavs of Brandenburg. Again, on the Danube, east of Passau, by the extermination of the Avars, Charlemagne made room for the "Eastern March" (Austria) and the great see of Vienna. The Slavs of Bulgaria were converted by St. Methodius (865), whom their king Bogoris had invited from Constantinople; and the same Methodius brought the faith to the Slavs of Moravia. He also visited Bohemia, and baptized the duke Boriwoy, with his saintly wife Ludmilla. The Czech population readily followed the example of their rulers. The country remained for some time ecclesiastically subject to the bishop of Ratisbon; the see of Prague was not founded until 968.

The Normans, after the grant of what is now Normandy to their duke Rollo (911), embraced the faith, and soon began to extend and illustrate it with the force and genius characteristic of the race. We have not space to trace the steps of the conversion of the outlying Scandinavians and Slavs. Suffice it to say that by the thirteenth century all the nations of Europe were Christian. (Streit, "Atlas Hieraticus," 1913, the latest authority on missions; for the missions in Canada and the United States see "Cath. Enc.")

Attempts were made by fervent preachers of the newly-founded mendicant orders to carry the faith among the Mahometans and the Christian populations under Mahometan rule in Asia Minor, Syria, &c. These efforts, owing to the pride and invincible prejudice of the Moslems, met with little success. The Teutonic knights, uniting themselves to the Order of the Sword founded in 1202, carried on from 1237 a long and cruel war against the natives of East Prussia. These last had been found intractable and ferocious, and their rejection over and over again of the teaching of the missionaries was held to justify proceeding against them by way of a crusade. The war lasted fifty-three years, and ended in the complete subjugation of Prussia, over which the Teutonic order then claimed to exercise sovereign rights. Prussians who were willing to become Christians were declared free men and enjoyed all private rights, but those who chose to remain in unbelief were made slaves to the conquerors.

Fourteenth Century.—This was an age of lamentable reaction. Crusades to the Holy Land being now regarded as impracticable, Christian princes turned their arms against one another. The hundred years' war between England and France began. The see of St. Peter remained for seventy years at Avignon, to the detriment of many religious interests; and soon after the return of Gregory XI. (1376) began the Great Schism, which distracted and perplexed all Christian nations for nearly forty years.

The people of Lithuania (1386), at the command of their duke, Jagellon, accepted the Gospel, and were baptized in vast numbers.

Fifteenth Century.—The maritime nations, Spain and Portugal, while extending the limits of geography, were full of zeal for the propagation of the faith. The people of the Canary and Azores Islands were converted in this age, and under Portuguese auspices three Dominican friars (1491) opened a promising mission on the Congo, in Western Africa. Immediately upon the discovery of America (1492) the religious orders, especially the Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, and Trinitarians, hastened to send labourers to the new field.

Sixteenth Century.—While some of the European nations were being led away by heretical teachers into revolt from the Church, new populations were entering her fold in the Transatlantic regions opened out by the energy of Spain. Cortes, as soon as he had conquered Mexico, did all that he could to make the people Christians. Franciscan missioners appeared there in 1523, followed by Dominicans and Jesuits. The heroic virtue of Martin de Valenza, and his zeal in preaching, converted great numbers of the Mexicans. At the present day but few of the people remain unconverted.

In New Granada, Spanish missionaries appeared very early; the first see was founded at Santa Marta in 1529. St. Louis Bertrand laboured here from 1561 to 1569, and is said to have converted fifteen thousand of the Indians.[1] St. Peter Claver, sometimes called the Apostle of the Negroes, after extraordinary labours and sufferings, died at Cartagena in 1654. Before 1800 the majority of the population, both Indian and negro, had become Catholic.

In Venezuela the see of Carácas was founded in 1531. In 1800 three-fourths of the Indian population of the province were computed to be Christians.

The conquest of Peru by Pizarro was soon followed by the establishment of a bishop's see at Lima (1539), raised to metropolitan rank in 1548. St. Turibius, the third archbishop, is regarded as the apostle of that region. The glorious St. Rose of Lima, who died in 1617 at the age of thirty-one, "bloomed in the Indies in the flower of virginity and patience."[2] Dominican, Franciscan, and Jesuit missioners combined their efforts, and by the middle of the seventeenth century the conversion of the Peruvian Indians, within all the districts subject to Spain, was accomplished.

In Bolivia, Chiquisaca was erected into a bishop's see in 1551. Jesuit missions made rapid progress in converting the Indians; about a hundred years later not less than 100,000 of them were Christians.

[1] See his Life, in English, by Father Wilberforce.
[2] Collect for St. Rose's feast, Aug. 30.

In Chile, the see of Santiago dates from 1561. Those of the native tribes which submitted to the Spaniards soon became Christians; but the nation of the Araucanos and other tribes, preserving their independence, retained along with it their idolatry. To this day there are many unconverted Indians in Chile.

The vast and fertile plains of Brazil began to be occupied by the Portuguese about 1500. The first missionaries were Franciscans. The Jesuit Father, Nobrega, was sent to Brazil by St. Ignatius in 1549. Father Anchieta joined him four years later, and spent the rest of his life in extending the faith among the Indians. His sanctity was demonstrated by miracles, and he is often called the Apostle of Brazil. The first see was founded at Bahia in 1561.

The first see in La Plata, now the Argentine Republic, appears to have been that of Cordova (1570), where the Jesuits had in process of time a magnificent college. St. Francis Solano preached to the Indians of Tucuman and the Chaco in 1589, and converted a great number of them.

The faith was brought into Central America by Franciscans. Alfonso de Betanços preached both to Spaniards and Indians in Costa Rica with great fruit from 1560 to his death in 1566. Other friars laboured successfully in Guatemala during the last thirty years of the century.

Some Augustinian friars, headed by Alfonso Gutierrez, went out to the Philippine Islands in 1575 at the request of Philip II., and began to preach to the natives. Three years later they were joined by a party of Franciscans under the B. Pedro de Alfaro. In nine years 250,000 natives had embraced Christianity. At the present day, out of a population variously estimated at from five to nine millions, the vast majority are Catholics; and they have learnt the arts of civilized life, along with the doctrines of salvation, beneath the fostering wing of the Church. It is lamentable to compare with this picture the miserable condition of the Maories of New Zealand. Victimized by half a dozen Protestant sects, and unable to decide for themselves which of the Christianities offered to them was the true one, this brave and gifted people, divided still more than when they were heathens by the very influence which should have united them, have been unable to resist the corrupting effects of the civilization which has enfolded them within its toils, and are now rapidly perishing.

The first see in the Philippine Islands was founded at Manila in 1581. This was made metropolitan in 1621, and three other sees have been since erected.

The Portuguese established their power firmly on the west coast of India about the beginning of the century, and a see was founded at Goa in 1534. St. Francis Xavier arrived in India in 1542; he preached on the Fishery Coast, and in Cochin, Madura, and Travancore, and made many thousands of converts. These were chiefly of low caste, or of no caste at all; Brahmin exclusiveness and Mussulman rancour strongly barred the way against the spread of Christianity among the upper classes of Indian society.

Japan received St. Francis, when he landed at Cangoxima in 1549, with open arms. The progress of Christianity was extremely rapid, and kings and princes embraced the faith; and it seemed as if a national conversion, like those of which earlier ages afforded so many examples, was about to be effected. Gregory XIII. in 1585 forbade any missionaries other than Jesuits to preach the Gospel in Japan. About the same time a Japanese embassy visited Rome. The sequel will be told in the next section.

Seventeenth Century.—Xavier had desired to carry the Gospel into China, but he died in the neighbouring isle of Sancian (1552) without having set foot in the empire. Towards 1600 some Jesuit Fathers entered China, but little effect was produced till after Father Ricci had made his way to Pekin (1602) and conciliated the goodwill of the emperor. The scientific attainments of Ricci, and, after him, of the Fathers Schall, Verbiest, &c., were what won from the Imperial house respect for them, and some degree of toleration for the Chinese converts. There are said to have been 300,000 Catholics in China in 1663. But several causes combined to overcloud this bright prospect: (1) the dispute about the Chinese ceremonies between the Jesuit and the Dominican missioners [CHINESE RITES]; (2) the persecution, more or less connected with this dispute, raised by the Government against the Christians towards the middle of the eighteenth century; (3) the suppression of the Society of Jesus; and (4) the French Revolution, which paralysed the missionary energy of the chief Catholic nation for many years. Within the last fifty years great efforts have been made to regain the ground lost. China is now divided into forty-five sees, under vicars-apostolic, and the total number of Catholics can be little less than a million and a half. Numerous conversions occur each year in almost every one of the "Chrétientés," or Christian settlements, which are planted thickly in every province of the vast empire.

The Seminary "des Missions Étrangères," founded in 1663 in the Rue du Bac, Paris, has carried on, chiefly in Eastern countries, a great work of evangelization.

In the course of this century missionaries belonging to various orders, chiefly Dominicans and Jesuits, carried the Gospel to Tonquin, Cochin-China, Camboja, Siam, Malaysia, and Burmah, countries which all lie within the Indo-Chinese peninsula. The later history of these missions has been of the usual chequered character: In Tonquin and

Cochin-China there have been prolonged persecutions and frequent martyrdoms. At the present day these missions are governed by sixteen vicars-apostolic, and the number of Catholics contained in them may be roughly estimated at 1,000,000.

Canada and Acadia (Nova Scotia) were colonized by France early in the seventeenth century; the first bishop's see was founded at Montreal in 1659. The Jesuit Fathers Brebeuf, Jogues, Lallemant, and Daniel converted the Hurons to Christianity. But the enemies of France instigated the Iroquois to attack the Hurons; all the above-named missionaries met with violent deaths, and the Hurons were nearly exterminated.[1] Acadia was ceded to England in 1713, and Canada in 1763. The French-speaking population of Lower Canada has remained Catholic, and the efforts of the missionaries have secured for the Church the large floating half-caste population of "voyageurs" and traders, besides converting many of the Indian tribes which roam over the surface of British North America.

In India, the Jesuit Nobili (1606), assuming the dress and customs of a Brahmin, and not associating with persons of inferior caste, made a considerable impression. [MALABAR RITES.] The B. John de Britto, also a Jesuit, addressed himself to the lower castes, and is said to have converted 8,000 idolaters; he gave his life for the faith. The flourishing Christianity of Ceylon, evangelized partly by Franciscans, partly by the Ven. José Vaz, of the Goa Oratory, and other Fathers of the same congregation, was injured and retarded by the Dutch after they had dislodged (1656) the Portuguese from the island. When Ceylon fell into British hands equity was better observed, and at the present day there are 400,000 Catholics, governed by an archbishop and four bishops.

The policy of British rule in India, with other causes, has tended to keep Christianity stationary, and at this day the total number of Christians in British India is said to be less than one million. Of these, about 250,000 are believed to be Europeans or Eurasians (half-castes). Of the remainder about 534,000 are found in the Madras Presidency, and of these about 416,000, or four-fifths nearly, are "returned as Roman Catholics."[2] In the Native States the Christians number about 700,000. Concerning these we have not met with creed returns, but there is no doubt that the great majority are Catholics. Streit ("Atlas") gives the number of Catholics in the whole of India as 2,200,000.

The Goa schism arose in the following manner. When the see of Goa was founded in 1534, a treaty was signed between Portugal and the Holy See, giving to the king of that country the right of patronage over the churches of India on certain conditions

[1] Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America.*
[2] *Encycl. Brit.* 9th ed. "India."

After their power on the Malabar coast had been displaced by that of the Dutch, and the circumstances were consequently changed, the Portuguese still refused to recognize the action of the Holy See in entrusting ecclesiastical interests in those regions to clergy of non-Portuguese nationality. A long and painful history is connected with these disputes, and the schism is not entirely healed to this day. The Indian missions were reorganized by Gregory XVI., who in 1840, Portugal having notoriously failed or become unable to fulfil its part of the contract, suppressed the original bull of patronage. In 1886 an Indian hierarchy was established by Leo XIII., containing the eight provinces of Goa, Colombo, Verapoli, Pondichéry, Madras, Bombay, Agra, and Calcutta. Later Simla was raised to the dignity of an archbishopric.

In Japan, where a considerable section of the people had become Christians, the Government took the alarm, and commenced to persecute about the end of the sixteenth century. Taicosama became Shogun, or supreme temporal ruler, in 1615, and from that time to his death in 1650 pursued a settled plan of extermination. In this he was aided by the selfish policy of the Dutch, who assisted him in putting down the revolt of the Christians of a large district, whom the persecution had driven to despair. About 1650 there were but few professed Christians left. When, however, after Japan was opened to Europeans a few years ago, the Catholic missioners returned, they found interesting proofs of the survival of a pure Christianity among a considerable number of the people. A hierarchy has lately been established, consisting of one archbishopric (Tokio) and three bishoprics. The number of Catholics is about 150,000.

Eighteenth Century. — The celebrated Jesuit missions, or "Reductions," in Paraguay attained their greatest development in the first half of this century. The Jesuits had obtained permission from the King of Spain to isolate their Indian converts in the settlements founded by them, and to manage their affairs independently of the colonial administration. A group of theocratic communities was thus formed in the plains of the Paraná and Uruguay, in each of which the clergy were at once the spiritual and temporal rulers of their flocks; in which crime was almost unknown, and industry universal; and a community of goods was established as in the Apostolic age. The Indians "in medium quaerebant"; the crops which they raised were thrown into a common stock, and divided by the clergy among the different households; not that this was regarded as a permanent arrangement, but only as that most suitable for the new Christians at the actual stage of mental and moral development which they had reached. The converts after a time

displayed an extraordinary talent for imitating any kind of handicraft, mechanism, or artistic workmanship. The eyes of all the philanthropists of Europe were turned upon this new experiment in human education. Unfortunately the hostility of the colonists, the transfer of the territory of Uruguay from Spain to Portugal, the malignant policy of Pombal, and finally the suppression of the Society of Jesus, brought utter destruction on a work than which the whole history of evangelic enterprise presents nothing more suggestive and encouraging. (See Huonder, *Reductions* in "Cath. Enc." good bibliography).

Nineteenth Century.—In 1822 the "Work of the Propagation of the Faith" was established at Lyons, with a view to assisting in the establishment and support of foreign missions. It was computed that in the first fifty years of its existence the Church had received, by the instrumentality of the missions connected with this society, an accession of about 700,000 neophytes. It distributes at the present time an income exceeding 200,000*l.* a year.

By the exertions of Cardinal Vaughan, "St. Joseph's College of the Sacred Heart for Foreign Missions," the chief object of which is to educate missioners to preach to the heathen, was founded at Mill Hill, near London. Its missionaries already occupy important fields of work in the Madras Presidency of India and Borneo, besides the negro missions in the United States.

Great efforts have been made in recent years for the extension of the Gospel in Africa. Besides the titular sees in Algeria there are vicariates, administered by bishops, which embrace the greater part of the seaboard all round the continent, and also the newly-founded vicariates of Central Africa. [See AFRICAN CHURCH.]

In Oceania there are, besides twenty-three flourishing dioceses, fourteen vicariates-apostolic, most of which are of recent creation. When the Catholic missionaries have not been interfered with (as in the Gambier Islands, Easter Island, and Marquesas Islands) the native population has sometimes embraced Christianity *en masse*; but in numerous instances the work has been, and is, made difficult by the opposition of Wesleyans, Baptists, and other sectaries.

The supreme direction of all Catholic missions rests with the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda [PROPAGANDA].

It seems desirable to add a few lines on the missionary labours of the last few years, up to the commencement of 1914.

In Europe we note the restoration of an official and recognized Catholicism at Geneva, where the Federal government has allowed the see from which the late Mgr. Mermillod was expelled to be reoccupied.

The northern kingdoms have become more favourable to Catholicism than has been the case since the Reformation. The Catholic population of Copenhagen now numbers several thousands. Members of religious orders expelled from France and Italy have been welcomed in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.

In North America great progress has been made in the various missions in the conversion of the Indian tribes. According to the census of 1911 the number of Catholics was 2,833,041.

In Asia the record is of a mixed nature; with much that is cheering there is joined much that is of a saddening and disquieting character. In China, where Christianity is of so long standing and is found in every province of the empire, there has been, and is, much persecution and hindrance, caused, not by the direct orders of the central government (which, so far as words and edicts go, is tolerant enough), but by the open animosity of the literate class, and the veiled hostility of the mandarins. The literates, *i.e.* the educated middle class, do not so much hate Christianity on its own account as in fear of the foreign and Western influences associated with it, by which they think their national independence is threatened. Such events as the destruction of the ancient Burmese monarchy, the French annexation of Tonquin, and the Russian encroachments on the west and north, naturally fill the Chinese, who are thorough patriots in their way, with a dread of Europe and all that comes from Europe. It is said that 25,000 Christians were put to death during the Boxer rebellion of 1900.

In Japan, Leo XIII. established in 1891 the ecclesiastical hierarchy, with the archbishop of Tokio as metropolitan, and the bishops of Nagasaki, Osaka, and Hakodadi as his suffragans. But Catholicism has not the field to itself; the various Protestant bodies, and the Russian Church, are continually labouring to add to their proselytes and extend their influence.

In India the movement towards Christianity, especially in Madura and in the districts (Chota Nagpore, Orissa, &c.) round Calcutta, has been very decided within the last few years. (See "La Mission Belge du Bengale Occidental," Brussels, 1890.) In Annam and Tonquin the losses caused by persecution and famine are being rapidly made good; it is probable that the movement in favour of Christianity will take a strong hold of the general population.

In Africa the energy of Cardinal Lavigerie, archbishop of Algiers, founded and supported a body of missioners, known as the "White Fathers," for carrying the Gospel to the tribes of the Sahara, the dark races of the Soudan, and to nations still further south. These missioners are settled on the shores and islands of the Lakes Victoria Nyanza and

Tanganyika, and elsewhere. The "Brotherhood of the Sahara," a lay institute, was founded by the Cardinal, in order by degrees to irrigate and cultivate the Sahara, thus making the proceedings of the slave-traders more difficult.

(Henrion, "Hist. des Miss. Cath."; Durand, "Miss. Cath. Françaises"; "Kirchenlex." *passim*; Fleury, "Hist. Eccl."; "Illustrated Catholic Missions"; "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith"; "Atlas des Missions," French ed., 1886, Friburg—this is a most useful publication, compiled by the Rev. Father Werner, S.J.; "Orbis Terrarum Catholicus," 1890, by the same. For American Missions see "Cath. Enc." For the present state of Catholic missions throughout the world see Streit, "Atlas Hierarchicus," 1913.)

MITRE (*mitra, infula*). A head-dress worn by bishops, abbots, and in certain cases by other distinguished ecclesiastics. Mitra (*μίτρα*) is used in Greek and Latin for the turban which was worn by women, and among the Asiatics, specially Phrygians, by men. It had no connection with religious rites.

On the other hand, a band (*infula*) was worn by heathen priests and by the sacrificial victims. The Jewish priests wore a cap (מִגְבָּעָה; *κίδαρις* in the LXX) of uncertain form, though the root points to a round shape, and the high priest a turban (מִצְנֶפֶת), from a root meaning "to wind" (in LXX, *κίδαρις* and *μίτρα*), with a plate of gold on the front (צִיץ; LXX, *πέταλον*; Vulg. "lamina"), inscribed with the words "Holiness to the Lord." The Vulgate uses "mitra" for the high priest's head-dress (Ecclus. xlv. 14), and for the priest's (Exod. xxix. 9; Levit. viii. 13). It is certain, however, that the early Church did not adopt the head-dress of the Jewish priesthood and transfer it to her own priests or chief priests. Polycrates of Ephesus, indeed, writing about 190 (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." v. 24), says of St. John the Evangelist that he "became a priest, having worn the plate (*πέταλον*)," and Epiphanius (Haer.), about 380, makes a similar statement about St. James, except that he makes it in St. James's case a mark of his Jewish, not his Christian, priesthood, for he says he was allowed both to wear the *πέταλον* and enter the Holy of Holies. This account of Epiphanius is evidently legendary, for on what possible ground could the authorities of the Temple treat James as high priest? Lightfoot (see also Routh, "Rell. Sacr." ii. p. 28) is probably justified in regarding the language of Polycrates on St. John's "plate" as metaphorical. But, in any case, such a "plate" answers to no vestment now in use; and even if we could translate it "mitre" (as we cannot), this use by St. John stands quite by itself. It would have been his custom, not that of the Church.

Hefele, who treats the above notices of St. John and St. James as mere legends, contends, nevertheless, that there are clear traces of mitres used as part of the official ecclesiastical costume from the fourth century. After carefully considering the proofs which he alleges, we can see no reason for abandoning the judgment of Menard, the learned Benedictine editor of St. Gregory's Sacramentary, viz. that for the first thousand years of her history there was no general use of mitres in the Church. All Hefele's references can, we think, be explained as poetical or metaphorical. And, on the other hand, Hefele himself allows that no Sacramentary or Ritual book before 1000 A.D. mentions the mitre, much less the bishop's investment with it at consecration, though, *e.g.*, in a Mass for Easter Sunday written before 986 the ornaments of a bishop are enumerated. Again, liturgical writers, such as Amalarius and Walafrid Strabo, are silent on the subject. "It is not"—we again quote from Hefele—"till the eleventh century that representations of popes, bishops, and abbots with the mitre occur; though from that time onwards they are very numerous."

The use of the mitre seems to have begun at Rome, and then to have spread to other churches. Leo IX., in 1049, gave the "Roman mitre" to the Archbishop of Treves, and this is the earliest instance known of such a concession. Canons also, *e.g.* at Bamberg, got leave from Rome to wear the mitre on certain feasts, and it was used by all cardinals till, in 1245, the first Council of Lyons sanctioned the cardinal's hat. According to Gavantus (tom. i. 149), the first concession of a mitre to an abbot was made by Urban II. in 1091. The straight lines and sharp point familiar to us in the Gothic mitres first appear in works of art of the thirteenth century. The Italian mitre, with its greater height and curved lines, came into use in the fourteenth.

Bishops and abbots (if mitred) receive the mitre from the consecrating bishop—a ceremony, as Catalani shows, of late introduction. The "Caeremoniale Episcoporum" distinguishes the "precious mitre," adorned with jewels and made of gold or silver plate; the "mitra auriphrygiata," without precious stones (it may, however, be ornamented with pearls) and of gold cloth (*ex tela aurea*); the "plain mitre" (*mitra simplex*), of silk or linen and of white colour. The bishop always uses the mitre if he carries the pastoral staff. Inferior prelates who are allowed a mitre must confine themselves to the simple mitre, unless in case of an express concession by the Pope ("Manuale Decret." 870). The Greeks have no mitre properly so called. The Armenians have adopted a kind of mitre for bishops and a bonnet for priests since the eleventh century. (Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii.; Gavantus, Bona, "Rerum

Lit." lib. i.; Catalani on the "Pontifical"; Menard on St. Gregory's Sacramentary; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 424 *sqq.*; Rock, ii. 75–98. Innocent III. gives mystical meanings to the mitre and its parts—*e.g.* the two horns are the two Testaments; the strings, the spirit and the letter, &c.).

MIXED MARRIAGES are marriages between persons of different religions. A marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person is invalid; one between a Catholic and a person of another communion—*e.g.* a Protestant—is valid, but, unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Pope or his delegate, unlawful. Further explanation has been given in the article on the IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE. But it will be useful to say something here on the legislation of the Church on marriages between Catholics and other Christians not Catholics.

(1) Benedict XIV. (Instruction on Marriages in Holland, 1741; Encyclical, "Magnae nobis") has declared the Church's vehement repugnance to such unions, on the ground that they are not likely to be harmonious, that they expose the Catholic party and the children to danger of perversion, that they are apt to produce indifference, &c., &c.

(2) He says the Church has permitted them for very grave reasons, and generally in the case of royal personages; but even then on condition that the Catholic party be free to practise his or her religion, and that a promise be given that the children of either sex be brought up Catholics.

(3) Increasing intercourse between Catholics and Protestants made such marriages far more frequent, and the conditions insisted on by Benedict XIV. were neglected. In Silesia a law of the State in 1803 required the children of mixed marriages to be brought up in the religion of the father. In England, till very recent times, there was a common arrangement by which the boys were brought up in the father's, the girls in the mother's religion, and neither in Silesia (see Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. ii. p. 856 *seq.*) nor in England did the Catholic clergy, as a rule, oppose this state of things. An attempt was made by the Prussian Government in 1825 to introduce the law which prevailed in Silesia and the other Eastern provinces to the Rhineland and Westphalia; and this order of the Cabinet was accepted by Von Spiegel, archbishop of Cologne, and also, though with some scruple, by the Bishops of Paderborn, Münster, and Treves. This led Pius VIII. and Gregory XVI. to declare a mixed marriage, when it was not understood that the children of either sex should be brought up Catholics, contrary to the "natural and divine law." Otherwise, the priest could take no part in the celebration. In extreme cases, and to avoid greater evils, he might passively assist at the contract; but more the Pope himself could not permit. Obedience to these Papal briefs led to the imprisonment of Droste von Vischering, the new archbishop of Cologne, in 1837, and to that of the Archbishop of Posen in 1839. The bishops, even those who had once been of a different mind, steadfastly adhered to the Papal regulations. One exception, however, must be mentioned. The Prince-Bishop of Breslau resigned his see in 1840 rather than submit, and became a Protestant. He died in 1871. Under the good king William IV. peace was gradually restored between Church and State.

(4) In England, as elsewhere, the following is the present canon law. If a Catholic and Protestant desire to marry, they must promise to comply with the conditions given above. Then, if the bishop is satisfied that some grave reason for the marriage exists, he may grant a dispensation, and the marriage is then celebrated in the Catholic Church. As the Anglican clergy are no longer the obligatory registrars for civil recognition, no repetition of the ceremony in the Established Church is now tolerated. (NE TEMERE; "Concil. Westm." p. 315.)

MODERNISM. In the art. GNOSTICISM we have described the attempt in the earliest ages of the Church to conciliate Christianity and paganism by distinguishing the higher knowledge of doctrine (γνῶσις) from the ordinary faith (πίστις). The latter was for the many, the former was the privilege of the few. The distinction in itself was perfectly lawful (1 Cor. xii. 8; xiv. 6) and was upheld by the early Fathers. But, as we have pointed out, there was great danger in the application of it. Under the plea of higher knowledge Christianity was changed at will. The Gnostics discerned elements of falsehood as well as truth in the received doctrines; they mutilated the text of the Gospels; they mixed tenets borrowed from the heathen philosophy or religions with Christianity; they treated the moral law as they treated Christian doctrine, and invented a new code of ethics. In short, they claimed to impart a knowledge which refused to believe what it could not understand.

So, too, in our own day, a similar attempt has been made to conciliate what is termed modern scientific thought with the ancient doctrines and practices of the Church. Here again the attempt is in itself lawful and praiseworthy. But, as of old, the danger is great lest what is essential may be sacrificed and pure teaching corrupted. "Modernism," like Gnosticism, has succumbed to this danger and both are now terms of opprobrium.

In every age of the Church in which philosophy and theology have been studied the highest minds have been exercised upon the problem of harmonizing reason and faith. And in each age it has been the temporary teaching of both which has been in question. Though some difficulties

of all time, others are prominent in one age and not in another. In the Middle Ages, for example, it was the Arabian commentaries and paraphrases of Aristotle, with their pantheistic and sceptical tendencies, their mystic dreamings and dangerous asceticism, which had to be met by the Church's defenders. An apparently easy way was to condemn philosophy altogether, as some of the Fathers had done [see PHILOSOPHY], or to reject the authority of Aristotle, as also was done in the early part of the thirteenth century (see the same art.). But the bolder and truer way was to make the most profound and exact thinker of antiquity a hewer of wood and a drawer of water to the Church. This was the great work of the mightiest of Christian thinkers who realized better than any of his contemporaries that truth cannot contradict truth: that what is theologically true cannot be philosophically false. St. Thomas's apologetic was conclusive for his own day, but in ours the difficulties come from science and history, the very departments in which the mediaeval writers were weak. It was to be expected that a new method of defence would be required. To speak in military language, though the strategy was the same, tactics and weapons had altered. Without any disparagement of the theologians and philosophers of other countries, it was mainly in the German universities and the "Instituts Catholiques" of France that this defence was carried on. While there was much to be praised in their work (which is not our concern here), there was much that deserved censure. Too much was conceded to the enemy: many important positions were abandoned. The constant study of infidel writers often had a bad influence on the mentality of the defenders. When it became necessary for authority to take action, there was sometimes a want of submission, and in a few cases open revolt. We have purposely avoided the mention of names, for we are not unmindful of the warning:

> "Periculosae plenum opus aleae
> Tractas, et incedis per ignes
> Suppositos cineri doloso."[1]

Gregory XVI., Pius IX., and Leo XIII. had frequent occasion to condemn these false defences (worse than attacks) and to warn the Faithful against their pernicious influence. Nevertheless, the evil continued and increased to such an extent that Pius X. determined to do his utmost to root it out from the Church. First a decree of the Holy Office "Lamentabili" (July 3, 1907) condemned a list of sixty-five propositions embodying the chief errors of leading Modernists. This was soon followed by the Encyclical "Pascendi" (Sept. 7, 1907), in which the Pope set forth at great length the various forms of the new heresy, laid bare its causes, and prescribed the remedies. Lastly, he took severe measures to ensure the ejection of those who favoured the heresy. By the Motu Proprio "Sacrorum antistitum" (Sept. 1, 1910), he ordered that an elaborate oath, in which the modernist errors were condemned, should be taken by all who were to be promoted to sacred orders or to hold the position of preacher, confessor, parish priest, &c. We have not space to give even a short account of these various documents. An analysis of the Encyclical "Pascendi" must suffice.

The Pope begins by pointing out that the new enemies do not attack the Church from without but within, and their attacks are directed, not against particular doctrines, but against the very roots of the Faith. They assume different characters: philosophers, believers, theologians, critics, apologists, reformers.

Each are taken in turn. In philosophy they are downright agnostics, denying that the existence of God can be proved by reason and that revelation can be made credible by external signs. But what reason cannot prove is known to us by religious immanence, that is, by a certain religious feeling of and craving after (*indigentia*) the divine. It is this feeling which the Modernists call faith. The intellect working upon the data of the religious sense produces "secondary opinions" derived from the primary simple ones, and these, when approved by the Church, are known as dogmas. Dogmas (the Modernists say) do not contain absolute truth; they are mere symbols, capable not only of evolution but also of change. Indeed, they are bound to change, for they must be living, and life means change.

As believers, Modernists assert that they maintain the reality of the divine, but they do so relying on their own subjective experience. Science has to do with phenomena in which faith has no place: faith, on the other hand, is concerned with what is divine, of which science is altogether ignorant. Hence there can never be any conflict between them. Thus, the life of Christ belongs to phenomena; but these when transfigured and defigured by faith, are taken out of the region of sensible things and become part of what is divine. For example, if we ask whether Christ really worked miracles and rose from the dead, they reply that science denies it but faith affirms it. And (they add) there is no contradiction here: for the philosopher speaking to philosophers thinks of Christ according to historical reality, whereas the believer, speaking to believers, considers the life of Christ as lived again by faith and in faith. As a matter of fact, the Modernists hold that faith is subject to science.

Next we have to consider the Modernist

[1] Hor. Od. ii. 1, 6–8.

as theologian. Here is his method of procedure: as philosopher, he knows that the principle of faith is immanent; as believer, he holds that this principle is God; he infers therefore that God is immanent in man. This is theological immanence. Again: to the philosopher it is certain that the representations of the object of faith are merely symbolical; to the believer it is equally certain that the object of faith is God as He is in Himself; the theologian concludes: Therefore the representations of the divine reality are symbolical. This is theological symbolism. Besides the divine immanence Modernists hold the divine permanence. Immanence and permanence differ from each other much in the same way as individual experience differs from experience handed down by tradition. For example, they assert that the Church and the Sacraments were not instituted by Christ Himself, because the law of immanence, the law of evolution and history, forbid us to admit such immediate institution. Nevertheless it is true that the Church and the Sacraments were *mediately* instituted by Christ. This they explain and seek to justify by maintaining that all Christian consciences (consciousnesses) are in a way virtually contained in the consciousness of Christ, like a plant in its seed. Now just as the germs live the life of the seed, so do all Christians live the life of Christ. But the life of Christ, according to faith, is divine, therefore the life of Christians is also divine. If therefore this life in the course of ages gave rise to the Church and the Sacraments, the Church and the Sacraments are rightly said to be from Christ and divine. And so with the authority of Holy Scripture, and with Dogma and Worship. Each is from Christ and each is divine, but only in the sense that it originated from the life of Christ as lived by Christians in successive centuries, to be gradually propagated and developed and in the end formulated, not by any logical process, but according to the needs and circumstances of the Church. Thus, for the Modernist the Sacraments are the resultant of the need man has to give sensible manifestation to his religious feelings, and moreover to determine and make universal the form of such manifestation. Similarly, the inspiration attributed to the writers of the Sacred Books is no more than the impulse felt by them to commit their belief to writing, an impulse distinguished from others of the same kind not otherwise than by its vehemence and by the nature of its subject-matter. In the Modernist theory the Church herself is born of a twofold human need: that of the individual believer to communicate his faith to others, and that of the body of believers to form themselves into a society. Such society, it is further contended, must, in virtue of its popular origin be democratic as regards its form of government. Moreover, it must be separated from the State, to which indeed in temporal matters it ought to be subject. It further follows that any magisterium or teaching office the Church may possess is dependent on the individual consciences of its members, since it can teach no more than what private individuals or the majority among them believe, and hence the Church in her teaching is bound to bow to popular ideals. Wherefore, all, clergy and laity alike, have the right to be free to express their personal convictions and opinions. To put obstacles in the way of such expression is to hinder the necessary evolution of dogma—which evolution of dogma is practically the fundamental principle of Modernism. In the Modernist theory, tradition has its place and value as a useful check on Evolution; for it is only by a species of covenant and compromise between the present and the past, between individual consciences and recognized authority, that wholesome progress is made. To this fatal view that in religion everything is subject to change, the Encyclical *Pascendi* opposes the Catholic teaching of the Vatican Council: "Let intelligence, therefore, and science, and wisdom increase and prosper abundantly and vigorously, in individuals and in the mass, in the believer and in the whole Church, throughout the ages and the centuries—but only in its own kind, that is, according to the same dogma, the same sense, the same acceptation."

Next, the Modernist is studied as an historian and critic. As such, he starts from the Agnostic axiom that history, like science, dealing entirely with phenomena, must relegate to the dominion of Faith as belonging to it alone, God and every intervention of God in human affairs. Hence, for the modernist historian there is a Christ of History other than the Christ of Faith, a Church of History and a Church of Faith, Sacraments of History and Sacraments of Faith, and so forth. Again, the historian must set aside, when treating, for instance, of Christ, all that surpasses man in his natural condition as determined by the laws of psychology and by what we gather from the place and period of his existence. Lastly, must be deleted everything not in harmony with what Modernists call the logic of facts, or not in character with the persons of whom it is predicated. These *a priori* philosophical principles equally avail the Modernist when he poses as a critic of Biblical and Church History. But, others too come into play. For example, he lays down as an axiom: No fact can be regarded as antecedent to the need which it meets—historically, the fact must be posterior to the need. Hence, the age of a particular chapter in a book in the Canon of Holy Scripture can only be determined by the date at which the need

of it has manifested itself in the Church of the Old or of the New Testament. There is thus in the Sacred Books a vital evolution springing from and corresponding with the evolution of Faith. To aid himself in setting up this thesis the Modernist makes much of the so-called Textual Criticism, using it with such easy assurance that, as the Pontiff remarks, one would imagine that before him no one had so much as turned over the pages of Scripture.

In their system of Apologetics, Modernists insist that all controversies in religious matters must be determined by psychological and historical research. Their argument is that Religion, and especially the Catholic Religion, is endowed with such vitality as to compel every psychologist and historian of good faith to recognize that its history postulates the inclusion of an element of the *Unknown*. And on Modernist principles the realizing of the presence of the *Unknown* is the basis of Faith. In their Apologetics Modernists appeal likewise to their doctrine of *Immanence*. They endeavour, that is, to persuade the non-believer that down in the very depths of his nature and of his life there lies hidden the need and the desire of some religion, and that not of a religion of any kind but of the specific religion known as Catholicism, which they say, is absolutely postulated for the perfect development of human life.

Dealing lastly with the Modernist as a reformer, the Holy Father observes that so great is the passion of such men for innovation that in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. They would have Scholastic Philosophy to be rejected as obsolete, Rational Theology to be based on modern philosophical views and Positive Theology on the History of Dogma. In the Catechism they would have no dogmas taught save those which have been reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding Worship, their contention is that the number of external devotions should be reduced. They demand the reform of Church government in all its branches, so as to bring it into harmony with the modern conscience, which now wholly tends (they say) towards democracy. They insist in particular on decentralization and on the admitting to share in ecclesiastical legislation in some degree of the lower orders of the clergy and even of the laity. Turning to Morals, Modernists adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive and in practice are to be encouraged in preference to the latter. Finally the clergy must return to their primitive humility and poverty.

Concluding this part of his Encyclical, Pius X. infers that the Modernist system is a closely connected whole and defines it to be "the synthesis of all the heresies," concentrating into one evil theory their whole sap and substance, with the fatal result that many are the roads it opens leading to Atheism and to the annihilation of all religion.

Our purpose being merely to set forth the nature and dangers of Modernism, we refrain from summarizing the two remaining sections of the famous Encyclical. They treat respectively of "The Causes of Modernism" and of "The Remedies for Modernism." Under this last head many wholesome disciplinary measures are enjoined or recommended. Such are, the teaching in Seminaries of Scholastic Philosophy, Episcopal Watchfulness over publications, Censorship of books, Diocesan Vigilance Committees, and others.

The Pontifical condemnation of Modernism was so absolute and so unequivocal, and the disciplinary measures taken so drastic and so loyally everywhere enforced, that Modernism as a peril to the Church may be said to have perished at the hands of Pope Pius X.

(Besides the documents quoted, Mercier, "Le Modernisme"; Cavalcanto, "Modernismo e Modernisti"; Heiner, "Der neue Syllabus"; Rickaby, "The Modernist"; Vermeersch, "De Modernismo"; Tanquerey, "De Modernismo"; and Card. Billot, "De Sacra Traditione."

MOLINISM. [See GRACE.]

MOLINOS. [See QUIETISM.]

MONARCHIANS. Early heretics who belonged to the Patripassian sect, *i.e.* they denied any real distinction between the divine Persons, and maintained that the one God (the Father) suffered for us. This was of course a form of Sabellianism (*q.v.*).

MONASTERIES, SUPPRESSION OF. [See SUPPRESSION.]

MONASTERY. [See CONVENT; MONK.]

MONITA SECRETA. A code of secret instructions said to have been drawn up by Acquaviva, fifth general of the Society of Jesus, for the guidance of the superiors of his order. They consist of the various methods to be adopted so as to gain wealth and influence for the Jesuits, to the exclusion of the secular clergy and the other orders. They are known to be the work of an ex-Jesuit, Zahorowski, who was dismissed from the society in 1611. While they have always been utterly scouted by the Jesuits themselves, even such prejudiced writers as Sarpi, Arnauld, and Pascal have placed no credence in them. It was reserved for the notorious Dr. Littledale to maintain that, though admittedly a libel and a caricature, the "Monita" are substantially true. (Gerard in "Cath. Enc."; Duhr, "Die Monita Secreta, oder die geheimen Verordnungen der Gesellschaft Jesu"; Reusch [Old Catholic], "Der Index der verbotener Bücher.")

MONK (A.-S. *munuc*, through the Lat. *monachus*, Gr. μοναχός, "solitary"). The ascetics of the first Christian age have been already described [ASCETAE]. They did not, as a rule, separate themselves from men, but in the world practised a rigid mortification, and aimed at fulfilling the counsels of perfection. Monachism commenced in Egypt. In the middle of the third century the persecution of Decius caused many fervent Christians to leave the cities and flee into the deserts, there to find that freedom in the divine service which human laws denied them. For a long time they lived apart, each in his own cell, supporting themselves by daily labour. The anchorites or hermits [HERMITS] were those who specially desired solitude; of these St. Paul was the founder. St. Anthony, whose life embraces more than a hundred years (250–356), chose for a time absolute solitude, but in his later years he allowed a number of disciples to gather round him, who, though living each apart, were eager to profit by the depth and wisdom of his advice, and ready to practise whatever rules he might impose. Thus St. Anthony was the founder of Monachism, although the coenobitic life, which has been a characteristic of nearly all the monks of later times, had not appeared. Of this, St. Pachomius is regarded as the originator, who, about A.D. 315, built monasteries in the Thebaid. It is easy to conceive how the common life should appear, under given conditions, more suitable as a road to perfection than the separate life. How one might pass into the other may be seen from a passage in the "Orations" of St. Gregory Nazianzen.[1] Speaking of St. Athanasius taking refuge with the contemplatives of Egypt, who, "withdrawing themselves from the world and embracing the wilderness, live to God," he says that, of these, "some, practising a life absolutely solitary and unsocial, converse with themselves and God alone, knowing no more of the world than they can become acquainted with in the desert; others, loving the law of charity by way of intercourse (κοινωνία), at once men of solitude and men of society, while dead to all other men and to worldly affairs in general . . . are a world to one another, and by comparison and contact sharpen one another's virtue." Hilarion, a disciple of St. Anthony, is said to have been the first to introduce communities of monks in Palestine: Eustathius of Sebaste, in Armenia; St. Basil, in Cappadocia. St. Athanasius, by making known at Rome the story of the wonderful life of St. Anthony, is said to have caused a great movement towards monasticism; in the time of St. Jerome the city had many monasteries both of monks and nuns. St. Martin was a strenuous upholder of the coenobitic life; two celebrated French monasteries, Marmoutier, near Tours, and Ligugé, near Poitiers, were of his foundation. The rule of St. Austin was perhaps rather designed for regular clerks than for monks, who for a long time after their institution were all laymen. At first it was nearly true that every monastery followed its own rule; gradually, however, the rule of St. Basil [BASILIANS] obtained a preference, and, after its translation into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileia, was largely adopted in the West. Monachism languished in Italy in the fifth century, owing to the irruptions of the barbarians; in the sixth (529), the strong but gentle hand of St. Benedict of Nursia raised it to a pedestal from which it has never since been dethroned. [BENEDICTINES.] The Benedictine rule gradually swallowed up all the others, being found more suitable than any to the conditions of life in Western Europe. For several centuries no other rule was heard of. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, the Orders of Cluny, Camaldoli, the Chartreuse, and Cîteaux branched off from the parent stem. In the thirteenth century appeared the friars; in the sixteenth, the Jesuits, Theatines, and other regular clerks; followed down to our own day by the various congregations of both sexes, the members of which, under their several institutes, devote themselves to the glory of God and the good of their neighbour. (Hélyot, "Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, &c."; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongregationen"; Montalembert, "The Monks of the West," ed. Gasquet).

[1] Or. 21.

MONOPHYSITES. The early history of the Monophysites, who held that there was but one nature in Christ, and were condemned at the General Council of Chalcedon, has been given in a separate article. [CHALCEDON.] For two years, Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II., was averse to the Confession of Chalcedon, and the monks in Palestine, counting on her protection, drove Juvenal, the Patriarch, from his see. In Egypt, Proterius, the orthodox successor of Dioscorus, was murdered in 457 by the fanatical populace, headed by Timothy the Cat and Peter the Stammerer, of whom the former usurped the patriarchate, till driven out by the troops of the Emperor Leo I. In Antioch, another monk, Peter the Fuller, overthrew the lawful patriarch, on his refusal to insert the words "Who was crucified for us," in the Trisagion. Scarcely were these Monophysite leaders removed, when their party found a protector in the usurping Emperor Basiliscus (475–477). Timothy the Cat and Peter the Fuller recovered their sees, and the decision of Chalcedon was set aside in an Imperial Encyclical.

The Catholics might have looked for triumph when Zeno came to the throne. The Bishop of Constantinople, Acacius, had

been hitherto orthodox, and Zeno restored an orthodox Patriarch at Alexandria—viz. Timothy Salifaciolus, succeeded by Talaja. But the latter offended the court and Bishop of Constantinople, and Acacius leagued with Peter the Stammerer, who on the death of Timothy the Cat became leader of the Egyptian Monophysites, and Zeno hit on a compromise meant to unite Catholics and Monophysites. His "Henoticon" of 482 condemned Nestorius and renewed the anathemas of St. Cyril but ignored the Council of Chalcedon, ordered preachers to avoid the points of controversy between Monophysites and their opponents, and bade the churches confine themselves to the Nicene Creed with the additions made to it at Constantinople. Peter the Fuller at Antioch, Peter the Stammerer in Egypt, on the one hand, Acacius of Constantinople on the other, accepted these terms. But Rome would hear nothing of the "Henoticon," and there was a schism between East and West from 484 to 519. Even at Constantinople a powerful party, headed by monks, known as the Acoemeti, rejected the "Henoticon," and again many Monophysites in Egypt abhorred it, fell away from Peter the Stammerer, and formed a separate sect, that of the Acephali. Justin I. acknowledged the authority of Chalcedon, and the Church of Constantinople was once more in communion with that of Rome.

From this time the Monophysites split up into numerous sects. The Phthartolatrae, or Severians, fought with Aphthartolatrae, or Julianists, on the corruptible or incorruptible nature of Christ's body. A subdivision of the latter held that Christ's body since its union with the Word was increate; the Ctistolatrae were of the contrary opinion. The Themistians, or Agnoetae, held that the human element in Christ before His resurrection was subject to ignorance. A Monophysite Aristotelian, Philoponus (560), argued that the three Persons of the Trinity were three distinct individuals, and his followers were known as Tritheists. Other Monophysite sects are mentioned by Petavius.

In 536 Armenia became Persian; in 640 the Saracens became masters of Egypt; and in these countries the Monophysites were of course freed from Byzantine persecution. In Syria and Mesopotamia they were harassed by Justinian, but their cause was maintained by the zeal of the beggar-monk, Jacobus Zangalus, called El Baradai. In all these countries Monophysite churches still exist. They are represented (1) by the Armenian National Church; (2) by the Jacobite Christians of Syria and Mesopotamia; (3) the Coptic Church; (4) the Abyssinian Church. The Schismatic Christians of St. Thomas are now connected with the Jacobites. All these sects are described under separate articles. (Hefele-Leclercq, vol. ii.; Dom Chapman in "Cath. Enc." For an elaborate account of the Monophysite divisions, see Petavius, "De Incarnat." i. cap. 16, 17. For the modern Monophysites see Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," 163 *sqq.*)

MONOTHELITES. A name given to those who held that Christ had only one will. "One will," "one operation," of the Word made Flesh, were the watchwords of their party. They argued, there is but one Person in Christ, therefore a single will, and a single operation. The Catholic doctrine, on the other hand, is that there are two natures, and therefore two operations and two wills in Christ. The will is a faculty of the nature, and if Christ had no human will He cannot have been true man. He remains for ever God and Man, in two distinct natures; each nature operates in the way proper to itself, Nature being the principle of operation; there are therefore two operations and two wills in Christ, the one Divine, the other human, although these wills are in perfect harmony with each other—since the human will of Christ follows, and is perfectly subject to, His Divine will. That Christ had two wills is implied in Lk. xxii. 42, Jn. v. 30, where He distinguishes His own (human) will from that of the Father, which is one with Christ's Divine will. Thus, Pope Agatho's synodal letter, accepted at the Sixth General Council—the Third of Constantinople—defines that Christ has "two natural wills, without division, change, partition, confusion, not contrary to each other, but the human will following and subject to the Divine." We may here add that Catholic theologians distinguish three kinds of operation in Christ: those which are purely Divine—*e.g.* creation, preservation of His creatures, &c.; those which are purely human, eating and drinking, weeping, &c.; those in which each nature acts—the Divine, as the principal, the human, as the instrumental cause—*e.g.* raising the dead, giving sight to the blind, &c. The last are called *theandric* (*θεός, ἀνήρ*) actions. We proceed to the history of the heresy.

Heraclius (610-641) naturally desired the reconciliation of Monophysites and Catholics, for the Persians had pressed forward to the Hellespont, and there was urgent need to unite the Christians of the Empire as one man against them. In 622, Heraclius, in an interview with Paul, the head of the Armenian Monophysites, suggested the form "one energy," as a means of reconciling the contending parties. He made use of the same expedient, taught him probably by Sergius of Constantinople, in 626, when he tried to effect a union between Cyrus, Catholic bishop of Phasis, and Athanasius, the Jacobite patriarch. When Cyrus became Patriarch of Alexandria, he taught in nine *κεφάλαια* that

Christ, because His two natures were united in one Person, "performed Divine and human acts by one theandric operation (*i.e.* by one operation at once Divine and human) according to St. Dionysius" (*i.e.* Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite). Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, when at Alexandria, tried to keep Cyrus from publishing these κεφάλαια, and also opposed the Monothelite doctrine at Constantinople. Soon after, Sophronius was raised to the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and continued to oppose the union which had been effected with a section of the Monophysites —viz. the Theodosians. Cyrus and Sergius, occupying the two great sees of Alexandria and Constantinople, vigorously supported the Monothelite compromise, and the latter tried to enlist Pope Honorius on the same side—with what measure of success has been shown in a separate article. [See HONORIUS.] On the other hand, the Catholic doctrine was clearly formulated by the Synod of Jerusalem, which met under Sophronius, in 634. Three years later Jerusalem was taken by the Saracens, and shortly afterwards Sophronius died. In 638 Honorius, too, was gone, and a new phase of the controversy began.

In 638 Heraclius gave his imperial authority to an Ecthesis or exposition of the faith composed by Sergius. This document forbade either phrase "one" or "two energies," but affirmed "one will" in Christ. The Ecthesis was supported by Pyrrhus and Paul, successors of Sergius at Constantinople, and by two councils held there in 638 and 639; but it was opposed throughout the West, and condemned by the Popes John IV. and Theodore, Paul of Constantinople being excommunicated by the latter Pope. Moreover, the orthodox doctrine found a powerful champion in the abbot Maximus, formerly secretary of Heraclius, then abbot of Chrysopolis, who was active in defence of the Catholic doctrine in Africa (the particular place is uncertain), where he held a dispute with Pyrrhus, and at Rome. The Emperor Constans II. withdrew the Ecthesis and enforced upon the empire under strict penalties another document, known as the Type, which forbade all discussion of the number either of the energies or the wills. But in the Lateran synod of 649 Pope Martin I. condemned both Type and Ecthesis, and anathematized the Monothelite leaders. Martin was seized, finally banished to the Chersonese, where, after enduring much misery, he died in 655. Maximus also died in banishment after cruel maltreatment in 662. An approach to peace between Rome and Constantinople was made about this time, but it was not concluded till Constantine Pogonatus (668–685) in union with Pope Agatho convoked the Third General Council of Constantinople. It met in 680, defined the existence of two wills in Christ and anathematized Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul, &c. The presiding Papal legates signed the decrees, which were confirmed by Pope Leo II. So ended the last great dogmatic dispute in the East. It was only in a corner of Asia—viz. in the fastnesses of Lebanon—that the Monothelite doctrine lingered. The adherents of this doctrine gathered round the monastery of St. Maro, acknowledged its abbot as their head, and persevered in their isolation till, during the Crusades, they were reconciled to the Church. [See MARONITES.] (Hefele-Leclercq, vol. iii.; Petavius, "De Incarnatione," viii. ix.; Chapman in "Cath. Enc."; the dogmatic theologians in their treatises on the Incarnation, *e.g.* Franzelin, "De Verbo Incarnato" thes. 40; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theology," ii. 82.)

MONSIGNORE (*Monseigneur*, my lord). This mode of addressing secular persons of high rank has been adopted in addressing ecclesiastics, from a patriarch or archbishop down to the simplest honorary chaplain or chamberlain of the Papal Court. It is a mistake to say that a cleric is made a "monsignor." What really happens is that the Pope bestows upon him an office (actual or titular) entitling him to be addressed as "monsignore." Protonotaries Apostolic, Domestic Prelates, Camerieri Segreti (Private Chamberlains) and Camerieri d'Onore (Honorary Chamberlains), as well as Vicars-General, have the title of Monsignore, and in Latin they are styled *Reverendissimi*. Vicars-General, Protonotaries and Domestic Prelates, are addressed as Right Reverend, and in England Camerieri as Very Reverend. Monsignore, when followed by the surname, is usually written and pronounced "Monsignor." The Protonotaries and Prelates are entitled to wear the purple mantelletta and rochet; Vicars-General wear a black mantelletta.[1] (Besides the officials mentioned, there are other members of the Papal Court who are styled monsignori; see Baumgarten in "Cath. Enc."; Humphrey, "Urbs et Orbis.")

MONS PIETATIS. An institution for lending money to the poor, on the security of some article deposited. The word "mons," a heap, a pile of money, was used with reference to the collected fund out of which the loan was made. Usury was in the Middle Ages (and indeed is still) the great bane of the small cultivator and shopkeeper. It was to provide against the miseries involved in the difficulty of obtaining small temporary loans, and in the high rate of interest exacted, that pious benefactors gave sums of money to be lent in the way described. Although the practice existed informally in early times, the first properly organized "Mons pietatis" was founded at Perugia in 1462, by the Franciscans. It was Blessed Bernardino da Feltre who a little later (1484) gave the greatest impetus to this good work. The

[1] Vicars-General were raised to the dignity of prelates by the *motu proprio* "Inter multiplices," Feb. 21, 1905.

principles on which the "montes" were carried on were: (1) the loans were to be only small sums and only to the poor; (2) a pawn or pledge of a saleable character was to be deposited with the officials; (3) originally a low rate of interest was exacted [B. Bernardino insisted on this]; (4) if the loan was not repaid the pawn was to be sold, and the surplus (if any) was to be returned to the pawner. The question of interest led to much opposition on the part of theologians and canonists (chiefly Dominicans), who held that all charges for loans were usurious. [See USURY.] The defenders of the "montes" replied that the charge made was not true interest, but compensation for the loss of the use of the money lent (*damnum emergens* and *lucrum cessans*) and payment of the costs of administration. The fifth Lateran Council (May 4, 1515) decided that the "montes" were lawful. (See also COUNCIL OF TRENT, sess. xxii. c. 8, De Ref.) Since that time they have multiplied exceedingly, and have been copied by the civil authorities. Curiously enough, they have not gained any foothold in England. (Ferraris, *Montes Pietatis*; Ballerini-Palmieri, "Theol. Mor." iii. 659 *sqq.*; Holzapfel, "Die Anfänge der Montes Pietatis"; Benigni in "Cath. Enc.")

MONSTRANCE. From the Latin *monstrare*, "to show"; the vessel in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed at Benediction or carried in procession. It has a large stem and base like a chalice, and the upper portion is generally fashioned to represent rays issuing from the host as a central sun. At first it was constructed like the turrets in which the Blessed Sacrament was anciently exposed, and various other designs are employed. When Fénelon's quietism was condemned by the Holy See he had a splendid monstrance made, the lower part of which represented angels trampling on bad books, one of which bore the title of Fénelon's own work, "Maxims of the Saints." The origin of the monstrance is traced back to the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi (q.v.). It is also called Ostensorium, from the Latin *ostendere*, and often, incorrectly, *Remonstrance*.

MONTANISTS. The earlier writers call them "the men of Phrygia" (*οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας*) because Montanus belonged to that country, and it was at Pepuza that he and two women, Maximilla and Priscilla, claimed to exercise prophetic gifts. The great importance of the movement is shown by the facts that Tertullian, the ablest of the Ante-Nicene Fathers except Origen, was won over to Montanism; that Claudius Apollinaris, Miltiades, and Rhodon exerted themselves against it; that the first councils of the Church were held in the middle of the second century to stem its progress in Asia Minor; and that three bishops of Rome, Soter, Eleutherus, and (probably) Victor, pronounced themselves against it—the last, according to Tertullian, after some hesitation (Tertull. "Adv. Prax." 1, PL, ii. 155). Montanus, if we may believe the report mentioned by Euseb. ("H.E." v. 16), hanged himself, and so did Maximilla. The power of Montanism did not outlast the second century, but adherents of the sect are mentioned even in edicts of Justinian and Leo the Isaurian.

Montanism was a reaction against a change which necessarily occurred as the number of Christians increased, as the extraordinary gifts, prophecy and the like, became very rare, and there was no sign of our Lord's coming to close at once the fortunes of the world and the Church. It was this speedy coming of Christ which the new prophets announced; it was the belief in its nearness which they endeavoured to revive. "After me," said Maximilla (Epiphan. "Haer." xlviii. 2, PG, xli. 857), "there will be no longer a prophetess, but the consummation." The prophets had already seen a miraculous representation of Christ's descent from heaven (Tertull. "Adv. Marc." iii. 24, PL, ii. 357). It was time, then, for Christians to break utterly with a world which would ere long break with them. The concessions which the Apostles even had made to human weakness were to be allowed no longer. The Paraclete had appeared in the prophets and inaugurated the last and most perfect stage in the development of the Church ("De Virg. Veland." 1; PL, ii. 889). The new discipline now in force made second marriages unlawful (Tertull. "Adv. Marc." i. 29, PL, ii. 280, and "De Monog." and "Exhort. Castit." throughout); made the fasts of the Stations obligatory, and prolonged the fast till the evening, whereas with the Catholics it ended at 3 P.M. ("De Jejun." 10); and imposed two weeks (Saturdays and Sundays excepted) of "xerophagy"—*i.e.* of abstinence from flesh-meat, wine, dainties of all sorts, and the bath (*ib.* 15). No flight in persecution was lawful ("De Fuga," 6, ii. 108"). But the most serious difference between Montanists and Catholics arose from their different views on absolution. In the "De Pudicitia" Tertullian combats the claim of the Roman bishop to pardon grievous sinners and restore them to the peace of the Church. He argues that this power belonged to the Apostles personally, just as the grace of miracles did, but denies that it was transmitted to their successors. God alone could forgive sins, and though, no doubt, He might declare His will through the prophets, and enable the Church to absolve from adultery, &c., as a matter of fact the Paraclete had said through the prophets, "The Church can pardon crimes, but I will not do so, lest they commit more crimes" ("Pudic." 21, PL, ii. 1024). "Psychici," or "animal men," is the name the Montanists gave to Catholics; "spiritual men" was the title they claimed for themselves.

Except on the power of the Keys there was no dogmatic difference between Montanists and the Church. Tertullian speaks of the Paraclete as inaugurating new discipline, not new doctrine ("De Pud." 11, PL, ii. 1001), and the author of the "Philosophumena" (viii. 19) expressly says the Montanists held Catholic doctrine, and only attributes Sabellian[1] error to some of them (*τινὲς δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ τῶν Νοητιανῶν αἱρέσει συντιθέμενοι*, κ.τ.λ.). As the Gnostics undermined the dogma, so the Montanists the discipline of the Church. The one set individual wisdom and intellect, the other individual holiness and devotion, against the claim of ecclesiastical authority. And thus it is that Gnosticism and Montanism are two great factors in the development of the Catholic Church. The opposition which they occasioned led the Church to assert explicitly her double claim—her claim to teach the absolute truth on the one hand; to try the spirits and restore the sinner on the other. (Schwegler's work on Montanism—Tübingen, 1841—led to a more intelligent appreciation of the subject. Baur has given an interesting summary of his views in his "Kirchengeschichte," p. 237 *seq.* But the best and most careful account, so far as we know, is that of Ritschl, "Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche," pp. 462 *sqq.*) Tixeront, "Hist. des Dogmes," i. 210; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," i. 270; Chapman in "Cath. Enc."; Harnack, in "Enc. Britannica.")

MORAL THEOLOGY is the science of the laws which regulate duty. It is distinguished from moral philosophy, or ethics, which is concerned with the principles of right and wrong, and with their application, so far only as they can be discovered from the light of nature; whereas moral theology estimates the moral character of actions by their conformity, not only to the natural standard of ethics, but also to the Christian revelation and positive law of the Church. It is different from dogmatic theology, which investigates the truths of revelation, their connection with each other, and the conclusions which may be drawn from them; moral theology, on the other hand, looks primarily to duty and practice, not to speculative truth; it considers faith as a moral obligation, and the truths of faith as principles of conduct. But perhaps we shall give a better, if a less scientific, idea of moral theology by describing it as the science of priests sitting in the confessional, the science which enables them to distinguish right from wrong, mortal sin from venial sin, counsels of perfection from strict obligation, and so to administer the sacrament of Penance. Indeed, it is because moral theology has arisen from the wants and is adapted to the needs of priests in the confessional, because it is directed to the solution of cases more or less likely to occur, that treatises on the subject are mostly deficient in scientific unity. They draw from philosophers and dogmatic theologians, canon and civil law, ascetical and liturgical authors, &c., the material which a priest wants that he may know when to give, when to refuse, absolution, what conditions he is to exact from his penitents, how he is to advise and exhort them.

In the first centuries of the Church public penance was in force. This was regulated by the canons; much less was left to the judgment of the bishop or the priest, and therefore there was no pressing need for compendiums of moral theology. The administration of the sacrament of Penance was regulated by conciliar decisions or by collections of penitential canons, such as those attributed to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Peter of Alexandria, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nyssen. From the seventh[1] to the thirteenth century the use of penitential books prevailed in the Latin Church—that is to say, from the whole body of decrees, canons, and sentences, those things which pertained to the sacrament of Penance were gathered in one book, known as "Extracts from the Canons of the Fathers for the Healing of Souls," "On Remedies for Sins," or, simply, "Penitential Book." But it was Pope St. Gregory's great work, "Expositio in B. Job, seu Moralium libri xxxv.," which was the text-book of the moralists until the days of the Schoolmen. Also his "Regula Pastoralis," so highly commended by Ven. Bede, was much in use among them. In the thirteenth century moral theology arose. Up to that time the confessor had to be guided purely by his own reason and the authority of ecclesiastical decisions contained in his "Penitential Book." But now scholastic theologians and canonists began to discuss the sense of ecclesiastical decisions, to harmonize them, to draw inferences from them and from the principles of the natural and revealed law. "Cases of conscience" were considered and decided on the private judgment of theologians, and not merely, as before, by councils and bishops, though the name of "casuist" began, apparently, some centuries later. Collections were made of the things a confessor should know when he had to decide cases and doubts proposed to him.

Among the earliest works on moral theology are the following, which belong to the thirteenth century: "Summa de Casibus Poenitentialibus," by St. Raymund of Pennafort (*floruit* 1228). Its four books treat (1) of sins against God; (2) of sins against our neighbour; (3) of ecclesiastics,

[1] "Patripassian" would be more accurate. No one could be more opposed to such an error than Tertullian. The general orthodoxy of the Montanists is further attested by Firmilian, *Ad Cyp.*, and Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlviii. 1, PG, xli. 856.

[1] They were introduced rather earlier in the East; see the article on PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE AND BOOKS.

their rights, privileges, duties; (4) of marriage. It was printed at Louvain, 1480; Cologne, 1495; Paris, 1500. "Summa de Virtutibus" and "Destructorium Vitiorum" are two works attributed, on doubtful grounds, to Alexander of Hales. The "Speculum Morale," by Vincent of Beauvais. The "Liber Poenitentiarum," by John of God, written in 1247. Glosses on the "Summa" of St. Raymund of Pennafort were written by a Dominican, Gulielmus Redonensis, about 1250, and widely circulated under the name of "John of Freiburg." A little later came St. Bonaventure's "Confessionale."

The chief productions of the fourteenth century were: the "Summa Major" and "Quaestiones Casuales," by the Dominican, John of Freiburg; the "Summa de Casibus Conscientiae," by a Franciscan, Astesanus or Astensis; "Summa Casuum Conscientiae," by Monaldus, another Franciscan, who flourished about 1330; "Summa Casuum Conscientiae," by Bartholomaeus a S. Concordia, a Dominican of Pisa, who wrote in 1338; "Speculum Curatorum," by a Benedictine, Ranulphus Higdenus (1357). But the most famous book of this age appeared in 1385 from the pen of Joannes de Burgo. It is entitled "Pupilla Oculi omnibus Sacerdotibus, tam Curatis quam non Curatis, summe necessaria, in qua tractatur de septem sacramentorum administratione, de decem praeceptis decalogi, et de reliquis ecclesiasticorum officiis."

Many famous works on moral theology are due to authors of the fifteenth century. Gerson's "Opusculum Tripartitum de praeceptis decalogi, de confessione, de arte moriendi," had so great a reputation that seventeen synods ordered priests to use it in expounding the Decalogue, hearing confessions, and visiting the sick. Three canonized saints, St. Bernardine of Siena ("De Confessione"), St. John Capistran ("Speculum Conscientiae," tractatus "De Canone Poenitentiali," "De Usuris," "De Contractibus," &c.), and St. Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, wrote on moral subjects. The "Summa Theologica et Summa Confessionalis" of the last has often been republished, and is still quoted. Many other names might be given. Nor must it be supposed that an idea can be formed of mediaeval moral theology from an account, even if an exhaustive one, of books exclusively devoted to this science. On the contrary, the greatest moral theologian of the Middle Ages, and the one who has had the most enduring influence, is St. Thomas Aquinas. But he, especially in the "Secunda Secundae," treats moral theology in its organic connection with dogmatic theology. His example has been followed by many later writers; and this, we venture to think, is the true scientific method, though far less convenient for practical purposes. Scotus, on the other hand, scarcely touched on moral questions; perhaps because he found the ground sufficiently occupied by Alexander of Hales and St. Thomas.

From the sixteenth century moral theology has been treated with greater completeness, and its order has been perfected for practical use. But the great change which has occurred consists in this, that theories affecting the whole system of moral theology arose, and divided casuists into schools clearly separated from and often bitterly hostile to each other. Medina, a Spanish Dominican (1528–1581) and professor at Salamanca, first (in his "Exposition of St. Thomas") propounded the theory since known as Probabilism[1] in set terms, and kindled a controversy which raged for two centuries after his death, and is not yet quite extinct.

A probable opinion is one which rests on reasons which are good and solid, but not so strong as to exclude all doubt. Hence, in many matters of conscience there may be a probable opinion according to which I am free to choose a particular course of action, and another opinion, also probable, that I have no such liberty, the law, human or divine, having already decided the matter for me. After doing my best to ascertain the real extent of the obligation, I am still in doubt. The opinion which favours the law and that which favours my liberty both seem probable. In such cases, Probabilists hold that I am free to use my liberty. A doubtful law, they urge, is not binding. A man's conscience can be bound by a law only so far as he knows of its existence; and in this case I do not know for certain the existence of the law, nor have I the means of doing so. Therefore I may act with safety, because I am certain that practically the law does not bind me. But several limitations must be made. First, I must be sure that the opinion on the side of liberty rests on a firm basis in the reason of the thing, in the authors of great name and weight who support it, or in both. The proposition that I may follow a probability, however slight, in favour of liberty, belongs to lax, not to Probabilist theologians, and was condemend by Innocent XI. (Prop. 3). Next, if a man is under the obligation of attaining to some definite external end, he is bound to take all reasonable means of securing that end, and may by no means follow an opinion probable, or even more probable, that the end will be secured. He must take the most certain means open to him. For example, a priest must not confer the sacraments after a fashion which leaves doubt as to their validity, if a safer path is open to him. A man must not pay a debt with money or a cheque

[1] This is the account generally given. Echard (*Script. Dominican.* tom. ii. p. 257, quoted by Billuart, *De Act. Human.* vi. 1) tries to show that Medina was not really a Probabilist, though he admits that he made way for the thin end of the wedge.

which he knows may prove worthless, though he has strong reasons for thinking them good. A doctor must not use doubtful remedies if he has better ones at command. A man may not fire at game if he knows there is even a slight danger of wounding a fellow-creature. Such opinions, again, are lax, not Probabilist, and are contrary not only to the fundamental principles of Christianity, but also to the natural conscience and common sense of mankind.

Laxity manifests itself in many ways, and the reader may form some idea of the scandalous excesses into which it has run by reading the list of propositions condemned by the Popes, especially by Innocent XI. We need not say more about it here; and, on the other side, we may also dismiss the opinion of the Rigorists, or Tutiorists, who held that we must always take the safer way, always sacrifice our freedom, however small the probability that our freedom is restrained by the law. This opinion was proscribed by Alexander VIII. A kindred opinion that we must not take advantage of our liberty unless we can point to an opinion of the highest probability in its favour may also be dismissed, for it never found any considerable support among theologians. Very different is it with another system of moral theology known as Probabiliorism, for long the powerful and even, for a time and in a certain degree, the triumphant rival of Probabilism.

The Probabiliorists put no restraint on liberty, where a man was convinced on solid grounds that the balance of evidence was decidedly in favour of his liberty. In such a case, they said, he acted prudently and as became a Christian. He was doing his best to ascertain the truth, and, after weighing the reasons, had decided that he might do this or that without sin. He judged according to the merits of the case and decided according to the rules of evidence, just as an honest judge would do. He chose the way to which he was inclined, not solely because of his inclination, but because of the preponderating evidence. On the other hand, a man who used his liberty when the probability of the opinions for and against his right to exercise it were evenly balanced, wantonly exposed himself to danger of material sin. If he acted against an opinion which he himself allowed to be more probable, alleging an opinion also probable on his own side, he was judging against the weight of evidence, and therefore sinning against the truth. If the Probabilists quoted the maxim, "A doubtful law does not bind," the Probabiliorists retorted, "In doubtful matters choose the safer side," If the Probabilists pleaded that they acted with safe and sure conscience, since, doubtful as they might be as to the absolute lawfulness of a particular action, they could be certain in practice that the action was lawful to them, since the law was uncertain, and, not being certain, had no binding force, the Probabiliorists replied, "You cannot feel certain of this without culpable presumption. The reflex principle which you assume to be morally certain, and make the basis of your conviction that in the particular case you are certainly free to act, is, in fact, contested by all Probabiliorists—*i.e.* by a vast number of grave and learned theologians from all nations, orders, and ranks in the Church. Yet, if this reflex principle be doubtful; if your argument, 'The law is uncertain, and therefore I am certain it does not bind,' is itself not absolutely and evidently cogent, then the question is at an end. You yourselves admit the wickedness of acting with a conscience practically doubtful. 'Whatsoever is not of faith is of sin.'"

From 1580 till about 1650 Probabilism, as even Billuart does not venture to deny, held possession of the schools. The great theologians prior to Medina's date did not treat the question formally, and are quoted on both sides. From about 1650 a powerful reaction set in. In France, Zaccaria writes, Probabilism was hated as "the pest of morality," and in 1700 it was condemned in the Assembly-General of the French clergy. The learned Benedictines of St. Maur and St. Vannes and the Fathers of the French Oratory were notoriously hostile to it. Nor must it be thought that this hostility was peculiar to French ecclesiastics or to Gallicans. Most, according to Billuart, of the Dominicans, some distinguished Jesuits (*e.g.* Gonzalez, General of the Society), and many Italian writers (*e.g.* the Dominican Concina, the brothers Peter and Jerome Ballerini, Berti, Fagnanus, many years secretary of the Congregation of the Council) were in the hostile ranks. Benedict XIV. made the moral theology of the Jesuit Antoine (in the Roman edition of the Franciscan Carbognano), an author rigid even among the Probabiliorists, the text-book at the Propaganda. And it may perhaps be worth mention that Bishop Milner recommended Collet, another Probabiliorist, for the use of his clergy. It was the text-book at Oscott within the memory of priests still alive. Henno, a well-known Franciscan, calculated that when he wrote—viz. in 1710—there were twenty Probabiliorists for one Probabilist; while the Flemish theologian Billuart, in 1747, thought the preponderance of numbers on the side of Probabiliorism had been doubled in the interval. No faith can be placed even in the proximate accuracy of these estimates. Still, they may be fairly accepted as evidence that numbers were on the side of Probabiliorism.

The proportion is now reversed, and Probabilism is the popular theory throughout the Church. It may, indeed, be regarded as the only existent theory. Carrière

(died 1864), a distinguished Sulpician, who wrote "De Contractibus et Matrimonio," is the only recent writer on moral theology, so far as we know, who is not a Probabilist. This change is due partly, we think, to the force of reason, for we cannot see that Probabiliorism is logical and consistent, and the arguments adduced by its advocates really tend to Tutiorism; partly to the disappearance of the old French Church and many Catholic universities where the stricter doctrine on morals had a strong hold; partly to the great influence of St. Alphonsus' works on moral theology. His "Theologia Moralis" and "Homo Apostolicus" appeared about the middle of the 18th century, and have often been republished. At present the Probabilist theology of this writer is accepted almost everywhere in the Church, and the recent works of Scavini and Gury are little more than adaptations of St. Alphonsus, though, of course, these authors do not follow him blindly, and the Jesuit Ballerini (in his notes to Gury) often differs from his conclusions. Moreover, the Congregation of Rites, in a decree confirmed by the Pope in 1803, declared that St. Alphonsus' works contained "nothing worthy of censure." This, as Heilig, the Redemptorist editor, explains, by no means implies that each statement of St. Alphonsus is true, or even that none of them will ever be condemned by the Church. It only means that his works are free from any "error already recognized as such by the Church." So, again, in 1831, the Sacred Penitentiary affirmed that a confessor might safely follow all St. Alphonsus' opinions on account of the judgment of the Holy See just quoted, adding, however, that there was no fault in adopting the opinions given by other approved authors. The subsequent elevation of the saint to the rank of Doctor of the Church makes no formal difference in the authority of his system, though it is clearly another mark of the Church's approbation. The Pope would not have made him a Doctor of the Church had he regarded the great literary work of his life in defending and expounding Probabilism as a mistake.

We passed over by design a subdivision which exists among Probabilists themselves. Aequi-probabilists hold that a man may use his liberty if the reasons in favour of his right to do so are at least equal in probability to those on the other side, but not otherwise. Probabilists pure and simple would allow a man to take advantage of his liberty if he has really probable grounds for thinking that the law does not bind him, even if the argument on the other side is more probable. This subdivision of Probabilists is an old one, but it has attracted more attention of late. The Redemptorist authors of the "Vindiciae Alphonsianae" try, we believe, to show that St. Alphonsus was an Aequi-probabilist. The object of their book is to correct Ballerini, who edited the Moral Theology of his brother Jesuit Gury, with elaborate notes, in which he not only assumes that St. Alphonsus was a Probabilist pure and simple, but often defends the probability of opinions which the saint rejected. In his third edition Ballerini replies to the charges of laxity which the Redemptorists made against him. A posthumous work on moral theology written by him was edited by Palmieri in 1892.

(The historical part of this article is drawn from Zaccaria's learned dissertation prefixed to some editions of St. Alphonsus' "Theologia Moralis." We have said nothing of the great moral theologians who have written during the last three centuries, De Lugo, Sporer, La Croix, &c., because a useful list of them is prefixed to Gury's work, and is sure to be in the hands of those whom the subject interests.)

MORGANATIC MARRIAGE ("coined from German *morgen*, here short for *morgen-gabe*, lit. morning-gift, originally a present made to a wife on the morning after marriage, especially if the wife were of inferior rank"—Skeat). In some countries when a member of the royal house marries a person of non-royal rank, such person is not raised to the rank of her husband, nor are her children reckoned in the line of succession. If, however, all the conditions of the Church have been fulfilled, the marriage is a true one in the eyes of the Church, and no other marriage can be contracted during the lifetime of both the parties. Even the civil law in some countries recognizes no other marriage as lawful. In England, however, the so-called morganatic wife is no wife at all. Thus, Mrs. Fitzherbert, who was married to the Prince of Wales (afterwards George IV.), was in English law only his concubine, and her existence was no bar to his subsequent union with Caroline of Brunswick. On the other hand, English law recognizes in the case of persons not in the royal succession the civil rights of a wife however inferior she may be in rank to her husband.

MORSE, also called *Monile, Pectorale.* A clasp to fasten the cope across the breast. It was often made of precious metal or ivory, and richly ornamented. (Rock, ii. 31; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 321 *sqq.*, where numerous specimens are depicted.)

MORTAL SIN. [See SIN.]

MORTIFICATION. [See ASCETAE; FAST.]

MORTMAIN. [See WILL (2).]

MOTU PROPRIO. A kind of apostolic letter, generally in the form of a decree issued by the Pope "on his own initiative." It bears at the end the Pope's name, *e.g.* Benedictus PP. XV., and is not countersigned by any official. It is a sign that the Pontiff wishes to act in the fulness of his power. (Taunton.) [See RESCRIPT.]

MOZARABIC RITE. [See LITURGIES.]

MOZZETTA (from *mozzo, mutilus*; cf.

μίτυλος and μύτιλος, curtailed). A short vestment, quite open in front, which can, however, be buttoned over the breast, covering the shoulders, and with a little hood behind. It is worn by the Pope, by cardinals, bishops, abbots, and others who do so by custom or Papal privilege—*e.g.* in England by canons. As it is the usual state dress of a bishop when he is not saying Mass or performing other sacred functions, bishops, &c., are usually painted with the mozzetta. The mozzetta leaves the greater part of the rochet uncovered, hence it is either not worn at all or worn only over the mantelletta by cardinals, bishops, and others where they have no jurisdiction. Thus the cardinals wear the mozzetta and rochet only in the churches from which they take their titles; but throughout Rome during a vacancy of the Holy See, especially at Conclaves.

The Pope wears five different mozzette. In the hotter part of the year—viz. from the first vespers of the Ascension to the feast of St. Catharine—his mozzetta is of red satin except on vigils, ember days, Masses of the dead, and other penitential occasions, when it is of red serge or camlet. The other half of the year he wears a mozzetta of red velvet, except as a mark of sorrow or penance in Advent, Septuagesima to the end of Lent, vigils, &c., when his mozzetta is of red woollen cloth. On a feast, such as those of the Annunciation and Conception, the anniversary of his election and consecration, on visiting a church where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, &c., he puts aside the mourning mozzetta even during penitential seasons. From Holy Saturday till Saturday in Low Week his mozzetta is of white damask. The cardinals have four mozzette—viz. of red or purple silk, violet silk, rose-coloured silk, violet serge. (Moroni, "Dizionario Istorico"; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 377.) [See ALMUCE.]

MUNDATORY, or Purificatory. A cloth of linen or hemp (S.C.R. May 18, 1819), used for cleansing the chalice. It has a small cross in the middle to distinguish it from the Lavabo towel. It is mentioned in the "Caeremoniale Episcoporum," but its use is of recent date and it is not blessed. The Greeks use a sponge instead. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." i. v. 5.)

MURATORIAN CANON. [See CANON OF THE SCRIPTURE, p. 112.]

MUSIC, CHURCH. [See CHANT.]

MYSTERY. In common parlance something hidden or veiled, especially by one mind from another (μύειν, to close the eyes; μῦ, a slight sound with closed lips). The heathens gave the name to the symbolical or sacred words and acts which they kept secret from the multitude, or to the hidden meaning of their liturgy, understood only by the initiated. By the early Fathers the term was applied to the sacred words and acts of the true religion, kept secret from the heathens and even from the catechumens. In the theological sense a mystery is a truth incapable of being discovered by human reason and incapable of being understood by it: a mystery is subjectively above reason and objectively above nature—it is both super-rational and supernatural. "Besides those things which natural reason can attain, there are proposed for our belief the mysteries hidden in God, which, unless they were divinely revealed, could not be known. . . . By their very nature the divine mysteries so far surpass the created intellect that, even when they have been imparted by revelation and received by faith, they nevertheless remain hidden and enveloped, as it were, in a sort of mist, as long as in this mortal life we are absent from the Lord, for we walk by faith, and not by sight (2 Cor. v. 6, 7). "If anyone shall say that in divine revelation no mysteries properly so called are contained, but that all the dogmas of the faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles by reason duly cultivated, let him be anathema." (Vatican Council, sess. iii. c. 4.) The teaching of the council is based on many passages of Scripture (1 Cor. ii. 6–12; Eph. iii. 4–9; Col. i. 26, 27; Mt. xi. 25–27; Jn. i. 18). The patristic writings contain many passages commenting on these texts: *e.g.* St. John Chrysostom and St. Jerome on Eph. iii.; also St. Peter Chrysologus, hom. 67 *sqq.* on the Lord's Prayer. (See TRINITY, E; Vacant, "Constitutions du Concile du Vatican," ii. 185 *sqq.*; Wilhelm and Scannell "Cath. Theol." i. 8 *sqq.*; Scheeben "Die Mysterien des Christenthums")

MYSTICAL SENSE OF SCRIPTURE. In the historical or literal sense words signify things; but sometimes God ordained that the things signified by the words should signify other things, and so we get the mystical or spiritual sense. St. Paul, for example, tells us in the Epistle to the Galatians that Ishmael and Isaac were types of Jewish bondage and Christian liberty. The mystical sense is subdivided into the allegorical, where the things of the old signify the mysteries of the new law; the moral, where they signify moral precepts; the anagogical, where they signify future glory (St. Thomas, 1ª, q. 1, a. 10). The mystical interpretation is by no means peculiar to Christians. Philo, St. Paul's contemporary, found in the allegorical interpretation of the *Old Testament* an easy means of reconciling it with Greek philosophy, and allegorical interpretation has been systematized by the Rabbins.[1] St.

[1] They also recognise four modes of interpreting Scripture—viz. the literal (פְּשָׁט), the seeking of hints for laws, precepts, &c. (רֶמֶז), the deduction of dogma and legal determinations (דְּרוּשׁ), the interpretation of mystical theology (סוֹד). See Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, art. "Exegese."

Paul's authority proves that there is a mystical sense in Scripture; but common sense warns us of the dangers attached to such a method of interpretation. And St. Thomas, following St. Augustine, teaches that arguments can be drawn from the literal sense alone (*loc. cit.*). [See BIBLE.]

MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. One of the subdivisions of theology classed under the more general division of Moral Theology. It is sometimes identified with Ascetical Theology, but it seems more proper to confine its definition in such a way as to distinguish it precisely, by its specific name of "Mystical," from that which is more properly called "Ascetical" (*q.v.*). According to this stricter definition it is described as comprising two parts—viz. the doctrinal and the experimental. The experimental is defined as "a pure knowledge of God which the soul ordinarily receives in a luminous darkness or obscure light of sublime contemplation, together with an experimental love so intimate that the soul, losing itself altogether, is united to God and transformed into Him." This is called Theology because it contains acts proximately referred to God as their object; Mystical, because acquired by a secret operation known only to God and the recipient of His Divine favours; and experimental, because it is only by personal spiritual experience that such a knowledge of God can be gained. Doctrinal Mystical Theology is "a science which considers the acts of the experimental, and discusses their essence, properties, and effects, according to the authority of the Scriptures and the contemplative saints, giving practical rules for the guidance of those who have attained, or are in the way to attain, the state of high contemplation."

The most eminent mystical writers in the Catholic Church are Pseudo-Dionysius the so-called Areopagite, St. Bernard, St. Thomas, St. Anselm, St. Bonaventure, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, Gerson, Harphius, Tauler, St. Theresa, and St. John of the Cross, and others. The great modern Doctor in Mystical Theology, whose works are the most complete and luminous, the most sublime, and at the same time the most philosophically exact and precise, and whose authority is the highest which any private theologian can have, is St. John of the Cross. His works have been translated into English in the best manner by D. Lewis. A more unpretending but very solid and useful treatise is the "Sancta Sophia" of F. Baker, an English Benedictine. As scientific and methodical treatises for the use of directors and professed theologians, the "Institutiones Theologiae Mysticae" of F. Schram, O.S.B., and the "Directorium Mysticum" of F. Scaramelli, S.J., are in the highest repute. (See Von Hügel, "The Mystical Element of Religion"; Thorold, "An Essay in aid of the Better Appreciation of Catholic Mysticism"; Devine, "Manual of Mystical Theology.")

N

NAILS, HOLY. In the story of the Finding of the Cross (see CROSS, p. 243) it is mentioned that the nails with which our Lord's body was fastened were discovered hard by the cross itself. St. Helena had one of these made into a bridle for her son Constantine, having in mind the words of the prophet Zechariah (Zachary): "that which is upon the bridle of the horse shall be holy to the Lord" ("There shall be upon the bells of the horses 'Holy unto the Lord'" (R.V. xiv. 20). Another of the nails was worked into an imperial crown (St. Ambrose, "De Obitu Theodosii," PL, xvi. 1402). This is said to be the one now preserved at Monza, "the iron crown of Lombardy." There are others venerated at various places (notably at Santa Croce in Rome) which may be facsimiles or may contain portions of the nails mentioned above. (Rohault de Fleury, "Les Instruments de la Passion," 165–181; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

NAME, CHRISTIAN, ETC. [See BAPTISMAL NAME.]

NAME OF JESUS. [See JESUS.]

NAME OF MARY. [See MARY, FEAST OF THE NAME.]

NARTHEX (*νάρθηξ*, the giant fennel). In the ancient basilicas a long narrow space, from which outer doors led into the portico, and inner doors into the body of the church, was known by this name. In it stood the Audientes (penitents allowed to enter the church, but only the part farthest from the altar), the Possessed (*χειμαζόμενοι*), and the Catechumens, who had not yet been baptized. The oblong shape of this space, which extended the whole width of the building, suggested the name. (Smith and Cheetham; Kraus, "Geschichte der Christl. Kunst," i. 285, 549.)

NATALE, NATALITIA. The day on which a saint is born into eternal life—*i.e.* the day of his death. The Church does not celebrate the natural birthday of the saints because they were born in sin, and the fact that she keeps the birthday of St. John the Baptist is, as St. Augustine points out, an

exception which proves the rule, for St. John was cleansed from original sin before his birth.[1]

The use of Natale, Natalitia, &c., for the day of a saint's death is very ancient. Thus the Church of Smyrna says of its bishop Polycarp, "We keep the birthday of his martyrdom" (*τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον*) ("Mart. Polyc." 18), and Tertullian speaks of the Mass said on the feasts of martyrs as "oblationes pro natalitiis" ("De Corona," 3, PL, ii. 79). The Church still retains the use of the word in her collects. Thence Natale came to mean a feast generally — *e.g.* "Natale Petri de Cathedra" in the ancient Kalendarium Beccleriánum is the feast of St. Peter's Chair. It was also used for the anniversary of a bishop's consecration. (Probst, *loc. cit.*; Smith and Cheetham.)

NATIONAL SYNOD. [See COUNCIL.]

NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. Nothing is known about the place, date, or circumstances of the Blessed Virgin's birth. Joachim and Anne are believed to have been her parents, and this belief, the earliest authority for which is the "Protevangelium Jacobi," an apocryphal Gospel of early date, was current in the East and West during the eighth century. It is recognized by St. John of Damascus and James, bishop of Edessa, while the "Liber Pontificalis," mentions in the life of Pope Leo III. that he had the history of St. Joachim and St. Anne painted in the Basilica of St. Paul. The feast of St. Anne on July 26, which is mentioned in the Roman and other Martyrologies, was sanctioned for the whole Church by Gregory XIII. in 1584. Leo XIII. raised both feasts (St. Joachim and St. Anne) to be doubles of the second class.

It is very uncertain when the feast of the Blessed Virgin's nativity was introduced. The Breviary lessons for the feast, said to be taken from St. Augustine, are spurious. The mention of the feast in Sacramentaries of St. Gelasius and St. Gregory proves little, considering the changes and frequent recensions which books of that sort, intended, as they are, for practical purposes, are sure to undergo. It is not mentioned by the Council of Mayence in 813, though it gives a list of the feasts then celebrated; nor again in the capitularies of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. On the other hand, it is mentioned by Walter, bishop of Orleans, in 871, and in a work on the virginity of Mary ascribed to St. Ildefonsus, but really, as Dachery thinks, written by Paschasius Radbertus, in the middle of the ninth century. It is placed in the list of holidays by the Emperor Manuel Comnenus in the middle of the twelfth century, and the Copts as well as the Greeks have adopted it. Both Greeks and Latins now keep it on September 8, though at one time this was not everywhere the day fixed for the celebration. The octave was added by Innocent IV. in consequence, it is said, of a vow made by the cardinals at the election of Celestine IV. The dissensions between the Church and Frederic II. made it difficult to secure the peace necessary for an election, and in this extremity the Conclave begged the Blessed Virgin's prayers, and promised, in case the favour was granted, to have an octave added to the feast of her nativity. In the new Calendar the octave is a "simple" one. (Kellner, "Heortology," tr. 230; Hollweck, "Fasti Mariani," 118 *sqq.*)

NAVE. That portion of the church reserved for the laity. Though the name is said to have been derived from the comparison of a church to a ship (see CHURCH), and the use of the corresponding words in French and other languages seems to justify this derivation, yet many make it to be from *ναός*, a temple. It was variously called *oratorium laici*, *ἐκκλησία*, and *quadratum populi*. In old English it was sometimes called *nef*.

NAZARETH, SISTERS OF. An offshoot from the institute of the Little Sisters of the Poor, which it resembles in most respects. There are many houses in the English-speaking countries at home and abroad.

NECROLOGY. A book containing the names of the dead, especially of bishops who had built the church to which the necrology belonged, of benefactors, friends, &c., that they might be prayed for. Such a book, as Meratus shows, is mentioned by Bede[1] ("H. E." iv. 14). According to Maskell it seems also to have been called Album or "White Book," Obituarium, Mortilegium. (Meratus on Gavantus, tom. ii. § v. 21; Maskell, "Monumenta Ritualia," clxxvii.)

NECROMANCY. [See SPIRITUALISM.]

NEOPHYTE (Gr. *νεόφυτος*, newly grown, of new nature). The term was applied in the primitive Church to converts newly baptized. They were dressed in white garments, and continued to wear them for eight days after their baptism. Thus of the West Saxon king Cedwalla, who, renouncing his crown, went to Rome to be baptized, and died soon after, we hear that he died while still in his white garments.[2] The Nicene Council ordered (Can. 2) that neophytes should not be hastily admitted to Holy Orders, but should undergo a probation of considerable length. This canon was evidently founded on the prohibition of St. Paul (1 Tim. iii. 6), and occasioned by the ill effects which had arisen from neglecting it. In later times the neophytes commonly met with, at least in Europe, were

[1] Apparently, however, even the heathen Romans used "natale" as a euphemism for the day of death. This, at least, seems to follow from Mommsen (*De Collegiis*, p. 127), as quoted by Probst (*Kirchliche Disciplin der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 127). A quotation is given from *Statutes of the Lanurian Collegium*, with lists of feasts for the "natalia," or days on which the members had died.

[1] "*Quaerant in suis codicibus* in quibus defunctorum est annotata depositio."—Bede, *loc. cit.*

[2] Bede, *H.E.* v.

converts from heresy, Judaism, or Islam. For these Gregory XIII. founded an ecclesiastical college. The matrimonial relations between spouses, of whom one has become a neophyte but the other refuses to leave his or her original persuasion, give rise to many difficult questions in canon law. The Catholic missionaries still use the term for their converts from the heathen, whose fervour and steadfastness are often found to equal anything recorded of the primitive neophytes. (Ferraris, *Neophyti.*)

NESTORIANS. A name given to the Christians who follow the doctrine of Nestorius, and hold that there are two persons as well as two natures in Jesus Christ. These two distinct persons, the person of God and that of man, were, he said, bound together in Jesus Christ by a merely moral union—*i.e.* there was a conformity of will between the man Christ and God the Word, who dwelt in Him, and hence the properties of one nature or person could not be ascribed to the other. He rejected, *e.g.*, such expressions as "the Word suffered," on the ground that it was the man Christ and not God the Word who was capable of suffering; "Mary is the mother of God," since Christ indeed had a mother, but God had none (Petav. "De Incarnat." i. 9). But a full account of the doctrine and history of Nestorius has been given in the article on the Council of Ephesus, and we confine ourselves to the history of the Nestorian Church.

The Nestorians had their original home and centre in Chaldaea and Mesopotamia. Christianity, it is said, was first preached there by Mar Addai and Mar Mari, of the number of the Seventy. The Bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon held the chief see in these parts, and after the schism became independent of Antioch.[1] The famous school of Edessa and the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia prepared the way for Nestorianism, and when in 498 Babaeus, whom the metropolitan Barsumas of Nisibis had won over to Nestorianism, ascended the throne of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Catholicism disappeared almost entirely in Mesopotamia. The Persians for obvious reasons encouraged the schism which separated their Christian subjects from the Greek Church of the Byzantine empire. The Persian kingdom was the refuge of Nestorianism. Thence it spread not only through Mesopotamia, Chaldaea, and Persia, but also to Arabia, Egypt, Media, Bactria, Hyrcania, India, and even China. The Nestorian Patriarch in the eleventh century had twenty-five metropolitans under him; the Nestorian "communion extended from China to Jerusalem, and its numbers, with those of the Monophysites, are said to have surpassed those of the Greek and Latin Churches together" (Newman's "Arians," p. 425).

[1] Assemani holds it for certain that till the schism the Bishop of Seleucia was a mere metropolitan subject to the Patriarch of Antioch. He must, however, have been superior in estimation to the other metropolitans.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century the Nestorian numbers fell rapidly, owing to the persecution by the Mongol king Timour. Later, the Nestorians suffered from internal schism. On occasion of a contested election to the Patriarchate three bishops and many priests appealed to Pope Julius III., who in 1553 proclaimed Sulaka "Patriarch of the Chaldeans," and thus began the series of patriarchs for the Chaldeans or descendants of Nestorians, who have renounced Nestorian doctrine and are in union with the Pope. In 1582 an archbishop, Simeon, who had separated some years previously from the Nestorian Patriarch, and called himself Patriarch of Kurdistan, also submitted to the Pope, and he too received from Rome the title of Chaldean Patriarch. These re-unions with the Catholic Church did not last long. But since the middle of the sixteenth century there were two Nestorian Patriarchs, one residing at Mosul, another in Central Kurdistan, and the constant intestine strife favoured the efforts of the Roman missionaries. In 1780 the Nestorian Patriarch Mar Elias at Mosul became a Catholic, and consequently it is only by the Lake of Urumiah and among the mountains of Kurdistan that Nestorians are found. The Christians in the low countries by the banks of the Tigris are Chaldeans—*i.e.* the descendants of Nestorians, now re-united to the Catholic Church. The Nestorians proper call themselves Suraya (Syrian) Christians, Meshihaye (Christians) Nestoraye, but never Chaldeans, which name is exclusively reserved to Catholics. It is true the Nestorian Patriarch calls himself "Patriarch of the Chaldeans in the East," but this title he only assumes in order to place himself on a level with the Catholic Patriarch at Mosul, and to avoid being regarded by the Latins as the head of an heretical sect.

The Bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon received the title of Catholicos in the fourth century—as representative in the East of the Antiochene Patriarch. He himself assumed the title of Patriarch after the schism. Till the middle of the fifteenth century he was chosen by the metropolitans and other bishops. These last assembled, with the archdeacon of the former Patriarch and with the chief laity, and chose the new Patriarch unanimously. In difficulty, recourse was had to the lot, and from 987 the secular power confirmed the election. Since 1450 the Patriarch has been chosen from one family, and generally the office has descended from uncle to nephew. The indispensable qualification for a Patriarch is that his mother during her pregnancy and while suckling her child, and the new Patriarch himself till the time of his election, should never have tasted flesh-meat. The Patriarch confirms the election of bishops, translates and deposes them. He alone consecrates the holy oils; no book can be published without his approbation. He prescribes the liturgical

rules and his name is always mentioned in the daily office. The Patriarch also exercises civil jurisdiction in cases where Nestorians only are concerned, and though there is a right of appeal to the Emir it is seldom used. In 872 the residence of the Patriarch was transferred from Seleucia to Bagdad; from 1258 onwards he resided in various places; after 1560 he lived in the neighbourhood of Mosul. After Elias XI., Patriarch of Mosul, had been reconciled to the Catholic Church in 1780, the Bishop of Urumiah, who had assumed the title of Patriarch long before, in 1582, became the only Nestorian Patriarch. In 1590 he withdrew to Kochanes, in Kurdistan. In 1842 his residence was burnt by the Emir, Nurallah Beg; next year he was driven by the Kurds to Mosul; but in 1848 he returned to Kochanes (Badger, vol. i. pp. 258, 374). His income is got from a poll-tax, levied every three years, from commutation of excommunications into fines, and from a tithe on the first-fruits contributed for the support of the churches.

The new bishops used to be chosen by clergy and laity in the presence of the provincial bishops. At present they are chosen, if any suitable candidate can be found in this way, from the relatives of the former bishop. The bishop is consecrated by the Patriarch and sometimes by the metropolitan; but in the latter case he must receive the completion of the rite, involving the confirmation of the election, from the Patriarch himself. Diocesan synods are to be held twice a year, those of the metropolitan province annually, those of the Patriarchate every four years. Bishops in distant places may, instead of personal appearance, send an account of their dioceses and letters of union to the Patriarch once every six years. Married men or widowers cannot become bishops, metropolitans, or patriarchs. A law of the Patriarch Jabaeus in 499 permitted the reiterated nuptials even of the highest ecclesiastics; but it was repealed by the Patriarch Mar-Abas in 514. Still, the letter of two canons in the Sinhados assumes that bishops may be married (Badger, vol. ii. ch. 36, p. 180). The metropolitan (*matran*) has no power over his suffragans, except that of summoning them to synods and consecrating them. The usual title of the bishop is "Abuna" (Father). He is supported by an annual poll-tax, gifts in kind at harvest-time, fees for ordination, consecration of churches, dispensations for marriage, &c. The diocese of the Patriarch is in Central Kurdistan. There are eight metropolitans, with seven bishops. The whole Nestorian population amounts to about 100,000. The archdeacon is the bishop's vicar in spiritual and temporal matters. The chorepiscopus (*saura* or visitor, corresponding to the Greek *περιοδευτής*) visits the country churches. He instructs the country clergy in their functions, sees that the episcopal dues are collected, superintends the election of parish priests, &c. His place is at the bishop's left, that of the archdeacon at his right. Next comes the archpriest, who is the chorepiscopus of the city.

The parish priests, who are married and may even marry again after ordination, are chosen by the people, the bishop confirming the choice. An office peculiar to the Nestorians is that of the Sciahara or cleric who is responsible for the night-hours of the Breviary office. He is only, as a rule, a cantor (*amura*) by ordination, although he is called deacon or priest. The parish priests, though they have great influence and are consulted in all political and domestic affairs of importance, get very little money and follow a trade. There are two minor orders, reader and subdeacon; three higher, deacon, priest, bishop. The tonsure is given before the lectorate.

The monasteries, once numerous among the Nestorians, are now extinct. The only old monastery is in the hands of the Chaldeans —*i.e.* Catholics of the same rite—and no new ones have arisen. The monastic profession declined after the fourteenth century, when vows of chastity were no longer regarded as irrevocable. The canons, however, required monks and nuns who married to do so privately and with the bishop's leave. A monk and nun before their marriage were subjected to penance. Although there are now no nunneries, there are women under temporary[1] vows of chastity who occupy themselves in works of Christian charity (Badger, vol. ii. p. 179).

The Nestorians use the old Syrian rite, in classical Syriac. (Assemani, "Bibl. Orient." P. ii. cap. 1–6; Badger, "The Nestorians and their Rituals," London, 1852; Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients," pp. 202 *seq.* A full account of the present state of the Nestorian Church will be found in Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," ch. v.)

NE TEMERE. Some account of the recent changes in the law of clandestinity has already been given in the article IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE, p. 445, but a few words may be added here to prevent any misunderstanding of the much-abused decree on the subject, issued August 2, 1907, and beginning with the words "Ne temere."

By the law of the Council of Trent ("Tametsi," sess. xxiv. *De Ref. Matrim.*) marriages were declared invalid unless celebrated in the presence of the parish priest of one or other of the two parties (or another priest with the permission of the parish priest or the bishop) and two witnesses. This law was to be binding only in places where the decree was published. As a fact, the decree was not published in non-Catholic countries, and hence it was not binding in them. Great

[1] It appears, however, to be very possible to obtain release from these vows (Badger, vol. ii. p. 179).

confusion arose as to which countries were subject to the decree, and also as to what was meant by the parish priest of one or other of the parties. To remove these difficulties the new decree was issued. We cannot here go into the whole of the changes made. Suffice it to say that henceforth the valid assistant is not the parish priest of the *persons*, but of the *place* where the marriage is celebrated; and the law is binding throughout the Church, even in mixed marriages. It is not, however, retrospective: marriages contracted before Easter 1908 are considered valid even though they have not fulfilled the above conditions.

Changes were also made in the law of Espousals (*q.v.*). (See Cronin, "New Matrimonial Legislation.")

NICENE COUNCILS. The main history of the Nicene Councils has been already given—that of the former in the articles ARIUS and CREEDS, that of the latter under ICONOCLASTS. Little need be added here. For the convocation, presidency, &c., of both, see the article COUNCILS.

1. The First Nicene and First General Council met in 325, after Constantine had sent Hosius to Alexandria in order to reconcile the Catholics and Arians, and the mission had proved unsuccessful. The bishops—according to Athanasius, who was present—were 318 in number, mostly from the East, though Hosius of Cordova played a great part in the council, and the Roman bishop was represented by the priests Vitus and Vincentius. Besides asserting the full and consubstantial divinity of the Son, the council dealt with various matters of discipline, especially the Paschal controversy [see EASTER] and the Meletian schism. The canons are twenty in number, for the eighty Arabic canons are mostly of much later date. Neophytes were not to be ordained (Canon 2); clerics not to live with *subintroductae* (3); the metropolitans to confirm and superintend episcopal elections (4); no bishop to receive persons excommunicated by another, but an appeal might be made to the provincial council (5); the patriarchal rights of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were to be maintained (6); decisions follow on the rights of the Bishop of Jerusalem [see JERUSALEM]; on the reconciliation of the Cathari or Novatians (8); then come penitential canons (9–14); canons on usury, change of place by the clergy, &c. (15–17); subjection of deacons to priests (18); the disciples of Paul of Samosata were to be rebaptized before they were received into the Church (19); prayer was to be made standing on Sundays and during Easter time. [See also CELIBACY.]

2. The Second Nicene Council, the Seventh General, met in 787 under Tarasius. Besides defining the veneration due to holy images, the council published twenty-two canons, in which the so-called Apostolic Canons and the oecumenical character of the Council in Trullo were recognized, clerics forbidden to leave the church where they had been stationed, the lives of bishops, the relations of clerics and nuns regulated, double monasteries forbidden, &c., &c. For the position taken by Rome with reference to some of these enactments, see TRULLO, COUNCIL IN. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 335 *sqq.*; iii. 741 *sqq.*)

NIMBUS. [See AUREOLE.]

NOCTURN. [See BREVIARY.]

NOMINATION. One of the ways by which the designation of a bishop to a see may be effected. The *ordinary* mode is that of election by the chapter; this has been the rule ever since, in the Empire, the Concordat of Worms (1122) put an end to the abuse of the emperor's investing bishops by "ring and crosier," and since, in England, the Papal interdict compelled King John to cease from forcing his nominee upon the see of Norwich. In France, by the Concordat of 1515 [CONCORDAT], the Holy See conceded the nomination to bishopries to the Kings of France, but the persons chosen were to be confirmed by the Pope, after due inquiry into their canonical qualifications. Under the Concordat of 1802 the nomination, with a similar proviso, continued to be in the hands of the French Government until 1906 [see FRENCH CHURCH]. Not the King of France only, but the Kings of Spain, Portugal, and the two Sicilies, and the House of Austria, obtained this right of nomination. It was extended even to the President of Hayti, by a Concordat signed in 1860. Yet, as Buss well remarks ("Kirchenlex." *Bischof*), the monarchical principle does not imply or require such a right; and if it be said that it is part of that *surveillance* which a civil ruler must exercise over all that passes within his dominions, "one may answer that it is solicitude for ecclesiastical interests which ought to determine the election of a bishop, and that this solicitude is more to be expected in an ecclesiastical body than in the government."

NOMOCANON (νόμος, law; κανών, rule). Collections of the canons of recognised councils, and of such portions of the civil law as refer to Church matters, are called by this name. The earliest is that of Fulgentius, a deacon of the Church of Carthage in the sixth century. The best known is that compiled in the ninth century by the celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople; it contains the ancient canons down to and including those of the Seventh General Council, or second of Nicaea (787), and the imperial constitutions affecting the Church to the same date. Balsamon, chartophylax at Constantinople in the thirteenth century, added a commentary to the work of Photius. The Nomocanon which goes under the name of St. Vladimir, and is accepted as the basis of canon law in Russia, contains canons

which are not recognized by the Western Church.

NONE. [See BREVIARY.]

NORBERTINES. [See PREMONSTRATENSIANS.]

NOTRE DAME, SISTERS OF. In 1803, by the counsel of the celebrated Père Varin, Julie Billiart (b. 1751, d. 1816), and her friend Françoise Blin de Bourdon, Countess of Gézaincourt, laid the permanent foundations of the Institute of the Sisters of Notre Dame, "an order which had for its primary object the salvation of the souls of poor children." In 1809 the mother house and the administration of the order were transferred to Namur. The foundress lived to see fifteen convents of her institute established. After her death the rules and constitutions received the formal approbation of the Holy See (1844). There are numerous houses in Great Britain, Belgium, and the United States. The most important of the English houses is the training college for Catholic school-mistresses at Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, the direction of which was confided to the Sisters by the Government in 1856. The "Centre System," which admits of the concentrated instruction of pupil teachers, now adopted by all the Education Committees of the larger English cities, originated with the Sisters at Liverpool. Julie was declared "blessed" by Pope Pius X. in 1906. (See Sister of Notre Dame, "Life of the Blessed Julie Billiart," and art. in "Cath. Enc.")

NOVATIANISM. Novatian, a Stoic philosopher, was delivered, as is said, from demoniacal possession by the exorcisms of the Church, and became a catechumen. In danger of death, he received clinical baptism, and afterwards, without being confirmed, was ordained priest. During persecution he refused to assist his brethren, but, later on, he protested against the laxity of the Roman clergy in receiving the lapsed to penance, and led away many Roman priests. Afterwards, he was a bitter opponent of Pope Cornelius, on the ground that he was a *libellaticus*; persuaded three country bishops to consecrate him in the year 251, and thus became, in Fleury's words, "the first Anti-Pope" (Fleury, ii. p. 220). He consecrated new bishops and sent them as emissaries to various parts (Cyprian, Ep. lv., ed. Hartel, p. 642).

He added heresy to schism, for he denied the Church's power to absolve the lapsed[1] (Pacian, "Ad Symphor." Ep. 3). He was condemned in councils at Rome and Carthage, and by Dionysius of Alexandria. His sect, however, continued, and won adherents in Constantinople, Asia Minor, and especially Phrygia. Like the Montanists, they condemned second marriage, and they rebaptized Catholics who joined them. They called themselves "the pure" (*καθαρούς*, Euseb. "H.E." vi. 43). Even at the Nicene Council, Ascesius, a Novatian bishop, defended these severer principles on penance (Socrates, "H.E." i. 10).

A modern historian (Baur, "Kirchengeschichte," i. p. 367) has said with justice that the Cathari, or Novatians, sacrificed the catholicity to the sanctity of the Church. Undoubtedly, the full privileges of the Church are for the pure, and the pure alone. But the Church is the steward of the Divine mysteries, and it is her office, through the means of grace entrusted to her, to effect and to renew that purity of heart which she requires from her children. The Church has neither the power nor the will to exclude those who truly repent. Hatred of sin and mercy to sinners is the double lesson taught by her Divine Founder. If she refused to receive sinners, she would cease to be catholic; if she received them without true repentance, she would cease to be holy.

(The principal authorities on the Novatian schism are Eusebius, "H.E." vi. 43 *seq.*; Cyprian's numerous Epistles to Cornelius. Pacian, Ep. 3, "Ad Symphor.," thus sums up the doctrine of Novatian: "Quod mortale peccatum ecclesia donare non possit, imo quod ipsa peccat recipiendo peccantes." For the later history of the Novatians, see Socrat. "H.E." v. 21, 22; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Église," i. p. 407 *sqq.*; Chapman in "Cath. Enc.")

NOVENA (from *novem*, nine). The practice of dedicating a period of nine days to special prayer or devotion probably originated, like many other Christian practices, from pagan customs. Thus we read of novenas of mourning (Iliad, xxiv. 664, 784; Aeneid, v. 64), and of propitiation (Livy, i. 31). In the early Christian Church St. Augustine condemns the practice as pagan (PL, xxxiv. 596). In spite of this, the nine days of mourning continued to be observed until in the Middle Ages the novena of masses became the rule in the case of great personages, especially popes and cardinals. The "Pope's Novena" remains to this day. A novena of preparation was celebrated in Spain and France before the feast of Christmas, and is still so liturgically in the Breviary office beginning with December 17. Here the number was suggested by the nine months from the Incarnation to the birth of our Lord. Once the novena of preparation was established for one feast it was easy to extend it to others; and further, to make use of it for any occasion of special prayer. "Persevering in prayer" (Acts i. 14) for a period of nine days has nothing superstitious about it, but is a potent means of obtaining what we ask for. There are many novenas indulgenced by the Church, too numerous

[1] It must be remembered how strict the discipline of the Church was in those days. Thus Cyprian (Ep. lv. ed. Hartel, 638) tells us that some of the Catholic bishops absolutely refused to accept the repentance of anyone who had committed adultery: "totum poenitentiae locum contra adulteria cluserunt."

to be mentioned here. Perhaps the most popular of these is the devotion of the "Nine Fridays," which consists in receiving Holy Communion on the first Friday of nine consecutive months. It was introduced by Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque in consequence of a promise said to have been made to her by our Lord assuring final perseverance and the reception of the sacraments before death to all who should practise it. There has been considerable discussion as to the exact meaning of this promise. (A large number of indulgenced novenas will be found in the "Raccolta of Indulgenced Prayers"; Hilgers in "Cath. Enc.")

NOVICE, NOVITIATE (Lat. *novitius*). The name of "novice" is given to those persons, whether men or women and whatever their age may be, who have entered some religious house and desire to embrace its rule. Upon entering, they assume the habit of the order or congregation, and follow the community life and customs. The term of probation, or "novitiate," is at least for one year;[1] sometimes it extends to two or three years. During that period neither is the order bound to the novice nor the novice to the order. At the end of the term the order is in no way bound to allow the novice to make his profession, if he does not seem to those in authority likely to adorn the religious life; and the novice, on the other hand, may quit the order without censure, and retains, should he do so, the property which he possessed at the time of his admission, or of which he may have subsequently become possessed. Nor can he, while a novice, legally renounce such property in favour of the order, unless with the licence of the bishop and within the two months next preceding his profession.[2] But he may make a will in favour of the order which he has joined, and for this reason—because it is in his power at any time, if he decides not to go on to profession, to cancel his will. The fact of his having made it is therefore no restraint upon his leaving the order if he thinks himself unfit for it; whereas, if he had renounced his property altogether in favour of the order, or his parents had renounced it for him, this fact would tend to restrain his freedom in the event of a sudden reaction of feeling coming upon him soon after his becoming a novice.

The earliest age at which profession is allowable was fixed by the Council of Trent at sixteen years.

The name "novitiate" is also sometimes given to the house, or separate building, in which novices pass their time of probation. (Ferraris, *Novitius*; Taunton; Suarez, "De Religione," tr. vii., 11, iv.–vi.; Martène, "De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus"; Vermeersch in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. xxv. c. 15, De Reg. et Mon.
[2] Conc. Trid. sess. xxv. cap. 16, De Reg. et Mon. But this veto upon renunciation does not apply to novices in the Society of Jesus.

NUN (Lat. *nonna*. From the fifth century *nonnus* and *nonna* occur pretty frequently in relation to monks and nuns, a sense of quasi-filial respect being attached to the words. Comp. the Gr. *vávva*, aunt, and the It. *nonno* and *nonna*, grandfather and grandmother). A nun is a maid or widow who has consecrated herself to God by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and bound herself to live in a convent under a certain rule.

1. *Historical.*—Hélyot and other French ecclesiastical writers of the eighteenth century were of opinion that the founder of the first nunnery was St. Syncletica of Egypt, of whom an ancient life is extant, written not later than the end of the fourth century.[1] This opinion was chiefly grounded on the belief that the author of that life was St. Athanasius, who thus would have been the biographer both of the first monk (St. Antony) and of the first nun. But the difference of style is too great to allow us to ascribe the latter work to St. Athanasius. No earlier notice of a nunnery occurs than that found in the saint's life of St. Antony, who, when he was renouncing the world (about 270), placed his sister in a house of virgins (*παρθένων*), and many years afterwards rejoiced to find her persevering in a chaste and holy life, and ruling other virgins similarly minded. But long before the institution of nunneries, and even side by side with them long after their first establishment, the Church recognized and encouraged several classes of pious women, such as widows, deaconesses, hospitallers, canonesses (*canonicae*; their principal duty was the care of funerals), *ascetriae*, and consecrated virgins living with their parents.[2] The letters of St. Jerome[3] give us a clear view of the austere and exalted life led by these last. Towards the end of the fourth century nunneries began to be multiplied at Rome. St. Augustine founded one at Hippo under his own sister as superior, and gave to it a rule which is extant in his 109th Epistle. St. Scholastica, the sister of St. Benedict, founded and governed a nunnery under her brother's direction. The rule of enclosure [ENCLOSURE] was gradually enforced on nunneries with more and more of strictness. A French council (755) says:[4]—"Nuns must not go forth out of their monastery; but if any among them have fallen into a fault, let her do penance within the monastery under the direction of the bishop." The chapter "Periculoso" of Boniface VIII. settled the question irrevocably; enclosure has been since imposed on all nuns taking solemn vows. Nevertheless some convents have evaded the rigour of the rule, and the Holy See has tolerated their conduct.

The primitive practice in the Church was

[1] Alban Butler, Jan. 5; Hélyot, *Dissert. Prelim.* § 8.
[2] On all these, see Thomassin. I. iii. 51–2.
[3] "Ad Eustochium," "Ad Marcellam," &c.
[4] Thomassin, I. iii. 47.

that virgins becoming nuns should be veiled and consecrated by the bishop. In process of time, "through oversight occasionally, but more frequently owing to absence or pressure of occupation on the part of the bishops" (Thomassin), the ancient practice ceased to be strictly observed, and great numbers were veiled by the abbesses, or by simple priests. This was strongly condemned as an abuse by several French councils, and the right of veiling virgins was reserved to the bishops; presbyters, however, might give the veil to widows. Thomassin infers from a canon of the Council of Tribur (895), that the Fathers of that council recognized two veils—one, that of probation, with which a young girl might clothe herself as early as twelve years; the other, the veil of consecration, to be given by the bishop, and not to be assumed till she was twenty-five years old.

The capitularies of Charlemagne and his son order the suppression or consolidation of small nunneries, in which it was thought the rule could not be perfectly observed.

It may be stated as a general fact, applicable to nearly all the great orders of men, that, soon after the foundation of each, an order or orders of women, subject to or in connection with it, was established, in which the rule and statutes of the founder were, so far as the difference of sex permitted, punctually observed. Even the Society of Jesus is not an exception, for, although the founder obtained a prohibition from the Pope against the company's undertaking the direction of nuns, the "Dames Anglaises," and several more recent institutes, though not otherwise connected with the Society, follow the rule of St. Ignatius.

If we consider the four principal monastic rules separately, we find that—

a. The rule of St. Basil [BASILIANS] was the basis of that framed by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, for the order of Mount Carmel [CARMELITES], and adopted in its original rigour by St. Theresa, for the order of Discalced Carmelites, which she founded in 1562.

b. The rule of St. Austin is followed by communities of nuns annexed to every congregation of Austin canons and hermits; also by Dominican nuns and the Ursulines. All, or nearly all, the communities of women founded since the Council of Trent follow the rule of St. Augustine, but have in addition a body of constitutions or customs suited to their special end and spirit, and, in some cases, taken from the rule of St. Ignatius.

c. The rule of St. Benedict is followed by the nuns of Camaldoli, Vallombrosa, and Fontevrault and many others. (See Hélyot.)

d. The rule of St. Francis of Assisi is embraced by the order of nuns called Poor Clares, founded by St. Clare; this is the second order of St. Francis.

The nuns of St. Jerome follow a rule found in the works of that doctor; the nuns of the Visitation (1610), one given them by St. Francis de Sales: it is the rule of St. Austin with a number of slight modifications.

2. *Rights and Obligations.*—Of the numerous and minute regulations contained in the canon law touching the rights, obligations, and privileges of religious women, a few of the more important are here subjoined. The general direction of all their houses is vested in the Sacred Congregation of Religious [CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN]. The orders and congregations of recent origin are usually under the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishops; of the older orders, some are under the jurisdiction of regulars. It is an exceptional case when, as with the Brigittines and the order of Fontevrault, the houses of the connected congregation of men are (or were) under the jurisdiction of the superior general of the nuns. Nearly all nuns who are bound by solemn vows are under the obligation of reciting the divine office in choir, and this they must do for themselves; their chaplains may not undertake it for them. The bishop may control their music. They use either the Roman Breviary or that approved for some order of men. They may solemnize, so it be done moderately and discreetly, their titular feast. The number of religious who can be received in any convent is determined according to the amount of revenues, or of customary alms, available for their support. Nuns are allowed to receive young girls as boarders for education, but upon many conditions—*e.g.* the consent of the Sacred Congregation must be obtained; the boarders must sleep in a separate building or wing; they must not be under seven or above twenty-five years, and if any one of them desires to become a nun she cannot do so without being first interrogated by the bishop or his deputy, so that the sincere and voluntary character of her wish may be tested. The novitiate, which postulants in early times often passed before they took the habit, cannot now be passed in a secular dress. Nuns cannot stand in the relation of sponsors. While on the one hand those are excommunicated who attempt to force any virgin or widow to become a nun against her will, those on the other are visited with the same penalty who, without just cause, hinder any woman from assuming the religious habit and taking vows.

The confessors of nuns must be selected and approved by the bishop for convents subject to him. For convents subject to regulars the regular prelate appoints confessors, subject to the approbation of the bishop. In either case a confessor cannot hear confessions in the same monastery for a period exceeding three years.

3. *Government, Mode of Life, the Veil, &c.*—The superiors of nuns are elected in chapter by secret voting[1] [see ABBESS], in

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. xxv. 6, De Reg. et Mon.

some cases for life, but generally for a term of years. In every convent there is a superior and a mistress of novices; the other offices vary. The bishop often appoints a canon, or an experienced priest, to exercise his authority in regard to the external government of the convent. Nuns take their meals in common, but each must have her separate cell. With regard to diet, fasting, clothing, taking the discipline, mode of saying office, &c., there is an infinite diversity of practice in the different orders and congregations. In primitive times, when a virgin consecrated herself to God, her hair was cut off; this is expressly mentioned in the lives of St. Syncletica (fourth century) and St. Gertrude of Nivelle (seventh century).[1] The white veil of reception is given to the postulant either by the bishop or the superior at the commencement of her novitiate; the veil of profession (which is black in some orders, white in others) is given by the bishop at the end of it. [See PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS.] The veil of a Christian nun symbolizes continence in flesh and spirit, holiness to the Lord. It signifies an espousal, not that harmonious union of two unlike human beings on which conjugal happiness depends, but a far more perfect union of two unlikes —viz. of the human soul and Christ, effected by means of prayer, obedience, and the sacraments. (Thomassin, Part I.; Taunton; Ferraris, *Moniales*; Vermeersch, "De Religiosis Institutis et Personis," and in "Cath. Enc.")

NUNC DIMITTIS. The canticle of Simeon (Lk. ii. 29–32). It is recited at compline every day in the year. (E. English, "The Nunc Dimittis.")

NUNCIO (*nuntius*, messenger). A Legate *a latere* of the Roman see [LEGATE] discharges a commission directed to special ends, and in its nature temporary; a Nuncio of the same see is its permanent official representative at some foreign court. The diplomatic agents of the Pope are of three classes: nuncios, internuncios, and apostolic delegates. In 1914 there were nuncios at the Courts of Vienna, Madrid, Munich, and Brussels, and to the republican government of Brazil; internuncios at the Hague, Buenos Ayres (for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay), and Luxemburg; and apostolic delegates to the governments of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, San Domingo, Hayti, and Venezuela. Before the French Revolution nuncios resided at Warsaw, Venice, Lucerne, Naples, Florence, Cologne, and Brussels. To the last named Clement VIII. committed the oversight of the Dutch and English missions. A constitution of Benedict XIV. enjoins all nuncios to watch over the residence of bishops within their dioceses.

Papal nuncios were formerly invested with an extensive jurisdiction; their tribunals were courts of appeal from the ordinary ecclesiastical courts of the countries in which they resided. From the language of one of the Tridentine decrees,[1] it would appear that they sometimes encroached on the rights of the bishops. In Germany, the Archbishops of Mayence, Cologne, and Treves, who were Electors of the empire and *legati nati*, often thwarted the exercise of jurisdiction by the nuncios, and the establishment of a nunciature at Munich in 1785 was the signal for an acrimonious controversy. The troubles arising out of the French Revolution soon absorbed the attention of the disputants, and the Munich nunciature was abolished in 1799. As mentioned in the art. APOSTOLIC DELEGATE, these latter agents are also sent to countries which have no official relations with the Holy See. (Ferraris, *Nuntius*; Kirsch in "Cath. Enc.")

NUPTIAL BLESSING. [See MARRIAGE, V.]

O

O ANTIPHONS. [See ADVENT, SEASON OF.]

OATH. The calling on God to witness that a statement made is true, or to make the fulfilment of a promise bind under a more solemn obligation. Oaths were required on certain occasions in the Hebrew law (see, *e.g.* Exod. xxii. 10, 11; Deut. vi. 13, x. 20), and the prophets (*e.g.* Amos iv. 2; Is. xiv. 24; Jer. li. 14) speak of God Himself as swearing. Two places (only two, as far as we remember) in the O.T. seem at first sight to condemn swearing—viz. Zach. v. 3, Ecclesiast. ix. 2; but it is clear from the context that false and perhaps rash swearing is meant.

There is, however, much more difficulty about our Lord's teaching on oaths, and it is well known that some sects—*e.g.* the Waldenses, the Hussites, the "Society of Friends"—have believed that oaths are forbidden to Christians. In Mt. v. 33–37, Christ certainly seems to forbid all oaths, whether direct, *i.e.* by the name of God Himself, or indirect, *i.e.* by objects related to God, such as the temple, heaven, &c. "Let your word be yea, yea, nay, nay, but what is beyond this is from the evil one." St. James's words (v. 12) are to the same effect. On the other

[1] Alban Butler, Jan. 5, Mar. 17; *Kirchenlex.* "Gertrude."

[1] Sess. xxiv. 20, De Ref.

hand, St. Paul, far from contenting himself always with a simple "yea" or "nay," most distinctly calls God to witness the truth of his assertions (Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Gal. i. 20; Philip. i. 8; and especially 2 Cor. i. 23), and the fact seems to be that our Lord desired a state of perfection in His followers which would make oaths unnecessary, and therefore wrong, so long, at least, as they were a "little flock" known to one another. A Christian's character was to make his word as good as his oath. In dealing, however, with the heathen world, Christians could not expect their word to be taken in this way, and the presence of bad Christians in the Church made its actual state very different from that ideal which Christ set before His disciples. Many who could not be trusted to avoid the shameful sin of lying might still shrink from the greater sin and shame of perjury; and hence the Church not only maintained the obligation of taking an oath when it was required in civil courts, but also herself exacted oaths on certain solemn occasions from her children. She has ever taught the lawfulness of oaths, provided always that they are taken with judgment—*i.e.* for a grave cause; in justice—*i.e.* provided the thing sworn be lawful; and in truth—*i.e.* provided the thing sworn be true (Jer. iv. 2). (See the profession of faith imposed by Innocent III. on converted Waldenses; the Constitution of John XXII. against the Fraticelli, *anno* 1318; Prop. 43 among the propositions of Wycliffe condemned by Martin V. and the Council of Constance, *anno* 1418.)

Although it is always wicked to swear without a conviction that the thing sworn is true, it is not always wrong to break a promise made on oath. A promissory oath to commit a crime is sinful, and to keep the promise is an additional sin. Again, notable change of circumstances may excuse from the keeping of an oath. Further, though, generally speaking, no earthly power can dispense from keeping an oath made in favour of another, still in other cases a dispensation may be valid. Thus, a superior may dispense in an oath concerning things subject to his authority, because such an oath is unlawful, except with an implied condition—viz. if the person who has authority in the matter consents. A parent, *e.g.*, may annul the promissory oaths of his children below the age of puberty. So, again, an oath against the common good, or an oath extorted by fear or fraud, may be dispensed by the bishop or by those who have quasi-episcopal jurisdiction—*e.g.* by a chapter in the vacancy of a see, or again by confessors with power to dispense from vows. (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." lib. iv. tract. 2.)

Many oaths ordered by the Church are made more solemn by touching the Gospels; and in the Middle Ages persons swearing often touched the Blessed Sacrament, relics, the sacred vessels, &c. Such an oath was called "Corporal," a term which has nothing to do with the "corporal," or linen cloth on which the Blessed Sacrament is laid, but simply refers to corporal or bodily contact with the sacred object. (See St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, qq. 88, 89; Maskell, "Monument. Rit." vol. ii. p. li. *seq.*)

OBEDIENCE. [See EVANGELICAL COUNSELS.]

OBLATES. *Oblates of St. Charles.* This is a congregation of secular priests, who "offer" themselves (whence the name) to the bishop, to be employed by him in any part of the diocese he may choose, and upon any work which he may commit to them. St. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, having found in his large diocese, parts of which were greatly neglected or totally abandoned, the need of a band of zealous, self-sacrificing labourers, who would be ready to go and do at once whatever he commanded them to do, founded this congregation of "Oblates of the Blessed Virgin and St. Ambrose" in 1578. He established them in the church and presbytery of the Holy Sepulchre at Milan. Dividing the congregation into six "assemblies," he directed that two of these should always remain in the community house in the city, while the four others were at work in other parts of the diocese. There is a house of this congregation at Bayswater, having several affiliations in other parts of London.

Oblates of St. Frances of Rome. A community of religious women, bound only by simple vows, established at Rome in 1433.

Oblates of Italy. An association of secular priests founded by some zealous ecclesiastics at Turin in 1816. They have the charge of the mission of Eastern Burma.

Oblates of Mary Immaculate. A society of priests founded at Marseilles in 1815 by Charles de Mazenod, afterwards bishop of the diocese. The superior-general is elected for life by a special general chapter. Their numbers have increased greatly, and they have been of inestimable service by placing themselves at the disposal of the bishops to be employed on the mission in Canada, British India, South Africa, and the United States.

OBLATI. 1. Children dedicated in their early years to the monastic state. [See BENEDICTINES; SCHOOLS.]

2. A class of persons of whom ecclesiastical annals, especially in the Middle Ages, furnish frequent examples, who "offered" and gave themselves and their property to a monastery for the glory of God and their own spiritual improvement. The father of St. Hugh of Lincoln was an "oblatus" in the monastery of the Great Chartreuse, in which the saint himself was a monk, and tenderly watched over his father's old age. Benedict XIV. ("De Synodo dioeces." vi. 3)

says that although *oblati* are not religious, yet, if they have transferred their entire property to the monastery, they are ecclesiastical persons and enjoy ecclesiastical privileges. (Ferraris, *Oblati Monasteriorum.*)

OBLIGATION, DAYS OF. [See FEASTS OF THE CHURCH.]

OBREPTION. "A vice in a rescript arising from a fraud. It comes from stating in the petition something which is against the truth." It is often confounded with Subreption (*q.v.*). (Taunton; Ferraris, *Rescriptum.*)

OBSERVANTINES. [See FRANCISCANS.]

OBSESSION. [See POSSESSION.]

OCCASIONS OF SIN. Any external circumstances inciting to sin. These may be persons, places, or things. Theologians divide occasions into proximate (*i.e.* generally followed by a sinful act), and remote (rarely followed by the act). It is clear that this distinction is vague, and admits of indefinite degrees. It is further complicated by the fact that what may be a proximate occasion to one person may be only remote to another; *e.g.*, one man may not be able to go into a public house without getting drunk, whereas another may enter many times without any such evil result. The general rule with regard to occasions of sin is that we are bound to avoid them if proximate (absolutely or relatively), but not if remote. The reason of the latter part of the rule is given by St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 10); it is impossible for us to avoid altogether the circumstances which possibly might lead us into sin. (Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." v. p. 97 *sqq.*; Slater, ii. 220.)

OCTAVARIUM. The purpose of the book is explained by its title, "Octavarium Romanum, sive octavae festorum, lectiones secundi scilicet et tertii nocturni singulis diebus recitandae infra octavas sanctorum titularium, &c." Maskell knows of no edition prior to the seventeenth century. The use of the book is not obligatory on those who have to say the divine office, though it is sometimes referred to in the Ordo.

OCTAVE. The Christian, following the example of the Jewish, Church, celebrates certain feasts till the eighth or octave day. The number eight is supposed to represent perfection, for the seven days of the week are taken as figures of the ages of the world, and the eighth of the eternal rest which is to follow them.

Octaves are privileged or non-privileged; and the former, again, are subdivided into classes. In the octaves of Easter and Pentecost, no other feast may be kept and no commemoration made, except of a simple, if it falls after the first three days. In the octave of Epiphany (not, however, on the octave-day) the feast of the patron saint, title, or dedication of the church may be kept. During non-privileged octaves even semi-doubles are celebrated. Those last, to which all octaves, except those already enumerated, belong, are again arranged in order of dignity, so that the lesser gives way to the greater in case of concurrence. The changes made by Leo XIII. may be found in Bäumer-Biron, "Hist. du Bréviaire," ii. 199–200; for the further changes made by Pius X. see Burton-Myers, "The New Psalter and its Use." (Gavantus, tom. ii. § 3, cap. 8.)

OFFERTORY. (1) An antiphon which used to be sung by the choir while the faithful made their offerings of bread and wine for the Mass, of gifts for the support of the clergy, &c. From St. Augustine's time verses of the Psalms were sung in North Africa during the presentation of the gifts, and the Offertory in the Roman Missal has been in use from ancient times, being found in the Antiphonary of St. Gregory, though the precise date at which it was introduced is uncertain. The oblations of bread and wine by the faithful began to fall into disuse from about the year 1000, but the antiphon and its name are still retained. The Offertory is said immediately after the Creed. (Le Brun, Benedict XIV.)

(2) The oblation of bread and wine by the priest, made after the recitation of the antiphon just mentioned. "The Church does really offer bread and wine, but not absolutely and in themselves; for in the new covenant no oblation is made of lifeless things: indeed, no oblation is made other than that of Jesus Christ; wherefore the bread and wine are offered that He may make them His Body and Blood." (Bossuet, "Explic. des Prières de la Messe.") In the oblation the priest speaks of the bread as the "spotless victim," and of the chalice as the "chalice of salvation" by anticipation—*i.e.* he looks forward to the moment when they will be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. All the ancient liturgies contain an oblation of the gifts before consecration (see the comparative table in Hammond's "Ancient Liturgies," p. xxvi. *seq.*); but the five prayers with which the oblation is made—"Suscipe, Sancte Pater," "Offerimus tibi," "In spiritu humilitatis," "Veni, Sanctificator," "Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas"—are of recent date, as appears "from the silence of Walafrid, Amalarius, Rupert, and Innocent III." concerning them (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." II. x.). The incensing of the *oblata* or gifts in solemn Masses seems to have been little known in the West till the ninth century, when it was introduced in France. The ceremony occurs in the Greek liturgies (Le Brun, tom. ii. 2 P. a. 7). The great oblation of Christ's Body and Blood must be carefully distinguished from the Offertory or anticipatory oblations of bread and wine. (Duchesne, "Christian Worship,"

ch. vi. 6.) "In all Eastern rites and in the Gallican rite in its various forms a later practice grew up of preparing (and offering) the gifts before the liturgy begins. Rome alone kept the primitive custom (as in St. Justin) of preparing them at this point, when they are about to be consecrated." (Fortescue, "The Mass," 296.) The Dominicans keep this Gallican practice and prepare the offerings before the Mass begins.

OFFICE. [See BREVIARY.]

OILS, HOLY. There are three holy oils, consecrated by the bishop on Holy Thursday, and received from him by the priests who have charge of parishes and districts.

(1) The oil of catechumens, used in blessing fonts, in Baptism, consecration of churches, of altars whether fixed or portable, ordination of priests, blessing and coronation of kings and queens.

(2) Chrism [see CONFIRMATION], used in blessing the font, in Baptism and Confirmation, consecration of a bishop, of paten and chalice, and in the blessing of bells. [See CHRISM.]

(3) Oil of the sick, used in Extreme Unction and the blessing of bells.

The Rituale Romanum requires these oils to be kept in vessels of silver or alloyed metal (*stannum*—properly a mixture of silver and lead), in a decent place, and under lock and key. The S. Cong. Rit. strictly forbids the pastor to keep them in his house, except in cases of necessity. (See "Manuale Decret." 2, 670–2.) The oils of the past year must not be used, but common oil, in lesser quantity, may be added to the blessed oils if necessary. For the history of the use of these oils, see BAPTISM, CONFIRMATION, &c. &c. (Leclercq in "Cath. Enc."; Schrod in "Kirchenlex.")

OLD CATHOLICS (*Alt-Katholiken*). A name assumed by various priests and laypeople in Germany who protested against the Vatican definition of Papal infallibility, and formed themselves into a separate body.

Scarcely was the Vatican definition issued, when Dr. Döllinger solemnly protested against it, as an innovation on Catholic doctrine. He found large support in the universities. Nearly all Catholics in the teaching body of Munich (44 Docenten), professors from Freiburg, Breslau, Prague, Münster, and four professors from Bonn, joined the opposition. Some of them, such as Reusch, Langen, Friedrich, were men of considerable reputation for ability, learning, and character. Nothing of course need be said of Döllinger. The party looked for encouragement to those German bishops who had been opposed to the definition, but in this they were disappointed. The leaders of the protesting movement were excommunicated.

In 1871, at an Old Catholic Congress in Münich, but against the declared wish of Döllinger, the resolution of forming Old Catholic congregations was formed, and on June 4, 1873, Dr. Reinkens was consecrated bishop by Heydecamp, Jansenist bishop of Deventer. The bishop had a salary allotted him by the Government (16,000 thalers from Prussia, 2000 from Baden); but his jurisdiction over his adherents is very limited; the real power is vested in a synod of Deputies from the congregations, of whom the majority are laymen. In many cases the Catholic churches were made over to the Old Catholics by the Government, a result which was accelerated by a decree of Pius IX. forbidding Catholic rites in all churches where partial possession had been granted to the new body. The cause of "Old Catholicism" enjoyed the special favour of the Government then engaged in a contest with the Church.

Facts, however, have proved that so inconsistent a position could not be maintained. The first synod, in 1874, changed the Tridentine doctrine on auricular confession, and made fasting and abstinence voluntary; the second, in 1875, reduced the number of feasts, and set aside nearly all the canonical impediments of marriage, except those recognized by the State; the third, in 1876, permitted priests to marry and receive the nuptial blessing, but forbade them to officiate after marriage; the fifth, in 1878, allowed persons in holy orders to marry, and to perform all the functions of the ministry. This resolution was passed in spite of a protest from the Jansenist Bishops of Holland. Friedrich and the Bonn professors, Langen, Menzel, and Reusch (previously vicar-general to the Old Catholic bishop), withdrew from their former associates. Reusch continued to officiate at Bonn, and thus formed a schism within a schism. There is no official census of the German Old Catholics, for in 1880 Dr. Reinkens told his adherents to return themselves simply as Catholics, but it may be safely said that their number in the whole empire does not reach 40,000.

In Austria they are a very insignificant body, though they had two men of learning among them—viz. the canonists Von Schulte and Maassen. In Switzerland only three priests refused submission to the Vatican Council; but a "Christian-Catholic" Church was formed, in great part from the most disreputable elements, under the auspices of the cantonal governments. Edward Herzog was consecrated bishop by Dr. Reinkens in September 1876. The "Christian-Catholic" Church has a married priesthood, a vernacular liturgy, and has made confession voluntary. This body is visibly dwindling away. Attempts have been made to erect schismatical churches by the ex-Dominican Prota-Giurleo at Naples, in Spain by the priest Aguazo, in Mexico by eighteen priests, in France by the eloquent ex-Carmelite Loyson, and in America by the Polish "bishop" Kozlowski.

Since the above was written, Pope Leo XIII. brought the Culturkampf to a happy

end. In Prussia and Baden, however, the laws in favour of the Old Catholics remain unaltered, and the sect, in principle, enjoys the same protection as before. The Catholics have re-obtained possession, at the cost of great sacrifices on their part, of a few of the churches which the Prussian Government had handed over to the Old Catholics, *e.g.* in Neisse, Cochem, Wiesbaden. In Baden, also, the sectaries were obliged to restore several of the principal churches to their legitimate owners, *e.g.* in Mundelfingen, Thiengen, Säckingen, Fützen, Kappel. In Bavaria a ministerial decree dated March 10, 1890, deprived the Old Catholics of the Government protection they enjoyed; they are no longer treated as members of the Church acknowledged by the State, but as a purely private sect. Döllinger, the author of the Old Catholic movement in Germany, died January 10, and Baron von Lütz, the Minister of Worship, who all along had been its staunchest supporter, retired from office on May 31 and died September 3 of the same year, 1890. The *Los von Rom* movement in Austria is political rather than religious, and tends to Protestantism rather than to the Old Catholic bodies.

In Switzerland negotiations with the Holy See have rendered the position of Catholics more tolerable. In 1879 the Bishop of Fribourg, Mgr. Marilley, resigned, Mgr. Casandy succeeded him as Bishop of Fribourg, Lausanne and Geneva, and in 1883 Mgr. Mermillod was appointed in the room of Mgr. Casandy. The Federal Council had banished Mgr. Mermillod from the country when he was vicar-apostolic of Geneva; it allowed him to return as bishop, and left it to the several cantons to acknowledge his new dignity. Geneva alone refused the acknowledgment. In 1890 Mermillod was created cardinal and received all the honours due to his rank from those same authorities who a few years before had sent him into exile. Peace was likewise restored in Basle on the resignation of Bishop Lachat. In consequence of the activity of the Catholics and of the falling away of its own members, the Old Catholic sect in Switzerland lost much of their influence; in many parishes they had to give up their right to use the Catholic churches for their worship. A bill for the suppression of the "Theological Faculty" at Bern was indeed thrown out by the Council (1883), but the Faculty is dying a natural death; in eleven years it had but 57 students. Meanwhile a Catholic university, supported by the State, has been founded at Fribourg and is very prosperous. In Italy, Spain, and Mexico the Old Catholic movement never acquired the slightest importance.

(From the article "Alt-Katholiken" in the "Kirchenlexikon," with additional information supplied by Dr. Wildt, the writer of the article. See also "The Times," August 14, 15, 1902. There is a good account of the subject in MacCaffrey, "Hist. of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century"; Granderath-Kirch, "Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils"; the two lives of Döllinger from opposite points of view, by Friedrich and by Michael; Baumgarten in "Cath. Enc.")

OLD CHAPTER, OLD BROTHERHOOD. After the extinction of the old hierarchy in England there was no English Catholic bishop until the appointment of Dr. William Bishop as vicar-apostolic in 1623. He established a chapter of twenty-four canons, the status of whom, however, was always of an anomalous character. The Roman authorities never gave them any formal recognition, though the canons exercised ecclesiastical rule for thirty years (1655–1685), when there was no vicar-apostolic. In 1688, when four vicars-apostolic were created, the status of the chapter became still more anomalous: there being now four quasi-dioceses, with only one chapter, unattached to any diocese. Dr. Leyburn, the first of the new vicars-apostolic, was required to swear that he would not recognize the chapter, and henceforth it became a sort of friendly society without any jurisdiction. The vicars-apostolic were usually chosen from their number. On the restoration of the hierarchy and formation of chapters in each diocese, the Old Chapter changed its name to the "Old Brotherhood of the Secular Clergy," by which it is known at the present day. The list of capitulars contains the names of bishops Leyburn, Clifford, Challoner, Milner, Poynter, and thirty other bishops, as also Tootle (Dodd), Gother, Lingard, Kirk, Rock, Tierney, Brownlow, and John Savage, Earl Rivers (1723–1736). (Sergeant, "An Account of the Chapter erected by William, Titular Bishop of Chalcedon, and Ordinary of England and Scotland"; Dodd, "Church Hist. of England," ed. Tierney; B. Ward, "Dawn of the Catholic Revival"; E. Burton, "Life of Challoner.")

OLIVETANS. A branch of the white monks of St. Benedict, founded in 1319, by St. Bernard Ptolomei. The reform was of a severe character. The ordinary fasts of the Church and of the monks were added to, and total abstinence from wine was enjoined. Unlike the parent order, they had a general superior. At the present time there are only ten small monasteries of the order. (Hélyot; Almond in "Cath. Enc.")

OMOPHORION. [See PALLIUM.]

ONTOLOGISM. This is the name, first given by Gioberti, which designates a form of Platonic Mysticism whose principles were inculcated by Marsilius Ficinus, systematically constructed by Malebranche, and again recast by the above-mentioned Gioberti. The name denotes that it is a first principle of the theory of cognition which lies at the basis of the system; that the order of intellectual

apprehension follows the order of real being. The necessary, self-existing being is first the real order; therefore it is the first object of intellectual vision, and is that in and by which every contingent and created existence becomes visible. Gioberti's theory was, for a time, very attractive to many Catholics, and seemed likely to gain an extensive sway. It was very vigorously controverted by Liberatore and others as contrary to the doctrine of St. Thomas, as rationally groundless, and as leading logically to consequences which are theologically unsound and incompatible with dogmas of faith. On account of this dangerous theological tendency seven propositions, embracing the fundamental tenets of Ontologism, were censured by the Holy See, as propositions which cannot safely be taught, in a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition bearing date September 18, 1861.

Various attempts were made by partisans of Ontologism to maintain that this censure of the Holy See was not directed against this system, but against another species of Pantheistic Ontologism taught in Germany. But one of their number, M. Brancherau, having a conscientious doubt on the subject, drew up a summary of the doctrine contained in a text-book which he had himself composed, comprised in fifteen theses, which he submitted to the Roman Congregation for judgment. The decision was given in September 1862, pronouncing the substantial identity of these propositions with the seven already disapproved, and declaring that they fell under the same censure, that they consequently could not be taught, and that the text-book itself, which was only a development of the same theses, could not be placed in the hands of pupils. On February 22, 1866, a decree of the united Congregations of the Inquisition and of the Index, formally approved by the Holy Father, censured the writings of Prof. Ubaghs, of Louvain, another distinguished Ontologist, as containing the same doctrine condemned in the seven propositions. During the same year M. Hugonin, who had been nominated to an episcopal see in France, was required by the Papal Nuncio at Paris, as a condition of receiving the confirmation of his appointment, to publish a retractation of the doctrine contained in his "Études Philosophiques: Ontologie," and to promise to do all which depended on him in the episcopal office to prevent the teaching of this same doctrine in the schools of France. All these distinguished persons submitted with docility to the sentence of Rome. Since it has become manifest that the Holy See did intend to condemn as unsafe the fundamental doctrine of Ontologism proper—viz. that the human intellect has an immediate cognition of God as its proper object and the principle of all its cognitions—the system has fallen dead, so far as Catholics are concerned. It still lingers, under various modifications, by which the genuine idea which lies at its basis is so far altered or obscured as to be comparatively harmless, and really or apparently exempt from positive censure. In such shapes, however, it is no longer potent to attract thoroughgoing thinkers, and is of small moment.

(Kleutgen gives a brief but thorough exposition of the seven propositions, with a refutation of the errors contained in them, in a work which in the French translation is entitled "Ontologisme jugé par le Saint-Siège." Paris: 1867. The works of Cardinal Dechamps may also be consulted for information concerning the controversy.)

OPHITES. [See GNOSTICISM, p. 382.]

OPUS OPERATUM. A term used by mediaeval theologians and adopted by the Council of Trent (sess. vii. can. 8) to express the nature of the efficacy of the sacraments. Man has the power by the perversity of his will to stay this efficacy of the sacraments; and certain dispositions—such as the love of God and man, or again, true repentance and sincere purpose of amendment—are absolutely necessary, in those who have the use of reason, in order that they may derive benefit from the sacraments. These dispositions, however, are only conditions without which the grace of the sacraments cannot be received. They merely remove the obstacles (*obices*) in the way: the grace itself comes not from them, but from the sacraments themselves.

The following clear explanation is given by Bellarmine ("De Sacramentis," lib. ii. 1). In justification, he says, as received through the sacraments, many causes concur: on God's part, the will to employ the sensible sign; on Christ's part, His Passion and merits; on the part of the minister, power and intention; on the part of the recipient, the will to receive the sacrament, faith, and repentance; on the part of the sacrament, the application of the sensible sign. "But of all these, that which actively, proximately, and instrumentally effects the grace of justification, is only that external act, called sacrament, and this is the sense of 'Opus Operatum,' the word *operatum* being taken passively, so that when we say the sacrament confers grace *ex opere operato*, our meaning is that grace is conferred by virtue of the sacramental act itself instituted by God for this end, not by the merit of the minister or the recipient." (See also Franzelin, "De Sacramentis in Genere," thesis vii.)

ORARIUM. [See STOLE.]

ORATE, FRATRES, &c. So the address begins in which, after the Offertory and Lavabo, the priest bids the people pray that his sacrifice and theirs may be acceptable to God. Originally the priest simply said "Orate," or "Orate pro me," "Orate pro

me peccatore." Rémi of Auxerre, in A.D. 880, is the first to give a fuller form, but he appends it merely as an explanation, "Orate, fratres"—*i.e.* "ut meum ac vestrum pariter sacrificium acceptum sit Domino." In the churches of Paris and Meaux down to the seventeenth century, and in our own Missals of Sarum, Bangor, and York, the words ran "Orate, fratres et sorores," &c. The answer which the server makes is "Suscipiat," &c.; but the response is given in a vast variety of forms by the mediaeval Missals, and it still varies much in the rites of different religious orders. (Le Brun, tom. ii., iii. Part. art. x.; Maskell, "Ancient Liturgies.")

ORATORY. In the earliest times Mass could only be said in private houses, and after the erection of churches it was still often said in private dwellings. The growth of the parochial system led to a sharper distinction between parochial churches and oratories or chapels. Thus the Council of Agde, canon 24 (*anno* 506), permits Mass to be said in oratories, but not on the great feasts of Easter, Christmas, &c. So the Council of Clermont, can. 14 (*anno* 535). In the East, the Synod in Trullo, can. 31 (*anno* 692), prohibited service in oratories without the bishop's leave, and many Western councils issued similar edicts.

A decree for the Universal Church issued by the S. Congregation of Rites, March 8, 1879, classifies oratories, as (1) Public, when all the Faithful have access to them. (2) Semi-public, when destined chiefly for the use of a College, Religious Community, Seminary, &c. (3) Private, when granted by Indult to a private person or family. A bishop's private chapel is, however, equivalent to a semi-public oratory. Any one of the Faithful can *validly* fulfil the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays in any public or semi-public oratory, but not in a private oratory; but all are to receive Communion even if a private one when Mass is celebrated there, they being present. Public and semi-public oratories may be consecrated and should at least be solemnly blessed. Private oratories are only to have the Benedictio loci read over them. A bishop may for just cause limit the access of the Faithful to any oratory, and supervises the celebration of Masses in them as in the churches of his diocese. The reserving of the Blessed Sacrament in an oratory is only permitted when an Indult from Rome has been obtained to that effect.

ORATORY, THE FRENCH. A society of priests founded by Cardinal de Bérulle at Paris in 1611, with the advice of César de Bus, the Père Cotton, and other eminent men, in order to strengthen ecclesiastical discipline, which had been weakened during the troubles of the League. Bossuet says that M. de Bérulle "preferred to give no other spirit to his company but the spirit of the Church itself, no other rule than her canons, no other superiors than her bishops, no other bond but charity, and no vows but those of baptism and ordination." To deepen devotion, promote professional studies, and spread an ecclesiastical spirit among the secular clergy, that through them the whole population might be reached and influenced, were the principal objects of the institute. In 1612 it was declared a royal foundation. After some hesitation Paul V. (1614) approved the society, under the title of "Congregation of the Oratory of our Lord Jesus Christ in France." In 1616 a residence, with chapel annexed, was occupied in the Rue St. Honoré. The fathers paid much attention to music, and were called "les pères du beau chant." The favourite work of the founder was the institution of seminaries for the training of priests; of these he lived to see six—at Langres, Nevers, &c.—in working order. He was the friend and supporter of Descartes, and the congregation always had the reputation of being rather favourable to Cartesianism. The Cardinal died in 1629, leaving fifty seminaries, colleges, and houses of retreat in the erection of which he had been instrumental, all in full activity. The saintly Père de Condren succeeded him in the government of the congregation; he was followed by Bourgoing, Senault, Sainte-Marthe, and De la Tour. Jansenism took a strong hold of the congregation, and the bull "Unigenitus" was long a bone of contention among the members; but the sounder portion at last prevailed, and the bull was accepted by the society in 1746. At the Revolution the educational functions discharged by the congregation saved it for a time; but the fathers firmly resisted the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, and when the ceremony of consecrating the constitutional bishops was appointed to take place in their church in the Rue St. Honoré they all refused to be present. Later, a few gave way and took the oath. The "Oratory of the Immaculate Conception," founded at Paris in 1852 by M. Pététot, curé of St. Roch, and the Abbé Gratry, adopted the rule of the ancient society.

Among the eminent men whom the French Oratory produced were Thomassin (a name often quoted in these pages), Lejeune, Richard Simon, Malebranche, Quesnel, Pouget, Massillon, Renaudot, Jean Morin (commonly called Morinus), Le Brun, Lami, Duhamel, and Card. Perraud. ("Encycl. du XIXme Siècle," 1852, art. by Jules Sauzay.)

ORATORY OF ST. PHILIP NERI. Philip Neri, a native of Florence, remarkable from his childhood upwards for the singular beauty and purity of his character, came to reside at Rome, at the age of eighteen, in 1533. For some years he was tutor to the children of a Florentine nobleman living in Rome. His

life was one of habitual self-denial, penance, and prayer. A thirst for doing good consumed him; and by degrees he gathered round him a number of men, young and old, whom he animated by his discourses to a greater zeal for God and hatred of evil, and to a more exact regularity of life than they had known before. This he did while still a layman; but on the advice of his confessor he received holy orders, and was ordained priest in 1551. For a short time after his ordination he received in his own chamber those whom he had won to God, and instructed them on spiritual things; then, during seven years, in a larger room. Out of these colloquies was gradually perfected the plan of evening exercises which is to this day practised by the congregation—plain sermons being preached, hymns sung, and popular devotions used, in a regular order, on every week-day evening except Saturday. The number of persons attending the exercises still increasing, he obtained (1558) from the administration of the Church of St. Jerome leave to build over one of the aisles of that church a chapel, to which he gave the modest name of an "oratory," whence arose the name of the congregation. About this time many persons afterwards eminent in the Church and the world joined him, amongst whom were Caesar Baronius, the ecclesiastical historian, and Francis Maria Tarugi (afterwards Cardinals), Lucci, Tassone, &c. Six years later, the Florentines living in Rome having requested him to undertake the charge of the Church of St. John the Baptist which they had just built, the saint (1564) caused Baronius and others of his followers to remove thither and to receive ordination. From this date the commencement of the congregation is reckoned. Their numbers increasing, it seemed desirable to the Fathers to have a house of their own. The old church of the Vallicella, situated in the heart of Rome, was ceded to them in 1575, and St. Philip at once caused the present magnificent church, called the "Chiesa Nuova," to be commenced on the site. The Fathers removed to the Vallicella in 1577 on the completion of the church; St. Philip joined them in 1583. Gregory XIII. had approved and confirmed the erection of the congregation in 1575. The constitutions of the society—which St. Philip desired should be composed of simple priests, without vows, but agreeing to a rule of life—were approved by Paul V. in 1612. St. Philip died in 1595, was beatified in 1615, and canonized in 1622. The rule of the congregation from the first was that each house should be independent, the only exception being made in favour of certain Italian oratories (Naples, San Severino, and afterwards Lanciano), which were at first administered by the mother house at Rome.

The Oratory was introduced into England in 1847 by Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman, who, during his long sojourn in Rome following upon his conversion, had studied closely the work of the holy founder and become deeply imbued with the spirit of his institute. The first house was at Mary Vale, *i.e.* Old Oscott, and was transferred, after a temporary sojourn at St. Wilfrid's, Staffordshire, to Alcester Street, Birmingham, in January 1849. A short time later a house was opened at King William Street, Strand, London, by F. Faber, with several other fathers who belonged to the Birmingham congregation, and were still subject to Father Newman. In October 1850, the London house was released from obedience to Birmingham, and erected into a congregation with a superior of its own. It was finally transferred to Brompton, where it has erected a large domed church. The Oratory at Birmingham remained under the direction—even after his elevation to the purple—of its illustrious founder, and has become a great centre for the midland counties of Catholic preaching and education.

The following passage embodies a portion of the Cardinal's conception of St. Philip's work. "He was raised up," writes Cardinal Newman, "to do a work almost peculiar to the Church." Instead of combating like Ignatius, or being a hunter of souls like St. Cajetan, "Philip preferred, as he expressed it, tranquilly to cast in his net to gain them; he preferred to yield to the stream and direct the current—which he could not stop—of science, literature, art, and fashion, and to sweeten and sanctify what God had made very good and man had spoilt. And so he contemplated as the idea of his mission, not the propagation of the faith, nor the exposition of doctrine, nor the catechetical schools; whatever was exact and systematic pleased him not; he put from him monastic rule and authoritative speech, as David refused the armour of his king. No; he would be but an ordinary individual priest as others; and his weapons should be but unaffected humility and unpretending love. All he did was to be done by the light, and fervour, and convincing eloquence of his personal character and his easy conversation. He came to the Eternal City and he sat himself down there, and his home and his family gradually grew up around him, by the spontaneous accession of materials from without. He did not so much seek his own as draw them to him. He sat in his small room, and they in their gay worldly dresses, the rich and the well-born as well as the simple and the illiterate, crowded into it. . . . And they who came remained gazing and listening till, at length, first one and then another threw off their bravery, and took his poor cassock and girdle instead; or, if they kept it, it was to put hair-cloth under it, or to take on them a rule of life, while to

the world they looked as before." [1] (Capecelatro, "Life of St. Philip Neri," Eng. tr.; Faber, "Spirit and Genius of St. Philip"; Ritchie in "Cath. Enc.")

ORDEAL. [See JUDICIUM DEI.]

ORDER, HOLY. Holy Order, according to Catholic doctrine, is a sacrament of the new law, by which spiritual power is given and grace conferred for the performance of sacred duties.

I. *The Meaning of the Word "Ordo"* is explained by St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 32, a. 2, ad 4), and the investigation of modern scholars has proved his view to be substantially correct. "Ordo" means "rank," whether high or low, but the meaning was restricted, much as our own word "rank" often is, to "eminent rank"—*i.e.* the clerical position as distinct from that of laymen. Salmasius suggested (see Ritschl, "Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche," p. 388) that the earliest Christian writers in Latin borrowed the word from the municipal constitution of the Romans, so that "ordo" would mean "magistracy." But it is much more likely that they adopted it as a version of κλῆρος; and, as the reader will presently see, it was only by degrees that it acquired the exclusive sense of "eminent" or "magisterial rank." Thus, though Tertullian implies that the "ecclesiae ordo" is distinct from the laity ("De Monog." 7, PL, ii. 938); though he speaks of persons who "are chosen into the ecclesiastical order" ("De Idololatr." 7, PL, 669), and, again, of "the priestly order" ("ordo sacerdotalis," "De Exhort. Cast." 7, PL, ii. 922); he also recognizes "widows" as an "order" of the Church ("Ad Uxor." i. 7, PL, i. 1286; and cf. "ordines," PL, ii. 947, in the plural, "De Monog." 12). Even Jerome uses "ordo" in its wide and, as we believe, original sense. For ("In Jesaiam" lib. V. cap. xix. 18) he enumerates five "orders" of the Church ("ecclesiae ordines")—viz. bishops, presbyters, deacons, the faithful, catechumens.

II. *The Number of Orders.*—In the Latin Church the ecclesiastical orders are those of bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, *ostiarii*, or doorkeepers. The first three are as old as the time of the Apostles; and all must be very ancient, for they are mentioned incidentally by Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in the middle of the third century (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." vi. 43). Nor is there any reason to think that their institution was recent even then. Some canonists add another order, that of the tonsure, but it is generally regarded as a mere introduction to the clerical state, and this view is consonant to the language of the Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. cap. 2). Apart from this, very many theologians, among whom is St. Thomas, do not regard the episcopate as a separate order, but only as the completion and extension of the priesthood, and hence reckon the number of the orders as seven. The title of the Tridentine chapter already referred to, "De Septem Ordinibus," favours this view; but, according to the eminent German canonist Phillips, it is not found in the earlier editions. The theory rests on the assumption that all orders are referred to the Eucharist, and thus the bishop has no power which a simple priest has not also, except that the former can, the latter cannot, convey this power to others by ordination. Those who hold the episcopate to be a distinct order not unnaturally reject this exclusive reference of Holy Order to the Eucharist as arbitrary, and argue that the power of ordination and confirmation sufficiently justifies the position of the episcopate as separate order. The orders of bishop, priest, deacon, and (but only since the thirteenth century) subdeacon are called "sacred" or "greater," those of acolyte, &c., "minor" orders. In the Greek, Coptic, and Nestorian Churches the orders recognized are those of bishop, priest, deacon, subdeacon, and reader, to which that of "singer" (ψάλτης) is sometimes added. Great variety, however, has prevailed in the East, both as to the number and classification of the orders, and we must refer the reader for fuller information to Goar ("Euchologion"); to Denzinger ("Ritus Orientalium," vol. i. p. 116 *seq.*); and to the articles on the individual orders in this work.

III. *Holy Order as a Sacrament.*—The Council of Trent defines (sess. xxii. De Sacr. Ord. can. 3) that Order is "truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ," and that by means of it the Holy Ghost is given (Canon 4). Evidently, in ordination there is an external sign, but the question at issue between Catholics and most Protestants turns on the grace which, as Catholics believe, accompanies the sign. A priest, as the Church teaches, receives supernatural power in his ordination, an indelible character [see CHARACTER], and, if rightly disposed, grace to support him in the exercise of his ministry. If this question be settled, the rest of the contention follows. A sign which necessarily conveys grace cannot have been instituted by authority which is merely human, and the external sign, grace given, institution by our Lord, are the three constituents of a sacrament.

That grace is given follows from the clear statements of Scripture. Christ "breathed on" His Apostles and said "Receive the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (Jn. xx. 23). St. Paul twice reminds St. Timothy of the grace he had received at ordination. "Do not neglect the grace which was given through prophecy, with laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14); "I put thee

[1] *Scope and Nature of University Education*, Disc. viii.

in mind to rekindle the grace [or rather gift, χάρισμα] of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6). St. Timothy was marked out for his office by someone who had the prophetic spirit, common in the early Church, and the presbyters joined St. Paul in the imposition of hands, just as presbyters unite with our bishops in the same way at the present time. But the former was an accidental, the latter an unessential circumstance, and hence St. Paul omits the mention of both in the second passage. The grace was conveyed by the imposition of Apostolic hands (observe the contrast, "*with*" [μετὰ] the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, and "*through* [διὰ] the laying on of my hands"), and the context leaves no doubt that the grace given was for the right administration of the ecclesiastical office. St. Timothy is to remember the grace received, and to let no one despise his youth, to be the example of the faithful, &c. &c., he is to "rekindle it," for the Spirit given is one of power, love, temperance, &c., and he must not be ashamed of the "testimony of the Lord." It is in vain that an able writer (Hatch, "Organisation of the Early Christian Church," p. 133) urges that χάρισμα has a latitude of meaning, and may be rendered "talent." This is not a fair account of its meaning in the New Testament; but if it were, what then? Plainly Timothy did not receive a natural "talent" by laying on of hands. Nor was it merely the office entrusted to him, for it would be senseless to speak of "rekindling" an office. It was, then, just what Hatch denies that ordination can give—viz. an interior quality, the fire of the Holy Ghost in the heart, ever present to empower and quicken St. Timothy in the exercise of his duties. It did not come from man, though man had it in his power to "rekindle" and correspond to it. It is well to notice that an interpretation substantially identical with ours is given and justified from the context by one of the best Protestant commentators on the Pastoral Epistles (Huther, *ad loc.*). Further, if, the clergy had been originally mere representatives of the people, deriving all their power from them, and only doing for the sake of order and convenience what laymen might do also, then indeed it would be hard to believe in the sacramental character of the rite. St. Paul, however, speaks of ἐπίσκοποι (the precise meaning of the word does not concern us here) as those whom "the Holy Ghost had appointed to tend the Church of God which He acquired through His own blood" (Acts xx. 28). If the Holy Ghost appoints those who are ordained to their sacred function, the prophecy or popular election which designs them for these functions being a separable accident, then we are not surprised to find St. Paul assuming that the same Holy Ghost endowed them with grace and power. It is quite true that Jewish Rabbis were *set* apart by imposition of hands,[1] and Hatch has collected many interesting and instructive parallels to different parts of the ordination rite from the customs of the Roman magistracy, &c. These, however, in no way affect the main question. No one supposed that the imposition of hands would of itself prove the grace of orders, while the other rites to which Hatch refers are allowed on all hands to be of merely human institution. Our appeal is to the grace which Scripture assures us is attached to the imposition of hands for holy orders, and we fail to see that the appeal can be set aside on the grounds which Hatch and so many other learned Protestants allege.

Such is the value assigned to the Sacrament of Holy Order in the Scripture, and the burden of proof lies on our adversaries if they maintain that the clergy, having first received their power from God, sank after the Apostolic age to mere representatives of the congregation. As a matter of fact, Christian antiquity is in harmony with Scripture. Only, the question of election or designation to office must not be confused with the power given in ordination to the office; and again we must not expect full and dogmatic statements on the nature of Holy Order in the brief and occasional writings of the early Fathers. Their main contention against heretics did not turn on the question of their orders or want of orders—in many cases heretics did possess true orders—but on the fact that they were outside the one Church. Still, St. Ignatius speaks of the bishop as having "acquired his ministry, not from himself, nor through men" (Philad. i.). The bishop is to be regarded as "the Lord Himself" (Ephes. vi.). "Let that be considered a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one commissioned by him" (Smyrn. viii.)—a rule, however, which in all likelihood was meant as a warning against all schismatical rites, even if celebrated by a priest, for the word βεβαία can scarcely be pressed. True, Tertullian ("De Exhort. Cast." 7, PL, ii. 922; "Monog." 7, 12, PL, ii. 958) holds very different language, asserts the universal priesthood of Christians, and reduces the difference between clergy and laity to one of ecclesiastical institution. But then Tertullian was a bitter Montanist when he thus wrote, and it was the characteristic of Montanism to set the claims of individual

[1] See Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chald. et Rabbin.* art. סְמִיכָה; and for full information, with abundant references to the Talmud, Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. des Judenthums*, art. "Ordination." The ordination was given sometimes on the authority of the Prince of the Sanhedrin, sometimes on the authority of the Prince and Sanhedrin conjointly. The rite is as old, probably, as the Sanhedrin, and was the rule till the fifth century A.D. Instances of ordination occur much later—*e.g.* one in the sixteenth. It is remarkable that the O.T. books after the Pentateuch (Num. xxvii. 11; Deut. xxxiv. 9) contain no instance of ordination by imposition of hands.

piety against the claims of the hierarchy. And, although he does certainly assume that his premiss—viz. that all Christians are priests—will be accepted by Catholics, it is quite in the manner of this exaggerated writer to take the Catholic and Scriptural doctrine that all Christians are priests in a sense, just as Israel was in a sense a nation of priests, and to distort it into the admission that even Catholics made no essential difference between priest and layman. (See Döllinger, "Hippolytus and Callistus," English translation, p. 320 *seq.*) His reckless use of Scripture and misrepresentation of fact, to enforce his Montanist views (see *e.g.* "Exhort. Cast." 7 and 9), show how little he can be trusted. Nothing of the sort can, so far as we are aware, be found in a Catholic bishop who called Tertullian his master; we mean Cyprian. He speaks of the bishops as successors of the Apostles (Ep. xliv. lxvi. ed. Hartel 599, 729; see also Clarus a Mascula, "In Sentent. Episc." 79, and this by ordination, as he expressly says); he derives the power of the Episcopate (xxxiii. *ib.* 566), not from the people, but from Christ's commission to Peter (*ib.*). Just as much to the point is a passage of Cyprian's contemporary Firmilian, who says the power of forgiving sins has been bestowed on the Apostles, then on the churches and the bishops, who have succeeded the Apostles by successive ordination (*ordinatione vicaria*, inter "Opp. Cypr." Ep. lxxv. ib. 820). So again in the Apostolic Constitution, which belongs to the same period, we read, "Neither do we permit laymen to perform any of the priestly functions (ἱερατικῶν ἔργων)—*e.g.* sacrifice, baptism, ordination, blessing great or small. For through the imposition of the bishop's hands such dignity is given" ("Const. Ap." iii. 10). This rule is attributed to the Apostles. The Council of Nicaea forbade deacons to give communion to presbyters, and this on the ground, which is taken for granted, that the former had no authority or power to offer sacrifice. "Neither the rule nor custom has handed down that those who have no authority to offer (*i.e.* to offer sacrifice, προσφέρειν, this principle being assumed) should give the body of Christ to those who do offer" (Can. 18). Later Fathers who treated of doctrine at greater length furnish, as we should expect, more explicit statements. "Who gives," says the author of a work falsely attributed to St. Ambrose,[1] "the episcopal grace? You answer without doubt, God. But still God gives it through man. Man imposes the hand, God gives the grace" ("De Sacerdot. Dign." cap. 5, PL, xvii. 577). St. Augustine ("Contr. Epist. Parmen." ii. 13, PL, xliii. 70) compares the Sacrament of Order to that of Baptism; neither can be reiterated; ordination, even when given by a schismatical bishop, is valid, and again ("De Bono Conjugali," cap. 24) he maintains the indelible character of Order. It is not lost if the flock is withdrawn from the pastor; it abides in spite of the pastor's crimes, though of course its permanence increases the culprit's guilt. ("Sacramento Domini semel imposito non carebit quamvis ad judicium permanente.") This indelible character of Order follows from the principles for which we have been contending. Man cannot take away what he did not give. And further, if a wicked or schismatical bishop ordain, after all it is God who, in the words of the author quoted above, "bestows the grace."

We will only add that the existence of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ naturally inclines us to believe in the Sacrament of Order. God, who in the old law appointed a priesthood to offer sacrifices which could not take away sin, did not surely leave the sacrifice in which the "Word," as St. Irenaeus says, is "offered up" to Him without appointed ministers and guardians. Nor does Catholic belief foster priestly pride. Such an abuse may and does occur, for here, as elsewhere, man's weakness and sin mar the work of God. But the very fact that bishops and priests hold a commission from God and not from their flocks is a preservative against the temptation to please men at the expense of virtue and truth. A man who holds his place because of his popularity has far more temptation to vanity than a priest who knows he is nothing except for a grace he has received beyond any merits of his, and in common with multitudes of others; that he can only use this grace in accordance with laws which man cannot change, and that it involves dread responsibilities. It needs no great piety or humility to feel the contrast between the trust reposed in him and his own weakness. It is the contrast between God and man, not between men, which is the true source of humility; and what is said of Christians generally is specially applicable to priests. "We have the treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellence may be God's, and not from us" (2 Cor. iv. 7). Priests and people alike sink into nothing before Him. "The eyes of man's pride shall be humbled, and the loftiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day" (Isa. ii. 11).

IV. *The Orders in which the Sacrament is given.*—St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 37 a. 3) holds that each order is a sacrament, and this apparently was the common opinion in the Middle Ages. But historical study and knowledge of the Eastern rites do not favour this view, which is, we believe, no longer common. Probably, the orders lower than the diaconate are only of ecclesiastical institution, and are

[1] It is printed in all editions of the saint's works, but the Benedictines have shown it cannot be his. Petavius quotes it as the work of St. Ambrose.

not, therefore, accompanied by sacramental grace. It is certain from the proofs given above and from the Tridentine definition (sess. xxii., especially Canons 4, 7) that the episcopate and priesthood are sacraments; and it is all but universally held (Durandus and Cajetan are quoted on the other side) that the diaconate is so also. Indeed this seems to be a clear consequence from Canon 4, just quoted, and Billuart calls this opinion that the diaconate is a sacrament "so common and certain that several theologians charge the contrary sentiment of Durandus and Cajetan with rashness" (Billuart, "De Ord." I. a. 3, § 1).

V. *The Minister of Order.*—The distinction by Divine right between bishops and presbyters has been sufficiently explained in the article on the former. Here it is enough to say that the ordinary minister of Order is the bishop. Priests, however, may, by concession of the Pope or Church, confer minor orders, and certain abbots exercise this privilege, though the Council of Trent (sess. xxiii. cap. 10, "De Reform.") withdrew from them the right of doing so, except in the case of their own subjects. Those who hold the subdiaconate to be of merely ecclesiastical institution would naturally allow that the Pope might permit a simple priest to give that order. It is much harder to believe that the Pope could empower a priest to ordain anyone deacon. Theologians of name assert that such a privilege was given in 1489 to a Cistercian abbot, and used by the Cistercian General at Rome in 1662 with the Pope's knowledge, but the alleged fact is disputed. (See Billuart, *loc. cit.* diss. ii. a. 1.) A bishop cannot lawfully ordain any except those who belong to his diocese by birth, domicile (see the article), possession of a benefice, or by having lived in his house for three years. In this last case the bishop must at once confer a benefice on the person ordained. A bishop may give letters dimissorial, enabling another bishop to ordain the bearers of them, and if the see has been vacant a whole year, then, but not till then, the chapter may give such letters. The superiors of Regulars must send their subjects to the bishop of the diocese, but in case he is absent, then the superior may send his subjects with dimissorials to any bishop. The dimissorials must, however, be accompanied with a certificate from the bishop's vicar-general, chancellor, or secretary (Gury, "Theol. Moral." De Ord. cap. 3). The episcopate may be conferred on any Sunday or feast of an Apostle, the other holy orders on Ember Saturdays, Saturday before Passion Sunday, and Holy Saturday. Minor orders may be given on the days mentioned last, and also, if the ordination is not a general one, "on Sundays and other festivals" (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." De Ord. § 794). These rules as to the time of ordination, and in particular the greater freedom as to the time allowed for consecration of bishops and conferring minor orders, are very ancient. The only change consists in this, that the ordinations used to be held, not as now, in the morning of Saturday, but on the evening of Saturday or on Sunday morning. They were held in the church in the presence of the people. As a rule, a bishop was consecrated in his own church or that of his metropolitan. (Chardon, 817.)

We have seen that Augustine recognized the validity of heretical and schismatical ordinations, provided, of course, the ordaining bishop had used the essential matter and form. The same principle had been followed by the Council of Nicaea in dealing with the Meletians and Novatians (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 500, 576 *sqq.*) and by Popes Leo I., Anastasius II., and Innocent I. But in the eighth and following centuries this point of doctrine was obscured. The fact that persons ordained in conscious schism could receive no sacramental grace, though they did receive character and power, that they had no jurisdiction, that they were reconciled to the Church by an imposition of hands, mistaken perhaps for re-ordination, led to the error. The decision of a Roman council in 769 against the Anti-Pope Constantine has been variously interpreted. But in any case, "after the death of Pope Formosus, his adversaries, Stephen VII. and Sergius III., regarded the orders given by him as invalid." (The words are Cardinal Hergenröther's, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. i. p. 712.) In the tenth century, persons ordained by the Anti-Pope Leo VIII. were required to say at their degradation "My Father Leo had nothing to give, and has given me nothing." In the eleventh century, simony was known as the "heresy of Simon," and many maintained that ordination by bishops simoniacally elected was invalid (Hergenröther, *ib.*). St. Peter Damian defended the true doctrine, but Peter Lombard found the diversity of opinion on the validity of heretical ordination so great that he considered the question to be almost insoluble ("Sent." iv. dist. 25). Even in the thirteenth century William of Paris believed that the Church could withdraw the character of holy order by degradation; while others, starting with the view that the episcopate was a mere extension of the presbyterate, supposed that, although a degraded priest could still say Mass, a degraded bishop could not validly ordain. As a rule, however, the great scholastics adhered to the teaching of St. Augustine, which in the end was accepted. (Hergenröther, *ib.* p. 987 *sqq.*; Saltet, "Les Réordinations.")

VI. *The Matter and Form of Holy Order.*—An account of the rite of ordination will be found under the different articles, DEACON, LECTOR, &c. This, however, seems the fitting place to discuss the theological question as to the essential matter and form of the

orders in which the sacrament is undoubtedly given—viz. the orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. There are three opinions.

(α) "Nearly all the Schoolmen," says Catalani ("Comm. in Pontif." tom. i. p. 197), "who discuss the matter and form of the episcopate make its form consist in these words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' which are uttered by the consecrating and assisting bishops, touching the head of the person to be consecrated, just as the book of the Gospels is placed on his head." Some Schoolmen hold that the matter and form of ordination to the priesthood consists in the bishop's handing to the new priest the paten and chalice—an act commonly called the "tradition of the instruments," and the form in the accompanying words. They felt special difficulty about the diaconate, but some of them placed the matter and form in the giving of the dalmatic, or else of the book of the Gospels. (See Chardon, 872.) And St. Thomas ("Supp." q. 34, a. 4) implies that he held one or other of these theories.

(β) We do not think any theologian at the present day would defend the theory just stated.[1] The objection to it will presently appear. Many of the later Schoolmen, however, hold a doctrine which has some resemblance to it. They suppose that Christ left the Church to determine the specific matter and form of Holy Order, and that this determination has been different for different places. According to them, the matter and form for the West consist partly in the words and rites just enumerated, partly in the imposition of hands (for the ordination of priests the third imposition in the Roman Pontifical), and in the accompanying words, which denote the reception of the Holy Ghost for the office given.

The following reasons tell, as we venture to think, with fatal effect against either of these theories, the latter of which has the additional defect of resting on arbitrary assumption.

The words "Receive the Holy Ghost" cannot be the necessary form of episcopal consecration. They are unknown in the Greek and Syriac rites, and not only so, but they are of recent introduction in the West. "They do not occur," says Chardon, writing in 1745, "in Latin Rituals which are older than 400 years, and they are wanting even in several modern ones" (*loc. cit.* ch. i.). The testimony of Morinus and Martène is substantially the same. "None of the English Pontificals, except the Exeter, contain this form" (Maskell, "Monument. Rit." vol. ii. p. 274). Again, the tradition of instruments for the ordination of priests is unknown at this day to the Greeks, and was unknown to the Latins till the tenth (so Morinus) or eleventh (Chardon) century. The last imposition of hands in the Roman Pontifical, that after the communion, and also the words "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye remit," &c., were unknown, according to Morinus and Chardon, even in the West, for 1,200 years. Again, Western Rituals previous to the ninth century say nothing about the placing of the Gospels in the hands of the man to be ordained deacon, and, of course, do not contain the form of words with which the book of the Gospels is presented. The rite began in England (Chardon. ch. v.; Maskell. p. 210). and is not to be found in any Pontifical before the tenth century, those of English use alone excepted. Even in the twelfth century, Latin writers who treat in detail about the rite for ordination of deacons are silent about the form "Receive the Holy Ghost, for strength," &c. It is scarcely necessary to add that investing of the deacon with the dalmatic cannot be traced beyond the Middle Ages. These facts are, we believe, accepted by all the most eminent critics, Morinus, Martène, Chardon, &c. It is only in slight details—*e.g.* as to the precise date of introduction—that they differ, and thus we are led to the third theory, which we state chiefly in the words of Chardon.

(γ) The form need not be imperative—"Receive the Holy Ghost," or the like: no tradition of instruments is needed for validity. "The essential matter and form of ordination consist only in the imposition of the bishop's hands, joined to the invocation of the Holy Spirit."[1] Morinus was led to adopt this opinion by the knowledge he gained when member of a Roman congregation formed by Urban VIII. to examine the Greek Euchologium. It has been adopted, scarcely, as Chardon asserts, by nearly all theologians of repute, but certainly by nearly all critics and scholars. It is in harmony with the statements of Scripture, of the Fathers, and the ancient Ritual books. It in no way contradicts the statements of the Tridentine Council, as Morinus shows, nor the practice of the Church in requiring those who have not touched the instruments to be re-ordained conditionally. For, so long as there is no authoritative decision on the point, the Church rightly insists that the safer course be taken.

Thus the matter of the consecration of a bishop would lie in the imposition of hands when the Gospels are placed on his head, and the form in the invocation of the Holy Ghost, which is preceded in the present Latin rite by the words "Receive the Holy Ghost." A priest is ordained when the bishop, with the assistant priests, imposes his hands and says

[1] Still, even the Carmelite Thomas a Jesu, in his learned work, *De Procuranda Salute omnium Gentium* (Antwerp, 1613; it is a guide for missionaries, with special reference to Oriental rites), says (lib. vii.) that Oriental orders, according to the truer opinion, are invalid, because given without tradition of instruments.

[1] Thus, in a certain sense, the necessary form is indeterminate; it may be precatory, imperative, &c. But, according to this opinion, the Church has not determined and cannot determine, so far as concerns validity, what Christ left indeterminate.

"Oremus, fratres," &c., "Exaudi nos, quaesumus," &c. (*i.e.* when the second imposition is made). A deacon is made by the imposition of the bishop's right hand, and the form lies in the prayer "Emitte in eos, quaesumus," &c. But the other ceremonies and prayers seem to determine and specificate the meaning of these forms, and mark the special purpose (the office of a deacon &c.) for which the Holy Ghost is invoked. Hence, though these particular rites are not absolutely necessary, it by no means follows that, if all were omitted and nothing left in any way corresponding to them, the grace of orders would be conveyed. (Tournely, "Praelect. Theol." De Ordine.)[1]

VII. *The Subjects or Recipients of the Sacrament.*—Any baptized male capable of intending to receive the sacrament may do so validly. We make the limitation as to intention on the authority of Tournely (*loc. cit.* qu. iv. a. 4, "verisimilius videtur"), and because it commends itself to us on grounds of history and reason. It is right, however, to say that the Thomists generally believe that an infant, or those who are hopelessly mad, might validly receive any order except the episcopate, to which last cure of souls is necessarily attached.[2] All admit that in adults, with the exception just mentioned, intention is required.

To be ordained lawfully a person must have the due age and knowledge; he must have observed the interstices (*q.v.*); he must be free from irregularity, suspension, excommunication; he must be of good life, and have the signs of a call or vocation from God. For holy orders he needs a title. For these requisites we refer to the articles devoted to them. But the mention of interstices suggests the questions raised on ordinations *per saltum*—*i.e.* ordination to a higher order of a person who has not received a lower one.

The Church has always disapproved such ordinations, except in rare cases, and looked on the exercise of lower orders as the best preparation for ascending higher. Still St. Cyprian was made priest and bishop without passing through the lower grades ("Vita Pontii," cap. 3, ed. Hartel, p. xciii.). St. Augustine received the priesthood in the same way ("Vita Possidii," cap. 4). Morinus, a very high authority, denies that antiquity furnishes any instance of a person who was not already a priest being consecrated bishop. But clear cases are produced by Chardon (812), and Martène ("De Antiq. Eccles." lib. i.; "Rit." cap. 8, a. 3).[1] The lower order is contained in the higher, and Church history records sudden elevations justified by extraordinary merit and emergency, just as secular history records sudden elevations like that of Xanthippus the Lacedaemonian, in the first Punic war (Polyb. "Hist." i. 32), or of Spinola to the rank of general. (See the dogmatic and moral theologians and the canonists on the sacrament of Order; *e.g.* De Augustinis, "De Re Sacramentaria," ii. lib. 4; Ballerini (Palmieri), "Theol. Mor." v. p. 708 *sqq.*; Card. Gasparri, "Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione"; also the liturgical writers, *e.g.* Martène, "De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus"; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. x. Other important works are mentioned in the above article.)

ORDERS, RELIGIOUS. The fundamental conceptions which lie at the root of the religious life (in the technical sense of the word "religion") have been more or less examined in the articles ASCETAE, HERMITS, MONK, and NUN. On the external development of that life within the Church, since the time when religious orders first arose, a few general remarks will find here their appropriate place.

The conception of *orders* of monks did not arise so long as every monastery was an independent entity, managing its own affairs without reference to any other authority but the general law of the Church. Bede speaks of monasteries following the *rule* of St. Benedict, but he never speaks of the *order* of St. Benedict. It was only when, commencing in the tenth century, separate communities such as those of Cluny, Cîteaux, and the Chartreuse were formed within the great Benedictine brotherhood, and these communities, however widely scattered, submitted to the rule of a single superior (usually the abbot of the mother house), and met periodically in order to settle their common affairs, that the term "order" came into use. A completely new order—the Trinitarians—was founded by St. John of Matha towards the close of the twelfth century for the redemption of Christians held in captivity by the infidels. The institution of our Lady of Mercy (Ransom), founded (1218) by St. Peter Nolasco as an order of chivalry, but afterwards transformed into a religious order, had the same end in view. Early in the thirteenth century the mendicant orders—Franciscan, Dominican, and Carmelite friars (see those articles)—were either founded or came into distinct prominence; in the second half of the century they were joined by the Augustinian friars. These four orders, having no landed property, but subsisting on alms, preached in all parts of

[1] The Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, condemning Anglican Orders, declares that the matter of the sacrament is the imposition of hands, "which indeed by itself signifies nothing definite, and is equally used for several Orders and for Confirmation." This must be determined by words definitely expressing "the sacred order of priesthood, or its grace or power, which is chiefly the power of consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord."

[2] So St. Thomas, *Suppl.* q. 39, a. 2. But Billuart, diss. iii. a. 3, § 1 with some other Thomists, will not admit this exception; and, indeed, it can scarcely be maintained.

[1] "Certe Joannes S. Galli discipulus, diaconus ordinatus, episcopus Constantiensis factus est, presbyteratu non suscepto, ut satis clare docet Strabo in Vit. S. Galli, c. 23." Martène, *loc. cit.*; he gives other instances.

Europe, but especially in cities, where luxury and civic pride were beginning to show themselves, the humbling and fortifying doctrines of the Cross. The Servites, founded by seven merchants of Florence and propagated by St. Philip Beniti, after a struggling existence of more than two centuries, were recognized by Innocent VIII. (1487) as a fifth mendicant order, with privileges in all respects equal to those of the other four. The Jeronymites and Bridgettines were founded in the fourteenth century. The founder of the Minims (1473), a filiation of the order of St. Francis, was St. Francis of Paula.

The movement of the Reformation, of which the mainspring was the rebellion of man's lower against the restraints imposed upon it by his higher nature, was met on the Catholic side partly by direct antagonism, partly by argument, and partly by the reassertion, under new forms adapted to the altered circumstances of the time, of the unchanging Christian ideal of the moral and religious end of man. And since the spirit of the Church is most clearly seen in the religious orders, it was to be expected that the conflict with Protestantism would fall to a large extent into the hands of men bound by the three vows. The Theatines (1524), Capuchins (1528), and Barnabites (1533) were founded in order to wage war against the corruption of morals which prevailed, and to promote the religious education of the people. The Society of Jesus (1540) opposed to the indiscipline and licence of Protestantism a more rigid and unquestioning obedience to authority than had yet been known in the Church. The Discalced Carmelites, men (1580), and women (1563), practised the full austerities prescribed by the original rule. On the movement among the Benedictines, see that article and MAURISTS. In the following century an austere reform of the Cistercian order was established in the monastery of La Trappe by Dom Armand de Rancé (1662). [TRAPPISTS.]

In the Middle Ages, when the power of law was still weak, and society was often agitated by unpunished acts of turbulence and injustice, the sight of the peaceful and orderly life of a monastery, spent in a round of ceaseless prayer, praise, and study, was by the very contrast deeply refreshing and stimulative to the higher characters among the laity. But when in process of time the "reign of law" was firmly established, this contrast lost much of its sharpness, and, so far as immunity from illegal violence was concerned, ceased to exist. It was therefore fitting that religious society, in order to maintain its ground in advance of civil, and not only "allure to brighter worlds," but also "lead the way," should produce new manifestations of the old endeavour after perfection. Coming forth from the cloister into the world, but still not of the world, the religious life has sanctified and embraced all those varied activities which have the relief of human suffering, and the dispelling of that ignorance which is an obstacle to salvation, as their end. Hence has arisen the multitude of congregations which adorn the Catholic Church of our own day. A few of these are noticed in the article CONGREGATIONS, RELIGIOUS.

The opposition of the governing class in nearly all the countries of Europe to the religious orders—an opposition lately carried in France and Portugal to the length of an ignoble persecution—is grounded, not on anything political, but on fundamental divergence in moral and religious ideas. The governing classes appear to think that man has no hereafter, and that his business is to get as much enjoyment out of his short term of life here as he can. Religious men and women know that the case is far otherwise; they cannot cease, therefore, to hold up the teaching of Christ and the practice of the saints for human instruction, in spite of any impediments which statesmen may throw in their way. (See Hélyot; Vermeersch, "De Religiosis Institutis et Personis," and in "Cath. Enc."; the moral theologians in their treatises *De Statibus Particularibus.*)

ORDINARY, THE. By this name, in the language of the Church, is denoted the diocesan bishop, who, in union with the common Father of Christendom, in virtue of the mission and the powers which he holds from our Lord, as a lawful successor of the Apostles, is called of common right, *jure ordinario*, to accomplish the Divine work of the sanctification of the faithful in the diocese over which he presides. The ordinary performs all ecclesiastical functions—teaching, administering the sacraments, governing the flock of Christ—in his own right; priests perform them by virtue of the delegated right which they derive from their bishop. [See BISHOP, SUFFRAGAN, and COADJUTOR.]

ORDINATION. The chief rules of law concerning the collation of Holy Orders, in relation to Persons, Times, and Places, form the subject of the present article.

Persons.—Women are incapable of being validly ordained, inasmuch as both the healthy natural instincts of mankind and positive Apostolic injunction (1 Cor. xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 11) require that women should be "silent in the churches." When mention is made in the "Corpus Juris" of the ordination of deaconesses,[1] this is to be understood, not of ordination properly so called, but of a special benediction in virtue of which, in convents of women, those receiving it were empowered to read homilies or gospels before the community.

To receive Holy Orders *validly*, it is

[1] Cap. 23, caus. 27, quaest. 1.

necessary to have been baptized and, at least for adults, to be acting voluntarily. To receive them *licitly*, it is necessary to be in a state of grace, to have been confirmed,[1] to take them in regular order and not *per saltum*, not to be irregular [IRREGULARITY],[2] to have attained the canonical age required, to be under no censure, to be sufficiently educated,[3] to be ordained either by one's own bishop, or, if otherwise, with his licence and after the production of his dimissorial letters [DIMISSORIALS]; and, lastly, to have a legitimate and sufficient *title*, by which is understood either a benefice, or a patrimony adequate to a man's support, or religious poverty—*i.e.* the poverty which religious men embrace by vow.[4] All orders in the regular course of things are conferred by bishops; but abbots also have the power—in some cases even before they have been blessed—of conferring minor orders on their own subjects (*subditi*).

Times.—The canonical age required for the tonsure and the three lowest grades of orders (ostiarius, lector, and exorcist) is seven years completed; for the acolyteship, twelve years completed. For the subdiaconate, the canonical age is 22, for the diaconate 23, and for the priesthood 25; in these three cases it is the commenced, not the completed, year that is meant. For the episcopate the full age of 30 years is required.

The tonsure can be conferred on any day, at any hour, and in any place. Minor orders can be conferred at general ordinations, and also on any Sunday or holiday,[5] and not necessarily during Mass. Sacred orders, according to the law, can only be conferred on the Saturdays in the four Ember weeks, on the fifth Saturday in Lent, or on Holy Saturday, and always during Mass. But since the plenitude of the Papal authority can dispense with any positive law, it is to be noted that orders are legally conferred on the members of all those religious orders which have received a special privilege of such a tenor from the Holy See at times other than those named by the law. The episcopate is conferred on a Sunday, or on the festival of an Apostle, unless a Papal indult has authorized the choice of some other day.

Two grades of sacred orders—*e.g.* the diaconate and the subdiaconate—may not be conferred on the same day.

On the intervals to be observed between the collation of the various grades, see INTERSTICES.

Place.—The Council of Trent enjoined (sess. xxv. 8, De Ref.) that sacred orders should be publicly conferred in the cathedral or in one of the principal churches of the diocese in the presence of the canons. Minor orders the bishop can confer in his own palace. But, notwithstanding the injunction of the council, custom has long sanctioned the collation of sacred orders by the bishop in his own house or chapel, if any reasonable cause can be shown for the non-compliance with the law. (Ferraris, *Ordo, Ordinare.*)

ORDO ROMANUS. Certain ancient collections of ritual prescriptions, or rubrics, as observed in the Roman Church, bear this name. They are represented at the present day by the Caeremoniale and the Pontificale Romanum (*q.v.*). The first of these collections which appeared in print was the "Ordo Vulgatus" (1559) of Melchior Hittorp. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Mabillon, in his "Museum Italicum," edited fifteen "Ordines," the first ten[1] of which are of great but uncertain antiquity; of the last five the authors and dates are known. The rubrics and directions which they contain relate, some to ordinary, others to extraordinary ceremonies. Of the former class are the Papal Mass, the Episcopal Mass, the celebration of Baptism and Extreme Unction, Ordinations, the Communion of the sick, the ceremonial of the last three days of Holy Week, Papal and cardinalitial functions during the offices of the whole year, sacerdotal functions on all ferias, benedictions, &c., &c. Of the second class are the election and consecration of a Pope, the coronation of the emperor and of kings, the creation of cardinals, the nomination of legates, canonization, &c. (Kober in "Kirchenlex."; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Grisar, "Analecta Romana," 198 *sqq.*; Atchley, "Ordo Romanus Primus.")

ORGAN (ὄργανον, *organum*) is used in the LXX for instruments of any kind, but especially of musical instruments. It occurs not only as the rendering of עוּגָב, the "pipe" or "flute," but also of כִּנּוֹר and נֵבֶל, which were stringed instruments (Ps. cl. 4, cxxxvii. 2; Amos v. 23, vi. 5). Our Latin psalms naturally conform to the Septuagint use; but the Vulgate, so far as it is Jerome's independent work, employs the word much more carefully. There "organum" never means a stringed instrument. It occurs fourteen times in Jerome's rendering of the Hebrew text; three times it represents עוּגָב, a "pipe" (Gen. iv. 21; Job xxi. 12 xxx. 31); in the other places it is the generic word for instruments of all kinds, a very accurate rendering of the Hebrew כֵּלִים to

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. xxiii. 4, De Ref.

[2] There are, however, certain cases of irregularity, incurred for no very grave cause, in which the bishop can give a dispensation, and then ordain licitly.

[3] In the *Corpus Juris* Pope Gelasius says: "Let none presume to promote illiterate persons to the clerical order, for one who is destitute of learning cannot be fit for sacred functions." See also Conc. Trid. sess. xxiii. 4, De Ref.

[4] In missionary countries *titulus missionis*, that is the offerings &c. of the faithful, is recognized.

[5] In dioceses where a special custom prevails to that effect, minor orders can be given on Fridays or on an Ember Wednesday.

[1] The first ten are at least older than the ninth century or they are mentioned by Amalarius.

which in this latter case it always answers. (So 1 Paral. xv. 16; xvi. 5, 42; xxiii. 5; 2 Paral. v. 13; vii. 6; xxiii. 13; xxix. 20, 27; xxx. 27; xxxiv. 12.) Aquila, so far as we have observed, anticipated Jerome in accuracy on this point, for he did not fall into the blunder of mistaking with the LXX the "pipe" of Job xxi. 12 for a harp (see Field, "Hexapl. Orig." tom. ii. p. 30). Nor, again, does he, in Amos v. 23 and Ps. cxxxvii. 2, use ὄργανα for the stringed instruments mentioned there (Field, tom. ii. pp. 974, 290). Jerome not unfrequently imitated Aquila, and he may have done so in this case.

The organ, then, in the Vulgate, so far as it means a definite instrument at all, is equivalent to pipe. But in St. Augustine's time, as appears from his commentary on Ps. lvi. (Heb. lvii.), it was already used in its modern sense. He speaks of it as a large instrument in which the wind was supplied from bellows. It arose from a development of the syrinx, or set of pipes bound together. First these pipes were placed in a box and sounded by means of a slide which opened the hole with which the pipe was connected. The invention of this perforated slide is attributed to Ctesibius. Then, as the breath of the musician was not enough to play so many pipes, wind was supplied by bellows worked by the hand or by water. Such an hydraulic organ ("organum hydraulicum") is described by Tertullian ("De Anima," 14, PL, ii. 669), who attributes the invention to Archimedes; and there is also a well-known account of an organ with a bellows of bull's hide in an epigram by Julian the Apostate. The hydraulic organ is also mentioned by Talmudical writers, who retain the word ὕδραυλις (אוּרְגָּל), and the legend adds that it was not allowed in the temple because its soft tones spoilt the singing (Hamburger, "Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud," p. 886). In 757 the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Copronymus sent an organ to Pepin, and another was sent to Charlemagne by Constantine Michael (references in Ducange, *sub voc.* "Organum"). A little later Pope John VIII. begged Anno, bishop of Freising, to send him an organ, with someone able to manage it (Mansi, "Concil." tom. xvii. col. 245). The development of the instrument does not concern us here. We only observe that keys were introduced in the eleventh century and pedals invented in the fifteenth, by Bernard, a German in the service of the Doge of Venice, and pass on to the ecclesiastical use of the organ.

It has never been adopted among the Greeks or Orientals. Chrysostom (in Ps. cl., PG, lv. 497) speaks of musical instruments generally as only "permitted" in Jewish worship "on account of their weakness." Theodoret (in Ps. cl. 5 and 6) holds much the same language, while the author of "Quaest. et Respons. ad Orthodox.," once attributed to Justin Martyr, but certainly written after the conversion of the empire, says expressly that, whereas instruments were allowed in the temple, singing only without instruments is permitted in Christian churches ("Respons. ad Quaest." 107). The Greeks and Russians at this day rigidly follow the same rule.

As to the West, we may at once put aside the fables that the organ was introduced into the churches by Pope Vitalian or even Pope Damasus. There is little doubt that it was the presents of organs made to Pepin and Charlemagne which led to the church use of the instruments. For Walafrid Strabo in the middle of the ninth century gives an account of the organ in the church at Aix-la-Chapelle, probably the very organ sent to Charlemagne from Constantinople. Its tones were so sweet and powerful, according to this writer, that they caused a woman to faint and die (Walafr. Strabo, "Carm. de Apparatu Eccles. Aquisgranensis"). Further, it has been shown from ancient charters that there was an organ in the church of Verona in Charlemagne's time (Ughelli, "Italia Sacra," tom. v. pp. 604, 610). A great organ with fourteen bellows and 400 pipes was built by Elfeg, bishop of Winchester, for the Benedictine abbey there (Mabillon, "Annal. Benedict." tom. vi. p. 630), and another at Ramsey is mentioned in the life of Oswald, archbishop of York (Mab. *ib.* p. 727). From the eleventh and twelfth centuries organs were usual in cathedral and monastic churches, and Bingham's assertion ("Antiq." vii. 7, § 14) that they were unknown there till after the time of St. Thomas Aquinas is quite erroneous. True it is, however, that protests were occasionally made against the use of organs. "Whence," says Aelred ("Speculum Caritatis," ii. 23), "whence, now that types and figures are over, so many organs and cymbals in the church? Wherefore that horrible sound of bellows, more like thunder than the sweetness of the voice?' More remarkable still is the opinion of St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 91, a. 2). He is answering the objection that as "the Church does not use musical instruments for the praise of God, lest it should seem to Judaize, so by parity of reasoning" it should not permit singing. He replies, "Musical instruments," such as pipes, harps, &c., "minister to delight and do not promote virtue, and were only permitted to the Jews because of their carnal dispositions; whereas singing does help devotion." It is evident that he did not approve of instrumental music. In the Papal chapel it has never been employed. At Trent efforts were made to banish all music from Mass, but the majority of the bishops, especially the Spaniards, opposed this measure (Pallavicino, "Istoria del Concil. di Trento," xviii. 6), and the Council (sess. xxii. Decret. de Observ. in Celebr. Miss.) simply required that the music should be

grave and devout. Similar injunctions were made by Benedict XIV. in 1749.

The use of the organ is rejected in orthodox synagogues. The Protestants were divided on the matter; the Lutherans and Anglicans retaining, the "Reformed" at first rejecting it. Thus, it was not till the close of the eighteenth century that organs were introduced at Berne, and they are still absent in most of the Scotch Presbyterian churches, though even there a change has begun.

(Bingham, the articles in the "Kirchenlex.," Smith and Cheetham, and Grove's "Dictionary of Music," have been consulted. See also Hill, "Organ Cases and Organs." But we have found by far the most full and accurate information in Ersch and Grüber, "Conversations-Lexicon," article *Orgel.*)

ORGANIC ARTICLES. [See CONCORDAT, p. 212.]

ORIGINAL SIN is the sin which we inherit by natural descent from Adam, our first father. The Council of Trent (sess. v. Decret. de Peccato Orig.) defines, as of faith, that Adam lost original justice not only for himself but also for us; that he "poured sin, which is the death of the soul, into the whole human race," and that this sin comes, not by imitation of Adam's transgression, but by propagation from him. Further, the council teaches that original sin does not consist in those desires and temptations which are common to our fallen nature because they remain even after baptism, which takes away original sin; and the council condemns the error of Lutherans and others who supposed that original sin destroyed free will and made man incapable of good actions. The Fathers of Trent, as Pallavicino informs us, carefully abstained from interfering in the scholastic disputes on this point. They appeal to St. Paul, particularly in Romans v. 12 *seq.*, and do not go beyond the plain statements of Scripture. But it will be well to draw out the common teaching of theologians, putting aside for the present points on which they differ.

God made Adam the representative of all who were to descend from him by natural generation. "God, who had made him our beginning, had made all depend on him for himself and us. . . . In sinning he lost all, as well for himself as for us" (Bossuet, "Défense de la Tradition," p. ii. liv. ix. ch. 12). Had he persevered, we should have been born in original justice. As it is, we are conceived and born in sin and the children of wrath. Our nature and faculties remain entire and we are still capable of natural good, but we are left without grace, and therefore without the means of reaching that supernatural end to which God has ordered us. "The remission of this sin consists in being transplanted into Jesus Christ as the Just One, and the Author of all justice." Thus St. Thomas places the essence of original sin in "the privation of original justice," the privation, not the mere negation, because the gifts of grace are absolutely necessary for us in order that we may prepare for heaven. Concupiscence or the rebellion of the senses, though not original sin, or in itself a sin at all, is still a consequence of the fall.

Such is the common teaching of Catholic theologians, for the opinion of Gregory of Rimini and others,[1] that it consists in a morbid quality transmitted by Adam, is universally rejected; while, on the other hand, the views held by Catharinus and Pighius,[2] that it is merely the actual sin of Adam imputed to us, does not seem to satisfy the requirements of the Tridentine definition. And so understood, the Catholic doctrine, mysterious though it is, does not, like that of the Reformers, present insuperable difficulties to the moral sense.

For, whereas it would have been unjust had God deprived us of the gifts proper to our nature, without actual guilt on our part, Catholics hold that He did nothing of the sort. Grace is in no way a part of or due to human nature. It is God's free gift. He gives it and withdraws it according to His own will. We have no claims to possess it, no ground of complaint if it is taken away. Our natural faculties enable us to know and love God as our Creator and constant Benefactor, and to order our lives aright. We have no title to more.

It may be objected that God has ordered us to a supernatural end, that we cannot choose one which is simply natural, and that grace is our only means of escaping utter misery. This is true. But God condemns none to misery because of original sin. He deprives us of original justice to which we had no title, and then He gives all abundant opportunity of recovering grace and entering heaven by the merits of Jesus Christ, by becoming new men in Him. God ordered us, first of all, to an end infinitely above our nature, and gave us by His free gift original justice to attain it. Adam forfeited the original gift, and then God, still ordering us to a supernatural end, and having no will to impose impossible commands, gave us the grace of our Redeemer as the means of reaching it. The only exception occurs in the case of infants who die without baptism; and they, according to the belief now universally received, far from being miserable, attain natural happiness in the next world. [See LIMBO.]

The doctrine, then, of original sin is mysterious, but by no means cruel or unreasonable. We cannot fully understand the manner in which it is transmitted, for the soul comes directly from God, not from the

[1] "Nullo modo defendi potest," Bellarmine says; but he admits it was held by Peter Lombard, Henricus, Gregory of Rimini, and Driedo. Bellarm. *De Amiss. Grat.* lib. v. cap. 15.

[2] See Bellarm. *loc. cit.* cap. 16.

parents. But here, too, the Catholic doctrine that original sin is a mere privation, not a positive quality, comes to our help. God cannot be the author of sin, nor can He stain the soul which comes from Him. But He can and does infuse souls deprived of original justice; and since the infusion follows by a natural law on the generation of the body, in that sense natural propagation may be rightly called the cause of original sin.

Theologians differ widely on the consequences of original sin. Undoubtedly concupiscence flows from the deprivation of original justice. Had Adam persevered our bodily appetites would have been in perfect subjection to reason, our reason itself to God. But according to the stricter Thomists, by the rebellion of the flesh consequent on original sin, man sinks below his natural state. Thomas de Lemos ("Panopl. Grat." tract. de Laesione Lib. Arbitr.) insists that, although after the Fall nature remains entire "as to its essence and faculties, it is not so with respect to the natural inclination to good." (So also Alvarez, "De Auxil. Grat." lib. vi. disp. 45.) Both these quotations are from Kuhn ("Dogmatik: Lehre der Gnade," i. p. 269). Other great theologians, and, as we think, more reasonably, look on man's ignorance, the rebellion of his appetites, &c., as connatural to his finite and composite nature. In Adam an extraordinary grace perfectly restrained appetites which reverted after the Fall to their natural condition. This opposite theory is well put by Bellarmine. When, he says, the supernatural gift was removed, "human nature, left to itself, began to experience that struggle between the lower and higher part which would have been natural—*i.e.* would have followed from the condition of matter—had not God conferred on man the gift of justice over and above." Human nature, he continues, "does not suffer more from ignorance and infirmity than it would do had it been created in a purely natural state." And he concludes, "The corruption of nature does not come from the want of any natural gift, or from the accession of any evil quality, but simply from the loss of a supernatural gift on account of Adam's sin." ("De Gratia Primi Hominis," *apud* Möhler, "Symbolism," p. 75.)

The Doctrine in Scripture.—The Old Testament never asserts that we sinned in Adam, or even inherited sinfulness from him. But Ps. li. (l.) 7, "Behold, in guilt I was brought forth, and in sin my mother conceived me," "contains the basis of the doctrine, inasmuch as it regards sinfulness as something inborn, and so not as resulting from the abuse of freedom" (Hupfeld, *ad loc.*). Job expresses the same idea, though less distinctly. "Who can bring pure from unclean? Not one" (xiv. 4). In Wisdom ii. 23, 24, death is said to have entered into the world "by the envy of the devil," and the Rabbins[1] developed the doctrine that all had sinned and incurred death because represented by Adam, and so implicated in his sin. Even this, however, is less than the doctrine of original sin.

In St. Paul we have the first explicit statement of the doctrine. "As through one man sin came into the world, and death by sin, and so death penetrated to all men, because[2] all sinned. [The construction breaks off here.] For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not reckoned if there is no law; but sin reigned from Adam to Moses, even on those who did not sin after the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one to come. But not as the trespass, so also the gift of grace. For if by the trespass of one the many died, much more the grace and the gift in the grace of the one man Jesus Christ abounded to the many."

It may safely be maintained that Pelagius and many other writers ancient and modern, who understand St. Paul to speak only of actual sin by which men imitate Adam, distort the grammar and sense of the passage. For (*a*) St. Paul describes a momentary act of sin "because all sinned" (ἥμαρτον)—*i.e.* in Adam. Not "have sinned, or were sinning." (*β*) It is not true that death is universal because all have actually sinned. Millions have died before they were capable of sin. (*γ*) The parallel between the two Adams would be destroyed on the Pelagian interpretation. Not, in the first instance, by the imitation of Christ, but by the reconciliation (see Rom. v. 11) which Christ's death effected, we are saved; just so, not by following Adam's example, but by an act external to us on the part of the former Adam we were lost. (*δ*) St. Paul argues that there could be no trespass against law—*i.e.* law externally promulgated—between Adam and Moses, because no such law was given except to a few. Men in that interval did not sin like Adam by actual transgression of positive law. Yet they died because they sinned in Adam their head.

The Tradition of the Church.—The forcible

[1] The Rabbinical names for original sin are "the sin of the first man" (חמא אדם הראשון), "the pollution of the serpent" (זוהמא שׁל נחשׁ). The Targum on Ruth iv. 22 alleges that David's father, having no sin of his own, died on account of the counsel given to Eve by the serpent, for which all the generations of the earth were condemned to death. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, *sub voc.* עיטא, quotes a similar statement from *Baba Bathra*, 17 *a*, respecting Benjamin, Amram, father of Moses, Jesse, father of David, and Kilab, David's son. These our were personally sinless, and died for the counsel of the serpent.

[2] ἐφ' ᾧ cannot mean *in quo* "in whom" (ἐν ᾧ), as the Vulgate renders it. But the Vulgate rendering does not alter the dogmatic sense. Estius defends the Vulgate rendering on insufficient grounds, but with great moderation. "Tolerari potest" is his verdict on our rendering. Bossuet (*loc. cit.* liv. vii. ch. 12 *seq.*) is far more severe.

teaching of St. Paul was, as everybody knows, fully appreciated by St. Augustine. It is useless to multiply citations, but we may give one passage ("Enchirid." cap. 26, PL, xl. 245) which fairly represents the form in which he constantly expresses the doctrine. "He [Adam], exiled after sin, bound his offspring also, which by sinning he had corrupted as it were in the root, under the penalty of death and condemnation, so that all progeny born of himself and his wife the occasion of his sin and partner of his condemnation by concupiscence of the flesh, in which concupiscence his disobedience met a punishment like itself, should draw to itself original sin, and thence be drawn through diverse errors and pains to that last and endless torture with the angels who deserted and corrupted [others], and with those who inherit and share in their portion."

Here we have the doctrine distinctly formulated that all men sinned in Adam, and that we are condemned because of him, and it is very hard to produce testimonies which touch this, the central point at issue, from Ante-Nicene Fathers. Irenaeus (ii. 22, 4, PG, vii. 784) speaks of "infants" as born again to God, and of Christ as "sanctifying infants." Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." iii. 9, p. 540) connects the fact of physical death with Adam's sin. Tertullian holds that Adam not only imparted death to his descendants, but also infected all who sprang from him with lust, and generally with a morbid inclination to sin ("Testimon. An." 3, PL, i. 613; "De Pud." 6; "De Jejun." 3; "Adv. Marc." i. 22, v. 17). Origen admits a natural inclination to sin (*πάντες μὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν πεφύκαμεν*), "C. Cels." iii. 62–64, iv. 40 (where see a catena of passages from Ante-Nicene Fathers in Spencer's note); and, "In Levit." Hom. viii 3, which only exists in the Latin version, he infers from the custom of baptizing infants their need of purification. "In Levit." xii. 4, he attributes the corruption of nature to the fact that men derive their bodies from their parents by natural generation. Cyprian, like Tertullian, traces sin and death to the Fall ("De Bono Patient." 17, ed. Hartel, p. 409; *cf.* "Testimon." iii. 54), but he goes in one passage far beyond Tertullian. Adults, he says, be their sins ever so great, are not to be deterred from baptism, much less infants, who "have committed no sin," but only "by carnal descent from Adam have contracted the infection of ancient death," and, in whose case, "not their own sins, but those of another, are remitted" ("remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata," Ep. lxiv. ed. Hartel, p. 720).

The above account has been made from private notes, and the conclusion to which it leads is confirmed by the greatest historical authorities. Petavius ("De Incarnat." xiv. 2) says the Greek Fathers speak little, and then not clearly, about original sin, and that Augustine was the first among the Latins to treat the matter accurately. Cardinal Newman is of the same mind, and he quotes Petavius, Jansenius, Walch, "men of such different schools that we may surely take their agreement as a proof of the fact" ("Development," p. 22). Bossuet, indeed (*loc. cit.* liv. viii.), argues vigorously, but with small success, on the other side. It is enough for Catholics to show, as they certainly can, that their belief in the doctrine is due, not to St. Augustine, but to St. Paul. (The dogmatic theologians treat of the subject in connection with creation (*De Deo Creante*) or apart (*De Peccato Originali*); St. Thomas, $2^a\,2^{ae}$, qq. 163, 164; Scheeben, "Dogmatik," ii. 575, *sqq.*)

ORTHODOX CHURCH. [See GREEK SCHISMATIC CHURCH.]

ORTHODOXY, FEAST OF. [See ICONOCLASTS.]

OSTENSORIUM. [See MONSTRANCE.]

OSTIARIUS, or Doorkeeper, holds the lowest of the minor orders in the Latin Church. His office was more important in ancient times. He had to prevent the heathen from entering and disturbing the service, to keep the laity separate from the clergy, men from women, and to see generally that decorum was maintained. He had to guard the church and all that it contained, to open the church and sacristy at certain hours, to open the book for the preacher, &c. (Chardon, v. 789.)

The office is mentioned by Pope Cornelius in the middle of the third century (Euseb. "H.E." vi. 43), and in the very ancient collection of canons commonly but wrongly attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage, in 398. The rite of ordination is the same as that in the Roman Pontifical. The bishop gives the keys to the persons ordained, saying, "Go act, as having to render God an account of the things locked by these keys." In the present rite the ostiarius is led by the archdeacon to the church doors; he locks and opens them and rings the bells. Neither of these two ceremonies is mentioned in the Carthaginian canons or in the Gelasian Sacramentary. The former, however (the opening of the doors), is very ancient, being given in the Gregorian Sacramentary and in some very ancient MSS. Of the latter (ringing the bells) no trace is found in ancient Pontificals. In the time of Charlemagne and Amalarius (A.D. 820), it was the priest's business to ring the bells.

OUR FATHER. [See PATER NOSTER.]

P

PALEA. Certain canons in the Decretum in Gratian [CANON LAW], about fifty in number, have the superscription "Palea." Some have considered this to be a part of the word "Paucopalea," the name of one of Gratian's disciples; others have thought that these canons (which in the MSS. of the Decretum usually appear in the margin), as treating of matters of slight importance, were hence called "palea," chaff. But as many of these canons refer to matters of the highest importance, this derivation appears inadmissible. Whatever be the origin of the name, it is certain that in the oldest MSS. of the Decretum the Paleae are few, that in those of later date they become numerous, and that in practice they are of equal authority with the canons known to have been compiled by Gratian himself.

PALLA. A small cloth of linen used to cover the chalice. The upper part may be covered with silk (S.C.R., January 10, 1852). Part of the corporal used to be employed for the covering of the chalice, but Innocent III. mentions the palla as distinct from the corporal. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss." I. v. 6.)

PALLIUM. A band of white wool worn on the shoulders. It has two strings of the same material, and four purple crosses worked on it. It is worn by the Pope and sent by him to patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and sometimes, though rarely, to bishops as a token that they possess the "fulness of the episcopal office." Two lambs are brought annually to the Church of St. Agnes at Rome by the Apostolic subdeacons while the "Agnus Dei" is being sung. These lambs are presented at the altar and received by two canons of the Lateran Church. From this wool the pallia are made by the nuns of Torre de' Specchi. The subdeacons lay the pallia on the tomb of St. Peter, where they remain all night. A bishop cannot, strictly speaking, assume the title of patriarch, archbishop, &c., cannot convoke a council, consecrate bishops, ordain clerics, consecrate chrism or churches, till he has received the pallium. He is bound, if he is elected to a see of metropolitan or higher rank, to beg the pallium from the Pope "instanter, instantius, instantissime," within three months after his consecration or from his confirmation, if he was already a bishop and has come to the metropolitan see by translation. Meanwhile, he can depute another bishop to consecrate if he has in due time applied for the pallium. He receives it from the hands of another bishop, delegated by the Pope after taking an oath of obedience to the latter, and wears it on certain great feasts, a list of which is given in the Pontifical. He cannot transmit it to his successor or wear it out of his own patriarchate, province, &c. If translated, he must beg for another pallium. The pallium or pallia, if he has received more than one, are buried with the bishop to whom they were given.

The early history of the pallium is involved in hopeless obscurity. We take the following facts from Chardon, 935 *sqq.* Pallium is the Latin name for the ἱμάτιον or loose upper garment of the Greeks.[1] Among the Romans, the use of the pallium was specially affected by philosophers, and afterwards by Christian ascetics (see Tertullian's treatise "De Pallio," PL, ii. 1029). Two great critics—viz. De Marca and Baluze—believed that the pallium was first given to bishops as a mark of special dignity by the emperors. It is true Pope Vigilius would not grant the pallium to Auxanius and Aurelian, archbishops of Arles, without the emperor's consent. Gregory the Great took the same precaution in granting it to Syagrius, bishop of Autun. But this deference to the imperial will arose from the difficult circumstances of the time, and De Marca admits that Gregory, before he had been calumniated to Maurice, gave the pallium to Vigilius of Arles without consulting the emperor.[2]

We may dismiss the doubtful statement of Anastasius (ninth century) that the Pope Marcus (d. 336) gave the pallium to the Bishop of Ostia, and the mention of the pallium in the spurious donation of Constantine. In all probability the pallium was at first an ornament of prelates (probably of metropolitans), and had no special connection with Rome. See the synod of Macon (*anno* 581), canon 6, which forbids archbishops to say Mass without the pallium, though it is certain that then the French metropolitans, as such, did not get their pallia from Rome.

The Pope then wore the pallium as a mark of his own authority, and an examination of the Liber Diurnus makes it probable that he sent it to suburbican bishops—*i.e.* bishops in the provinces near Rome, over whom the Pope exercised a specially immediate authority. The sending of it marked the special dependence of these bishops on the Pope. Next, the Popes granted the Roman pallium to vicars-apostolic—*i.e.* to their representatives in distant provinces. The first certain example of such a concession is the

[1] It was tucked round the neck in running or other active exercise. Hence, perhaps, the origin of the present form.

[2] A decree of Valentinian III. (*anno* 432) grants the dignity of archbishop and *honor pallii* to the prelate holding the see of Ravenna. Baronius and Bona deny the authenticity of this decree.

grant of a pallium to St. Caesarius of Arles by Pope Symmachus in 513. Thus the Roman pallium came to be regarded as a special mark of honour, and was eagerly coveted by bishops. Gregory the Great granted it to Syagrius of Autun, to the two metropolitan bishops in England (Canterbury and York), &c. This Chardon calls "the third degree in the fortunes of the pallium." Next a rule was made, at a general synod of Franks under St. Boniface in 747, that metropolitans must ask the pallium from Rome. This law was not always regarded. It was enforced, however, in a capitulary of Charlemagne, and after that always or nearly always served in the Frankish Empire.

In 877,[1] the great synod of Ravenna under John VIII., representing all Italy, required (cap. i.) metropolitans to demand the Roman pallium personally or by deputy within three months of their consecration. (Hefele-Leclercq. iv. 660 *sqq.*) Otherwise, they could not consecrate other bishops, and were liable, after three monitions, to deposition. The Pope insisted on this rule being kept in France. The rule was soon afterwards established throughout the West, except in Ireland, where the pallium was unknown even in St. Malachi's time. Innocent III. forbade even the assumption of the name of archbishop till the pallium had been obtained, and the decree forms part of the "Corpus Juris."

In the East, the patriarchs gave a sort of pallium (*ὠμοφόριον*) to their metropolitans. After the time of the Crusades, the Fourth Lateran Council (canon 5) required even patriarchs to receive the pallium from the Pope.

To sum up, the pallium was an ornament of metropolitans, given to them perhaps from early times by the patriarchs and by the Pope in that comparatively narrow district which was under his most immediate supervision. Then the Pope gave it to his vicars in distant parts, then as a mark of special honour to some bishops, then he required all Western metropolitans to ask it from him before exercising their functions as archbishops, and finally the rule was extended even to patriarchs. (See Kraus, "Real-Encykl." ii. 574; Thurston, "The Pallium"; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 620–676, and in "Cath. Enc.")

PALM SUNDAY. The Sunday before Easter, on which the Church celebrates Christ's entry into Jerusalem. The name, "Palm Sunday" ("Dominica in Palmis," or "ad Palmas," *βαΐων ἑορτή*), is ancient, for it occurs in the "Life of Euthymius" (died 472), and is spoken of as a great day by Isidore of Seville. It was also called "Pascha Floridum" ("Pascua Florida" in Spanish, "Blumensonntag" in German, and "Flower Sunday"). It was the custom to bless flowers and entwine them with the palms in sign of joy. One of the antiphons sung during the procession runs thus: "Occurrunt turbae cum floribus et palmis Redemptori obviam." The State of Florida (U.S.A.) derives its name from the fact that it was discovered on Palm Sunday, 1512. According to our present rite, palms or olive-branches are blessed by the celebrant before Mass, and distributed to the faithful; the clergy walk in procession through the church and pass outside. Then cantors enter the church, leaving the rest without; the hymn "Gloria, laus, et honor" is sung, both parties, those within and those without, taking part. At last the subdeacon knocks at the door with the shaft of the processional cross, and the whole body march up the church. The Greeks have a procession with palms at matins.

Martène denies that any trace of the procession can be found before the eighth century, in spite of Meratus's elaborate attempt (tom. ii. pars iv. tit. 7) to produce earlier testimonies. Meratus shows that the name Palm Sunday occurs in an ancient Roman Calendar published by Martène himself in his "Anecdota," and dating from the fourth or fifth century; that St. Aldhelm (709) mentions the singing of the "Ozanna"; and that in a prayer in the most ancient MS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary tenth century) there is an allusion to the practice the faithful had of coming to the church with palms. These instances clearly are not to the point. But in the "Peregrinatio Etheriae" (fourth century) the procession of Palm Sunday is described in great detail. In an "order" observed in a German monastery, and ascribed by Mabillon to the year 800 *circ.*, the procession is mentioned, and so in Pseudo-Alcuin (tenth century).

In ancient times those who were to be baptized on Holy Saturday, called "competentes," heard the whole Creed explained on this Sunday. Hence its old name, "Pascha petitum s. competentium." (Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," ch. v.; Rock, iv. 78–82, 264–270; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," ch. viii. sect. 4.)

PARABOLANI (Gr. *παραβάλλεσθαι*, "to expose oneself to danger." The word "parabolani," with its Latin suffix, was evidently formed from *παράβολοι*, "dare-devils," the men who for money fought with wild beasts in the amphitheatre). The "parabolani," a class of lay assistants to the clergy, principally engaged in looking after the sick and attending to funerals, are frequently mentioned by writers of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. Gibbon describes them as a charitable corporation originally founded in the time of the Emperor Gallienus.[1] They were very numerous at Alexandria, and seem

[1] Nicholas I. had made a still more stringent rule, but only for Bulgaria.

[1] *Decline and Fall*, ch. xlvii.

to have formed a kind of body-guard to the patriarch Cyril at the time of his contest with the prefect.

PARACLETE (*παράκλητος*). A word used four times in St. John's Gospel (xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7) as a name of the Holy Ghost, once in his first Epistle (ii. 1) of Christ. It is found nowhere else in the N.T. and nowhere in the LXX. The Vulgate rendering in the Gospel is Paracletus, in the Epistle Advocatus; and Paraclete (usually Paraclitus) is a common title of the Holy Ghost in the Breviary. The Rhemish follows the Latin.

Aquila gives *παράκλητοι* as a rendering of "comforters" (מְנַחֲמִים), Job xvi. 2, where the LXX more rightly has *παρακλήτορες*. Origen, "De Princip." ii. 4, in the version of Rufinus, says the word when used of the Holy Ghost means comforter ("a consolatione dicitur, Paraclesis enim Latine consolatio dicitur"). This interpretation, though widely adopted by Greek and Latin Fathers, is surely erroneous. The word means "one called in," an advocate or pleader. This appears from the passive form, the constant classical use, the undoubted sense in 1 Jn. ii. 1 (though even there the Greek Fathers take it as "comforter"), and the use of the word in Rabbinical writers (see פרקלים in Buxtorf).[1] The Holy Ghost pleads the Christian cause against the world (Jn. xv. 8), and Christ's with the Christian (xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 14). [See TRINITY, p. 827.]

PARADISE (פַּרְדֵּס). An old Persian word adopted at an early date by the Hebrews. It only occurs three times in the Old Testament, and always means simply "a park" (Cant. iv. 13; Neh. ii. 8; Eccl. ii. 5). In the LXX (Gen. ii. 8) and Peshito it is used for that particular garden or park in which Adam and Eve were placed; and in the later Jewish theology for that part of Hades which was inhabited by the souls of the just, and which we call "Limbo." In this sense it occurs in Lk. xxiii. 43. Lastly, in 2 Cor. xii. 4, Apoc. ii. 7, it means "heaven," or "a part of heaven." [See HEAVEN, and LIMBO.]

PARASCEVE (*παρασκευή*), "preparation"—*i.e.* for the Sabbath, and so equivalent to Friday (Jn. xix. 13). It is retained in the Rhemish version and in the Missal as a name for Good Friday.

PARISH [see CURE OF SOULS, PATRON, PATRONAGE, TITHES]. During the first three Christian centuries country and town parishes as now understood, each with its settled incumbent, can scarcely be said to have existed in the Church. "In the earliest times there were no churches, no presbyters, except in cities, and with the bishop" (Thomassin). The diocese was then called *παροικία*, paroecia; it was the *παροικία* both of the bishop and of the presbyters and deacons surrounding him. No other name than this for the episcopal district occurs in the Apostolic Canons or Constitutions. The ground notion was, either that Christians were *πάροικοι*, *juxta habitantes* (1 Pet. ii. 11), dwellers among the non-Christian masses, or that they were "sojourners," without any fixed abode in this life, passing onwards towards a better. The word *paroecia* was gradually supplanted by the barbarous form *parochia*, still meaning a diocese. Thus in the eighth century St. Boniface writes to Pope Zachary "Provinciam in tres parochias discrevimus" (We have divided the province into three dioceses); and Zachary often uses the word in the same sense.

Separate parishes or districts within the diocese, to which the bishop appointed resident presbyters, removable at his pleasure, began to be common in the fourth century. The change is attributed by Anastasius, in his "Lives of the Roman Pontiffs," to Dionysius, who was Pope from 261 to 272. "This Pope," says Anastasius, "assigned churches to the presbyters, and established cemeteries, parishes (*parochias*), and dioceses." In the northern countries of Europe, the difficulties of communication being greater than in the south, and the population more sparse, the plan of separate parishes, each with its own priest responsible for the souls of all persons living within the limits, necessarily prevailed over the earlier state of things. The zeal of laymen [PATRON, PATRONAGE] did much to spread a network of subordinate centres of religion and civilisation over each Christian country. A parish in the modern sense is "a defined district of territory, the boundaries of which are settled by the Pope or by the bishop of the diocese, having one fixed rector, with power to rule and judge the people living within it, and to administer to them the sacraments and other divine things" (Ferraris).

Parishes are properly conferrable on secular priests; if regulars hold them they are removable by the bishop, or by the superior of the order to which they belong. There is an exception to this rule in the case of the regular canons of Prémontré (see PREMONSTRATENSIANS, note).

Parishes in lay patronage are treated tenderly by the canon law; thus the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. cap. 18) orders that the presentees of lay patrons, after due examination, be admitted by the bishop without concursus, if found "idonei." (Ducange, *Parochia*; Ferraris, *Parochia*; Soglia, *Instit. Canon.* ii. 8. §§ 84–87; Taunton.)

PARISH PRIEST. The word *parochus*, for parish priest, is of late introduction; it has nothing to do with the ancient *parochi*, or purveyors, mentioned by Horace:—

[1] He quotes, *e.g.*, a gloss on the *Pirke Avoth* ii.: "A paraclete is a good mediator for a man to a king"; "If he has good paracletes he will be delivered"; "Penance and good works are a man's paracletes in the heavenly judgment," &c.

Proxima Campano ponti quae villula tectum
Praebuit; et parochi, quae debent, ligna salemque.—Serm. I. v. 46.

See also Cic. ad Att. xiii. 2, 2.

Early in the fifteenth century, Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, taught that parish priests were of divine institution, and were the successors of the seventy-two disciples; he also held that they were members of the hierarchy and had a right to vote in councils. His opinions were adopted by the Sorbonne, and long afterwards by the Jansenists, such as St. Cyran, Richer, Bailly, and Van Espen. But it is now acknowledged that there were no country parishes until the fourth century, and that there were none in cathedral cities (except perhaps in Rome and Alexandria) until the beginning of the eleventh century [see PARISH]. The Council of Trent teaches that the hierarchy consists of bishops, priests, and ministers—making no mention of parish priests as such. As to the right of voting in councils, the bull *Auctorem fidei*, directed against the synod of Pistoja, condemns the doctrine whereby parish priests and other priests in synod assembled are declared to be, together with the bishops, judges of faith, and whereby it is insinuated that judgment belongs to them of their own right conferred by ordination, as false, rash, subversive of the hierarchy, &c., &c.

The true definition of a parish priest, according to Bouix ("De Parocho," p. 184), is "a person lawfully deputed and bound to minister in his own name the word of God and the sacraments to certain members of a diocese, who in their turn are to a certain extent bound to receive them from him." Hence from the very fact that a man is instituted as parish priest he has ordinary jurisdiction *in foro interno*, and, if he is a priest, can give absolution. Vacant parishes are to be filled by competitive examination (Conc. Trid. sess. xxiv. De Ref. c. 18). The method to be observed, as laid down by the council and modified by subsequent papal enactments, is as follows:—The bishop must give public notice of the examination. Candidates should have reached their twenty-fifth year, and should excel in virtue and learning. The examination should be conducted by three examiners in the presence of the bishop or vicar-general. The same questions should be put to each candidate, and the same text of Scripture given for the sermon to be written by each. The candidate who, in the opinion of the bishop, has passed the best examination should receive the parish. There are many exceptions to the rule of examination, *e.g.* when the parish has a lay patron. The new parish priest is bound to make a profession of faith within two months of obtaining possession of his parish. His duties are to reside among his flock and to feed them, that is, to offer the sacrifice of the Mass for them on all Sundays and days of obligation (*festis de praecepto*), to preach and to administer the sacraments to them. The chief rights of the parish priest are: (1) the reservation of the holy oils; (2) to confer the nuptial blessing, the blessing of women after childbirth, the blessing of houses on Holy Saturday; (3) to administer Communion at Easter; (4) to administer the last sacraments, *i.e.* Viaticum and Extreme Unction; (5) to perform the burial service for his parishioners. He has also the right to tithes and funeral dues. Under the new legislation, *Ne temere*, the parish priest of the place where a marriage is celebrated (or his delegate) must be present in order that the marriage may be valid. It should be noted that some parish priests are removable at the will of the bishop (*ad nutum amovibiles*); while others, who are styled "*perpetui et inamovibiles*," can be removed only for some grave cause. A recent decree of the Consistorial Congregation (*Maxima Cura*, Aug. 20, 1910) lays down at great length the causes for removal and the procedure to be followed.

For a long time before the Reformation parish priests in England were called *persones* or parsons, because they were *personae ecclesiae*, the representatives of the Church in the parish. The word was not in use before the Conquest; but *persona*, as equivalent to *rector ecclesiae*, occurs frequently in the treatise of Bracton, writing in the reign of Henry III. From the law courts it probably passed into the speech of the people, and Chaucer naturally speaks of the parish priest, introduced into the "Canterbury Tales," as "a poore persoun of a toun."

The "parish priest," or "parson," of England and Ireland, corresponds to the *curé* of France, the *Pfarrer* of Germany, the *paroco* of Italy, the *pastoor* of Holland, and the *párroco* of Spain and Portugal. (See Ferraris, *Parochus*; Taunton, *Parochus*; Bouix, "De Parocho"; Craisson, "Manuale Juris Canonici," nn. 1287–1514.)

PASCH. (*Pascha*, the Chaldaic for Passover, see EASTER, p. 192.) The word is retained in the N.T. in the original Greek (*πάσχα*), in the Vulgate (*Pascha*), and in the Rhemish (Pasche) (Mt. xxvi. 17; Mk. xiv. 12; Lk. xxii. 7; Jn. xiii. 1, &c.). In the New Covenant the word is used of the true "Passover," of which the ancient one was only the figure. Christ's death and resurrection were intimately bound together, so that the one name *πάσχα* was used for both. Afterwards a distinction was made between *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον* (Good Friday) and *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον* (Easter Day). The days in Easter week and the Sundays after Easter are called "post Pascha" in the Roman Missal and Breviary.

PASCHAL CANDLE. [See HOLY WEEK.]

PASCHAL CONTROVERSY. [See EASTER.]

PASCHAL PRECEPT. [See COMMUNION.]

PASSION OF CHRIST. [See REDEMPTION OF MANKIND.]

PASSION (OF MARTYRS). The sufferings of one who laid down his life for the Christian faith were called his "passion," *e.g.* "Passio Cypriani." The entries in the Roman Martyrology of the anniversaries of the deaths of the martyrs speak of them as "passiones."

PASSION SUNDAY. The Sunday before Palm Sunday. With Passion Sunday the more solemn part of Lent begins; the images are veiled with violet at the first vespers; the Judica psalm and the Gloria Patri are omitted at the Introit, &c. The name Passion Sunday is ancient, but we have been able to find no ancient or even mediaeval author who mentions the veiling of the images. None is quoted by Gavantus or Meratus. It is said to refer to the last words of the Gospel for the day, "Jesus autem abscondit se et exivit a templo" (Jn. viii. 59).

PASSIONISTS. Their full title is, "Congregation of the Discalced Clerks of the most holy Cross and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ." Their founder, St. Paul of the Cross, born near Genoa in 1694, put on the habit of the order in 1720, with the sanction of the Bishop of Alessandria, Monsignor Gattinara. In 1721, having compiled the constitutions which he wished his followers to observe, Paul went to Rome in order to obtain sanction for his proceedings. This sanction was withheld for many years, in the course of which Paul was ordained priest and employed on various works of charity in Rome. All obstacles being at length removed, he established the first monastery of his congregation at Monte Argentaro, near Orbitello, in 1737. The rules of the society were confirmed by Benedict XIV. in 1746. Clement XIV. showed the Fathers marked favour, and conferred on them the house and church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo on the Coelian Hill. Here the holy founder took up his abode, and here (1775) he died. In 1867 he was canonized by Pius IX. The congregation rapidly extended itself after his death, but for some time within the limits of Italy only. But Paul's most settled purpose, and the subject of his impassioned longing, had been to work and pray for the conversion of England. His desire was in part fulfilled when, in 1842, his followers obtained a footing in this country.

The whole order comprises twelve provinces and about 100 houses, with 1400 religious.

The life of the Passionists is very austere. They fast three days in every week, besides Advent and Lent; they wear nothing on their feet but sandals; they rise at night to say Matins, and, indeed, recite the office in choir at all the canonical hours. They divide their time between contemplation and action; being indefatigable in giving missions and retreats, especially to persons living in community. Besides the three usual vows, they make a fourth—that they will do their utmost to keep alive in the hearts of the faithful the memory of our Lord's Passion. On the day of their profession they make a vow of perseverance in the congregation. Nevertheless, they only take simple vows. (Hélyot, "Contin.")

The Congregation of the Passion has never had a regular cardinal protector, as is the case with other religious orders. The sovereign pontiffs have always retained it under their own immediate protection.

From the very beginning of his foundation St. Paul of the Cross had it in his mind to establish a congregation of religious women who should devote themselves to prayer and meditation on our Lord's Passion. It was not until towards the end of his life that he was able to carry out this design. The rules were approved by Clement XIV. in 1770. The nuns lead a most austere life and are enclosed.

A second order of Passionist nuns was founded in England by the Passionist Father Gaudentius in 1850. They are not enclosed, so that they may carry on external work such as homes for factory girls, parish schools, and also secondary education.

Although missions and spiritual retreats are the principal external works for the good of souls prescribed by the rule of the Passionist Fathers, still the necessities of the faithful and the scarcity of priests compelled them at first to undertake the spiritual charge of the Catholics living in the vicinity of their foundations, who otherwise would have had no one to minister to their spiritual wants. But as priests became more numerous most of these charges were gradually relinquished, and at present the Passionist Fathers retain only a few parishes. Calls for missions and retreats, on the other hand, have become very frequent, and during the greater part of the year several bands of missionaries are at work simultaneously in different localities. Their method in conducting missions is substantially the same as that followed by other missionaries, but the prominence given in their preaching to the mysteries of our Lord's Passion is found to be singularly effective in rousing the negligent and stimulating the devout to still greater fervour. (See Hélyot-Migne, supplement; Devine in "Cath. Enc.")

PASSOVER. [See EASTER.]

PASTOR. Jesus Christ, who, in the Preface for Festivals of the Apostles, is called "Pastor aeternus," communicates the characteristics of a good shepherd of souls to all those who faithfully discharge the office of governing in his Church. This communication is pre-eminently made to

the Roman Pontiff, who, in the collect "pro Papa," is described as "pastor ecclesiae"; it also appertains in lesser degrees to bishops and priests, upon each one of whom it devolves to lead, feed, and gently rule, like a shepherd, the flock committed to him. [See PARISH, PARISH PRIEST.]

PASTORAL STAFF. [See CROSIER.]

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. The science of the care of souls. It is a branch of theology which grows out of and is based upon dogmatic, moral, and ascetical theology and canon law. Though the name is new, the thing is as old as Christianity itself. Our Lord practised it and taught it to His disciples (Mt. x. 6 *sqq.*; Mk. vi. 8 *sqq.*; Lk. ix. 3 *sqq.*; x. 4 *sqq.*; xxii. 35). St. Paul treats of it at length in his epistles to Timothy and Titus. So, too, the Fathers constantly deal with the subject. St. Cyprian's Epistles and his treatise "De Lapsis," St. Gregory Nazianzen's "Oratio Apol. de Fuga Sua" (al. "De Sacerdotio"), St. Ambrose's "De Officiis Ministrorum," and, above all, St. John Chrysostom's "De Sacerdotio," will occur to everyone. The "Regula Pastoralis" of St. Gregory the Great (so highly commended by Ven. Bede and translated into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great) is still one of the very best books on the guidance of souls. His oft-quoted saying, "Ars est artium regimen animarum," can be traced to St. Gregory Nazianzen (PG, xxxv. 408). During the Middle Ages the "Regula Pastoralis" was the common text-book, though the subject of pastoral theology was also dealt with by the Schoolmen in connection with dogma and moral. It was, however, the outburst of pastoral zeal which accompanied the Counter-Reformation that gave rise to the special study of this branch of theology. The works published at this time are too numerous to mention; the "Instructio Pastorum" by St. Charles Borromeo and the writings of St. Francis of Sales may be taken as examples. During the succeeding centuries there has been a constant stream of pastoral literature, more particularly during recent years, the most notable being the "Homo Apostolicus" of St. Alphonsus.

The pastor, like the Chief Pastor, Christ Himself, has the threefold function of teaching, sanctifying, and ruling—he is prophet, priest, and king. Hence pastoral theology lays down the rules and methods for the due performance of these duties. It treats of the priest's studies, of catechizing and preaching, of the instruction of converts, &c.; of the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice and the administration of the sacraments and the preparation for them; of the organization of parishes, the regulation of the church and its services, the management of schools, social work, &c. The table of contents of one of the manuals will show how varied are the matters treated of.

Pastoral medicine is a branch of the subject which has lately attracted much attention. A competent knowledge of it is most useful for the spiritual care of the sick and the guidance of persons in different states of life. (Besides the books mentioned, see Frassinetti, "Parish Priest's Manual," Eng. tr.; Oakeley, "The Priest on the Mission"; Keatinge, "The Priest: His Character and Work"; O'Donnell, "The Priest of To-day"; Scannell, "The Priest's Studies"; Sandford-Drum, "Pastoral Medicine"; Drum in "Cath. Enc.")

PATEN. A plate used from the earliest times to receive the Host consecrated at Mass. Larger patens, called ministeriales, were used for the communion of the people. It is consecrated with chrism by the bishop, and this rite of consecration is mentioned in a Gallican Sacramentary as old as the eighth century, published by Mabillon in the "Museum Italicum." (Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

PATER NOSTER. The prayer taught by our Lord to His disciples. It occurs in all the ancient liturgies, with one notable exception—that of the so-called Clementine liturgy—given in the Apostolic Constitutions. Its absence there has never been satisfactorily explained. In all the chief liturgies it occurs much in the same place—*i.e.* shortly before the Communion. In most of the Greek, in the Mozarabic and the Ambrosian liturgies, the Canon was followed by the Fraction of the Host; then came the Pater. St. Gregory settled finally the place of the Pater in the Roman Mass, placing it where it now stands, immediately after the Canon and before the Fraction. This seems to be the sense of Gregory's words when he says (Lib. 7, Indict. 2, Epist. 64, quoted by Le Brun) that the Sicilians taunted him with following the use of Constantinople and reciting the Pater "mox post canonem," "immediately after the Canon," and so they are understood by Le Brun, tom. iii. Diss. ii.; Benedict XIV. "De Miss." ii. 19; Probst. "Lit. der ersten drei Jahrhund." p. 356; Hammond, "Ancient Lit." lxxii. The other view—viz. that the Pater was introduced into the Roman liturgy by Gregory—is maintained by Scudamore in his article on the Lord's Prayer in Smith and Cheetham. The Pope also tells us that, whereas in the East (and also in the Gallican rite) the Pater was said by priest and people, at Rome it was recited by the priest alone. In nearly all the ancient liturgies the Pater is introduced by a preface like the exhortation in the Mass, "Praeceptis salutaribus," &c.[1]

The Pater occurs in all the Breviary hours at the beginning and end, and sometimes in the course of the hour itself. But

[1] The Ethiopic liturgy is an exception. But the introduction to the Pater is generally in the form of a prayer—not a statement, as in the Roman and Ambrosian Mass.

whereas in the Mass it is said aloud, in the Breviary it is said secretly, or at most only the first and concluding words are said audibly. The reason is that at the part of the Mass where the Pater occurs the faithful only were present, while catechumens, &c., were admitted to the hours. (So Benedict XIV. *loc. cit.*)

The addition to the Lord's Prayer, "For thine is the kingdom," is wanting in the best ancient authorities. It probably arose from the embolismus [see the article] of the liturgy used in the Syrian Church. The version given by St. Matthew (vi. 9–13) was adopted by the Church from the beginning for liturgical purposes (see "Didache," viii., where the doxology is added). "With regard to the English text now in use among Catholics, we may note that this is derived, not from the Rheims Testament, but from a version imposed upon England in the reign of Henry VIII. and employed in the 1549 and 1552 editions of the 'Book of Common Prayer.' From this our present Catholic text differs in only two slight particulars: 'which art' has been modernized into 'who art,' and 'in earth' into 'on earth.'" (Thurston in "Cath. Enc." and at greater length in the "Month," March 1914; Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 360. See Westcott and Hort, N.T. vol. ii., notes on Mt. vi. 13.)

PATERINES. A Manichaean sect which first came into notice under this name in Italy about 1040, when a number of them were convicted of heresy by Heribert, archbishop of Milan, and burnt at the stake. They taught that matter was essentially evil, condemned marriage, and set at naught Church authority. The Lombard married clergy, when (1057) they were attacked on the score of incontinence by Anselm of Badagio and Ariald, taunted their assailants with being Paterines. Möhler[1] identifies them with the Boni Homines who were condemned by the Council of Lombez in 1165. They appear again among the heretical sects that infested Languedoc at the end of the twelfth century, and are then identified with the Cathari or Puritans. Innocent III. spoke of "impii Manichaei, qui se Catharos vel Patarinos appellant." The origin of the name is unknown. [ALBIGENSES; BONI HOMINES; BULGARIANS.]

PATRIARCH, PATRIARCHATE. The dignity of Patriarch—the Primacy of St. Peter being considered as standing apart—is the highest grade in the hierarchy of jurisdiction. Immediately next to the rank of Patriarch may come that of "Primate"; metropolitans or archbishops follow; under each metropolitan are ranged his suffragan bishops. In the fifth century the Exarchate [EXARCH] was an intermediate grade between the patriarchate and the rank of metropolitan.

[1] *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. ch. v. § 3.

The Sixth Canon of the first Nicene Council recognizes an ancient, customary, and legitimate authority in the bishops of the three sees of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch (named in this order) over their respective provinces. The *title* of "Patriarch," however, is not given; the thing is recognized, but not the word. The title came into use in the fifth century, at least in its present sense, for it had earlier been used loosely for any great see. From the latter part of the fourth century, Constantinople gradually came to occupy the position of a fourth Patriarchate. That of Jerusalem, after a struggle for precedence between it and Caesarea, became the fifth. For the history of each of these Patriarchates, excluding Rome, see ALEXANDRIA, CHURCH OF; ANTIOCH; CONSTANTINOPLE, PATRIARCHATE OF; JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF. Since the misfortunes which overtook the Eastern Church (Monophysite heresy, Mussulman domination, Greek schism, &c.) severed all these four sees from Catholic unity, the Popes have continued to nominate bishops to the lost Patriarchates; but these bishops have resided at Rome, except lately in the case of Jerusalem, the Patriarch of which, Monsignor Valerga, commenced to reside at his see in 1847. Besides the Latin Patriarch of Antioch, the Holy See admits a Maronite, a Melchite, and a Syrian Patriarch of the same see, a Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenian, a Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, and a Patriarch of Babylon of the Chaldaic rite. (On the Pope as Patriarch of the West, see POPE, p. 667.)

There are also four minor Patriarchs in the Western Church—the Patriarch of the Indies, who is the prelate of highest rank in the Church of Spain; the Patriarch of Goa; the Patriarch of Lisbon; and the Patriarch of Venice. (See Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus"; Bingham, "Origines Ecclesiastic[illegible] i.; Fortescue, "The Orthodox East[illegible] Church," ch. i.; "The Lesser Eastern Churches," and in "Cath. Enc.")

PATRIMONY. [See TITLE TO ORDERS.]

PATRIMONY OF ST. PETER. [See STATES OF THE CHURCH.]

PATRIPASSIANS. [See SABELLIANISM.]

PATROLOGY. [See FATHERS.]

PATRON, PATRONAGE. The word *patronus* is used in three [illegible]nses in canon law; it signifies (1) an advocate or barrister; (2) the former master of a manumitted slave, to whom under the Roman law a certain control over his freedman was reserved; (3) a person having the right to present to a benefice. The third sense only is here in question.

The subject of patronage is of little practical interest to English Catholics, for, from the great spoliation of the sixteenth century down to the present day, an English benefice in Catholic hands has been a

phenomenon rarely met with. However, it seems desirable to give a brief sketch of the principal provisions of the law on this subject.

Patronage (*jus patronatus*) is defined to be "the right or power of nominating or presenting a clerk for preferment to a vacant ecclesiastical benefice." It may be usefully considered from three points of view, according as (1) its acquisition, (2) its transfer, and (3) its prominent incidents are taken into account.

1. The right of patronage is *acquired* in one of three principal ways—by foundation, or building, or endowment—according to the memorial line:

Patronum faciunt dos, aedificatio, fundus.

If one person founds a church by giving the ground, a second builds it, and a third endows it, the right of patronage belongs to the three jointly. The consent of the bishop is, of course, always necessary. An endowment, in order to convey a right of patronage, must be *sufficient—i.e.* it must be ample enough to provide a decent maintenance for those serving the church, and to meet the annual expense of lights and other church requisites. Otherwise it is not an endowment, but a benefaction, and as such carries no right of patronage. Patronage acquired by Papal privilege, conceded at any date anterior to the Council of Trent, was abolished by a decree of that council;[1] hence anyone now claiming it on that ground must show that such privilege was conceded *since* the council, with a clause expressly derogating from its decree. Patronage can also be acquired by prescription if multiplied unopposed presentations can be proved.

2. The transfer of patronage ordinarily takes place in one of four ways—by succession, donation, sale, or exchange. By succession—as when, on the death of a patron, the right passes to his heirs, whether at law or under settlement or devise. When the patronage passes by donation, the consent of the bishop is usually, but not in all cases, necessary. With regard to the third mode—sale—it is instructive to compare the provisions of the canon law with the law and practice of the Anglican communion as regards the sale of advowsons.[2] In England an advowson can be sold separately, and for the best price. The sole condition is that the benefice be not actually vacant at the time of sale; otherwise no distinction is made between advowsons and any other kind of property. The canon law does not permit an advowson (*jus patronatus*) to be sold separately at all. It can only be sold indirectly—*i.e.* through being inseparably annexed to some other property which is susceptible of legal sale. Thus, if a man sells his whole estate, and to this estate an advowson be annexed, the latter passes to the purchaser along with the other property. Or even if the sale be not of a man's whole estate, but only of a particular piece of property—a palace, a farm, a field, &c.—to which a right of patronage is inseparably annexed, that right is transferred to the purchaser by the sale. But in all such cases canon law exacts the condition that the price given be not enhanced on account of the annexed patronage. Any simoniacal attempt to sell the patronage as such is visited by the law with severe penalties.

3. The chief incidents of patronage are four—presentation, honour, defence, maintenance in case of poverty. (1) The first-named is so strictly inherent in a patron that if he present a qualified clerk for a benefice the bishop is bound to accept him, even though he may know of one more worthy. But the presentation must be made within four months if the patron be a layman, within six if he be a clergyman; otherwise it passes for that time to the bishop. The law is more tender of lay than of ecclesiastical patronage, because interference with the former would tend to discourage rich laymen from building churches and extending Christianity. Women are capable of presenting to benefices equally with men. No patron can present himself to any benefice in his gift, although he may ask the bishop to confer it upon him, and the bishop may, at his discretion, legally do so. (2) By "honour" are understood the precedence and respect which a patron may justly claim in a church founded by him or his ancestor. (3) "Defence" refers to the right and duty of the patron to watch over the beneficiary property, and prevent its waste or dilapidation. (4) "Maintenance in poverty" is the claim which the patron has, should misfortune overtake him and reduce him to want, to receive a decent maintenance (and this applies to his wife and children also) out of the revenues of the benefice in his gift. (Ferraris, *Jus patronatus*; Taunton.)

PATRON AND TITULAR OF CHURCH, PLACE, &c. The title of a church is the name it bears—*e.g.* of the Trinity, St. Augustine, St. Mary, St. Saviour, &c. The patron saint is that saint under whose special protection it has been placed. Thus the titular is a wider term comprehending the persons of the Trinity, mysteries (*e.g.* Corpus Christi), and saints; the patron of a church can only be a saint or angel. Of churches with the title of St. Mary, the patronal feast is the Assumption. Only a canonized (not a beatified) saint can be chosen as patron. (S.C.R. 23 Martii, 1630.)

The patron of a church is chosen by the founders ("ex fundatorum beneplacito," Merat. § iii. 12, 1). Usually only one patron

[1] Sess. xxv. De Ref. c. 9.

[2] An advowson (*advocatio*) is the perpetual right of presentation to a benefice.

is chosen, or else two patrons whose feast falls on the same day. The feast of the principal titular or patron is a double of the first class with an octave. This holds good even of churches not yet consecrated. The rule, however, does not apply to chapels of seminaries, &c., &c. The rules for churches which have more than one patron with independent feast are the same as those given below for local patrons.

The patron of a place is chosen by the people with the consent of the clergy. (Decret. Urban. VIII., 23 Mart. 1630.) A place may have several patrons, principal and less principal, but not more than one principal patron except by immemorial custom or Apostolic indult. The feast of the principal patron is a double of the first class with an octave (so also if there are several chief patrons); of a "less principal," a greater double when celebrated solemnly, otherwise a lesser double.

The feast of the chief or titular patron of the cathedral church is kept throughout the diocese even by regulars, who, however, are not obliged to celebrate the octave. (S.C.R. 27 Maii, 1628.)

The constitution of Urban VIII. (Const. clxi. "Universa," § 2) requires that only two patronal feasts be imposed in any one place as holiday, of obligation—one the feast of a chief patron of the kingdom or province, the other that of a chief patron of the city, town, village, &c. The Apostolic constitution *Divino Afflatu* and the subsequent decree of the Congregation of Rites (Jan. 23, 1912) made various changes in the way of keeping the feast of patrons. (Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter and its Use," 79.)

PAUL OF SAMOSATA. [See ALOGI.]

PAUL, ST., CLERKS REGULAR OF. [See BARNABITES.]

PAULICIANS. In the fancy of Gibbon ("Decline and Fall," ch. liv.), this Manichean or quasi-Manichean sect, after its banishment from Asia, "scattered over the West the seeds of reformation." By "reformation" can only be meant revolt; a common fury of negation and destruction may easily have induced the Protestants of the sixteenth century to accept the Paulicians as the ancient exponents of their own principles; but negation is no permanent bond; and when the positive doctrines of the sect are calmly examined they appear to be such as no moderate Protestant would endorse. The Paulicians rejected or minimized the Sacraments, abhorred images, and condemned the invocation of the saints; while reverencing *some* books of Holy Scripture, they repudiated Church tradition and the doctrine of a visible Church; in their eyes relics were rubbish, miracles impostures, and the Blessed Virgin not the mother of God. So far all is plain sailing; and a zealous Presbyterian might recognize in the Paulicians the theological ancestors of his own "Nullifiers." But the Paulicians also believed in two Powers, one good, the other evil, dividing the universe between them; and they held the earth and all things sensible to have been created by the spirit of evil. The good God, they said, created the soul of man; the wicked power, or Demiurgus, created his body. Instead of sin in the body being an offence against the "temple of the Holy Ghost," on this view it was the natural outcome of the bodily constitution; therefore, of course inculpable. They rejected the Old Testament as the work of the Demiurgus. Jesus Christ, they said, did not take his body from Mary, but brought it down with Him from heaven. They admitted neither of St. Peter's Epistles; most of them rejected also the Acts. Such was the sect which, according to Gibbon, "scattered over the West the seeds of reformation"!

The origin of the name "Paulician" is uncertain; one theory derives it from a certain Paul, who, with his brother John, founded a society near Samosata early in the seventh century; another — which Gibbon prefers—sees in it merely an evidence of the high value which they set on the life and writings of St. Paul. They first come prominently into notice in the seventh century, when they were organized by Constantine, a native of a village near Samosata, who took the name of Silvanus. Other eminent leaders among them were Simeon, Sergius, Chrysocheir, and Baanes. They became very numerous in Armenia, and, being persecuted by the imperial officers, rose in revolt; nor was their subjugation entirely effected till the tenth century. For their later history see the article BULGARIANS. (See "Kirchenlex."; Photius, "Contra Manichaeos"; Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Manich.* in "Bibl. Patrum," vol. XV.)

PAULINE PRIVILEGE. [See DIVORCE, p. 276.]

PAULISTS. The Institute of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle was founded in New York by Isaac Thomas Hecker and several associates who had formerly been members of the Redemptorist order. A sketch of the rule was drawn up in 1858, and was approved by Archbishop Hughes. Twenty years later it was much enlarged, but it is still in the stage of experiment before being presented to the Holy See for papal approval. "Its spiritual features," says Fr. Elliot, "are substantially the same routine of devout exercises observed by the original fathers while Redemptorists. Although the Paulists do not make vows of religion, they undertake to observe the evangelical counsels as fervently as if canonically bound to do so. This is expressed in the formula of profession as a "whole-hearted determination to obey the rules, to aspire

after Christian and religious perfection, to devote oneself energetically to the labours of the Apostolic ministry, and to persevere in the same vocation to the end of life." The conversion of non-Catholics is the chief object of the Paulists' Society, but all branches of the Apostolate are embraced. Many thousands of converts have been made and many lukewarm or lapsed Catholics have been brought back to the practice of their religion. Besides preaching, the Paulists devote themselves to the apostolate of the press by means of the "Catholic World Magazine" and printed books, chiefly sermons. Their "Five Minutes Sermons" have had great success both when actually delivered and when afterwards printed. "No innovation on Catholic methods, least of all on the Catholic spirit, has ever been observed in their public utterances or ministrations, though the personal tone and character of the Paulists has imparted to their discourses and writings a peculiar zest." (Elliott in "Cath. Enc."; see also his "Life of Father Hecker.")

PAX. The KISS OF PEACE in the Mass has been described under that heading. The Pax here intended is the tablet or instrument which was given to the people to kiss at Mass. It was introduced into England about the middle of the thirteenth century, and widely used. It is called "osculatorium" (Syn. Constit. of York, 1250 and 1252); "osculatorium pacis" (Statutes of Canterbury, about 1281); "asser ad pacem" (Council of Oxford, in 1287); "tabula pacis" (Council of Merton, about 1300); "marmor deosculandum" (Synod of Bayeux, about the same date). It was adopted in France, Italy, Spain, and Germany. But the use was almost extinct in Le Brun's time, on account of the absurd contentions for precedency to which it gave rise; though it was presented in some cases to communicants, &c. We have been referring to the use at Mass It is still used in communities, confraternities, &c., at times of ordinary prayer. (From Le Brun, tom. ii. part v. art. 7. See also KISS, p. 505; Ducange, *Osculatorium. Pax*; Maskell, "Ancient Lit." p. 50; Rock, iv. 187.)

PAX VOBIS is said by bishops after the "Gloria in Excelsis." If the "Gloria" be not said, then the bishop's salutation is the same as the priest's—viz. "Dominus vobiscum." The fact that "Pax vobis" was our Lord's Easter greeting to the Apostles made it unsuitable for penitential days. (Benedict XIV. "De Miss.")

PECTORAL CROSS. A small cross of precious metal worn on the breast by bishops and abbots as a mark of their office, and sometimes also by canons, &c., who have obtained the privilege from Rome. (Decr. S.C.R. 17 Sept. 1828.) The Pope does not wear the pectoral cross. Innocent III. is the first author who clearly mentions the pectoral cross as one of the episcopal insignia. (Gavant. p. i. tit. 2. See BISHOP.)

PECULIUM CLERICI. The property of which an ecclesiastic can be in possession is divided into *peculium beneficiale*, or *ecclesiasticum*, and *peculium patrimoniale*, or *quasi-patrimoniale*. The former consists (1) of the annual profits of his benefice or benefices; (2) of the dues which he receives in the discharge of his clerical functions. The latter consists (*a*) of property which has come to him by inheritance, donation, or bequest; (*b*) of that which he has acquired for himself—*e.g.* by writing. Over property of the former class he has only a limited power of testamentary disposition; that of the latter class he can freely dispose of.

PELAGIANISM was an extreme reaction from the Gnostic and Manichean doctrine that men were necessarily determined to good or evil. According to Pelagius (1) Adam's sin injured himself only, so that his posterity are born innocent. Infants were baptized that they might be united to Christ and enter the kingdom of heaven; not that they might be purged from original sin (Concil. Carthag. *anno* 411, can. 2, 3). It was possible to live altogether without sin ("hominem posse esse sine peccato," Pelag. apud August. "De Gratia Christi," cap. iv.). (3) Grace, as Catholics understand the term, was not necessary or even possible. Pelagius made grace consist simply in the gift of nature, and especially of free-will. When pressed by his adversaries, he admitted the need of exterior grace—viz. "law and teaching," "the example of Christ," &c. Nay, some think he allowed that God, by interior grace, enlightened the understanding (August. *op. cit.* 7, 10, 40; Petav. "De Pelag. et Semi-Pelag. Haer." cap. iv.).[1] But the essence of his heresy remained, for he never granted that the will must be moved and aided by God's grace before we can take one step towards life eternal; and even if Pelagius admitted the possibility of interior illumination of the understanding, he certainly did not hold such a grace to be necessary.

Pelagius, who was a monk or ascete, and is said to have been born in Britain (Bretagne?), preached at Rome (400–410) with great applause. Here he was joined by Celestius, also a monk. Pelagius attacked the doctrine of original sin in his fourteen books on St. Paul's Epistles. They still exist, but with serious alterations in a Catholic sense, and are edited by Vallarsi in his edition of St. Jerome. His letter to Demetrius (*anno* 411), and his "Libellus fidei ad Innocentium" (*anno* 417) are also given there. St. Augustine ("De Gratia Christi, Peccat. Orig. Nat. et Grat.") has preserved fragments of four books by Pela-

[1] We cannot see that the references given by Petavius prove this.

gius on "Free-will." The strife on original sin began at Rome in 410. Celestius was condemned by a synod of Carthage, whither he had gone in 411. Pelagius next appears in Palestine, whither Orosius pursued him at the request of Augustine, who had already written three anti-Pelagian works—viz. "De Spiritu et Littera," "De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione," "De Perfectione Justi Hominis." Jerome also attacked Pelagius in an "Epistle to Ctesiphon" and a dialogue against the heresy in three books. A synod at Jerusalem in 415 tried Pelagius, but came to no decision; another at Diospolis (Lydda), late in the same year, acquitted him. St. Augustine attacked Pelagius again in his work "De Gestis Pelagii." Theodore of Mopsuestia defended him in a lost work (*πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ μὴ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*); the Africans, again, condemned the heresy in the Councils of Carthage and Mileve (416). Both parties had recourse to Pope Innocent, who declared the doctrine of Pelagius erroneous, but died before the case could be fully judged. Zosimus (417–18) was deceived by a profession of faith which Celestius made, and declared both Celestius and Pelagius innocent. More condemnations of Pelagianism followed in the Carthaginian Councils of 417 and 418, and in the latter year Zosimus reinvestigated the matter, anathematized Pelagius and Celestius, and notified this step in an "epistola tractoria" to the bishops. Eighteen Italian bishops who refused to subscribe this epistle were deposed, among them the learned Julianus of Eclanum, against whom St. Augustine wrote ("Contra Duas Epist. ad Bonifac." *anno* 420; "Contra Julian." lib. vi. *anno* 421; later still, the "Opus Imperfect. contra secundam Julian. Respons."). Pelagius and Celestius now found an asylum with Nestorius of Constantinople, and along with him they were condemned in the Third General Council—that of Ephesus—in 431. This result was due in great measure to the energy of Augustine and the efforts of Marius Mercator, a Western layman living at Constantinople. (See the dogmatic theologians on the supernatural order, grace, and original sin. The patristic works mentioned in the article are the sources.)

PENAL LAWS. [See IRISH CHURCH, p. 465; ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 299.]

PENANCE, SACRAMENT OF. The Latin word *poenitentia* (from *punire*, in an archaic form *poenire*) means sorrow or regret, and answers to the Greek *μετάνοια*, change of mind or heart. As a theological term, penance is first the name of a virtue which inclines sinners to detest their sins because they are an offence against God. Then penance came to mean the outward acts by which sorrow for sin is shown, and the word was supposed by St. Augustine to come from "poena," and by others—*e.g.* Peter Lombard—from "poenam tenere." The Greek word[1] *μετάνοια* has wandered further still from its original sense, for in the Greek liturgies it means simply a prostration. Thus in the office for ordination of deacons the rubric runs, "The priest departs with the deacon and they make three bows (*ποιοῦσι μετανοίας τρεῖς*) to the icon of the Lord Christ." (See Morinus, "De Poen." lib. i. cap. 1.) In a more restricted sense still, penance is used for the penitential discipline of the Church, or even for the third station of public penitents (so, *e.g.*, I. Concil. Tolet. canon 2), and again for the satisfaction which the priest imposes on the penitent before absolving him from his sins. Lastly, penance is a sacrament of the new law instituted by Christ for the remission of sin committed after baptism.

So understood, penance is defined as a "sacrament instituted by Christ in the form of a judgment for the remission of sin done after baptism, this remission being effected by the absolution of the priest, joined to true supernatural sorrow, true purpose of amendment, and sincere confession on the part of the sinner." The Council of Trent (sess. xiv.) defines that priests have real power to remit and retain sins, that persons are bound by the law of God to confess before the priest each and every mortal sin committed after baptism, so far as the memory can recall it, and also such circumstances as change the nature of these sins, and that the sacrament of Penance is absolutely necessary for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. It is true that perfect sorrow for sin which has offended so good a God at once and without the addition of any external rite blots out the stain and restores the peace and love of God in the soul. "There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." But this perfect sorrow involves in a well-instructed Catholic the intention of fulfilling Christ's precept and receiving the sacrament of Penance when opportunity occurs. This implicit desire of confession and absolution may exist in many Protestants who reject the Catholic doctrine on this point. They desire the sacrament of Penance in this sufficient sense, that they earnestly wish to fulfil Christ's law, so far as they can learn what it is. In this sense the sacrament is necessary for the salvation of those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism. They must receive it actually or by desire, this desire being either explicit or implicit. This point is of capital importance for the apprehension of Catholic doctrine. We in no way deny that God is ready to forgive the sins

[1] The Rabbinical term is תְּשׁוּבָה, "turning," "conversion"; and the Syrian Christians have the same word in the Syriac or Chaldee form—viz. ܬܘܒܐ. This word is the translation of *μετάνοια* in the Peshito, and is still retained, *e.g.*, by the Maronites (see Morinus, i. 7).

of non-Catholics who are in good faith and who turn to Him with loving sorrow. But the High Church doctrine that confession of mortal sin is not an absolute duty imposed by the law of Christ, or that absolution is a benefit which the penitent is not absolutely bound to seek, is in the sharpest antagonism to the Catholic faith as defined at Trent. The Council also teaches that satisfaction must be made for the temporal punishment which may be due even to pardoned sin, and that confession, contrition, absolution, and satisfaction are the four parts of penance. The minister, and the only possible minister, of the sacrament is a priest with ordinary or delegated power to absolve. The form consists in the words "I absolve thee from thy sins," &c. Mortal or venial sins (for it is of faith that venial sins may be confessed, though there is no obligation of doing so)[1] supply the place of matter. The Council speaks of sins as the "quasi materia," for though Thomists and many other theologians hold that sorrowful confession of sins is the proximate matter of the sacrament, Scotists maintain that absolution is both matter and form, and the Council abstained from interfering in this scholastic dispute. In the articles of CONFESSION, ABSOLUTION, &c., many details relating to this sacrament have been given, so that we may content ourselves here with an elucidation of the main principles.

1. Priests have received power from Christ to forgive sins in His name and according to His law—*i.e.* in the case of true repentance. God alone can remit sins, but He has been pleased to make the priest's absolution the means by which His grace is conveyed. He said to His Apostles, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted [*i.e.* become remitted] unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they have been retained" [*i.e.* continue to be retained before God] (Jn. xx. 23). This wonderful power must have been intended for the successors of the Apostles, as well as for the Apostles themselves, for it is incredible that this means of pardon was conferred only for a short period of the Church's life. While sin lasted, the stream of grace and mercy must continue to flow. History proves the correctness of this inference, for in all ages the power of absolution has been used and recognized. Thus Cyprian urges the sinner to repent "while confession may be made, while satisfaction and remission through the bishops (*sacerdotes*) are accepted before God." ("De Laps." 29, ed. Hartel, p. 258; the remission included, no doubt, absolution from censures.) In this, says St. Chrysostom ("De Sacerdot." iii. 5, 6), the priests of the Gospel excel those of the Jewish Church, that, whereas Jewish priests could merely declare a man clean of leprosy, the Christian priests "have received power," not with regard to the leprosy of the body, but "the impurity of the soul," a power which consists not in declaring that the uncleanness is removed but in actually "removing it entirely" (*ἀπαλλάττειν παντελῶς ἔλαβον ἐξουσίαν*). He proves this sacerdotal power by an express appeal to the words in St. John, "Whose sins ye remit," &c. So again the author of an ancient homily, printed among the works of St. Athanasius (PG, iv. 183; the Benedictines place it among the *dubia*, but say it is found "in ancient MSS."), says "If thy bonds are not loosed, entrust thyself to the disciples of Jesus. Those are to be found who can loose us, having received this power from the Saviour" (*ἐξουσίαν ταύτην εἰληφότες παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος*), "whose sins ye remit," &c. Morinus (lib. viii. cap. 1) quotes from Leo, Ep. 91, "Ad Theodor.": "Very useful and necessary is it that the guilt of sin should be loosed before the last day by the judgment of the priest." Augustine, Ep. 189, "Ad Honorat." (*apud* Morin. *ibidem*), urges the clergy not to flee in persecution, because their presence will be urgently required for "the administration (*confectionem*) of the sacraments." "If the ministers are wanting, what ruin will come on those who depart this life unregenerate [*i.e.* unbaptized] or bound [*i.e.* unabsolved]!" The value of these testimonies lies partly in the fact that they do not argue for the priestly power of absolution, but assume it, partly in their connection with the strong utterances of Scripture on the one hand, the penitential discipline of the Church on the other. It must have required a strong belief in the power of absolution to make men undergo long years of rigorous penance in order to obtain it. It may be well here to answer two objections. Morinus (lib. viii. 8, 10, 11) has shown, and indeed demonstrated, that down to the twelfth century absolution was always given among the Latins in a precatory form. And it is evident from Goar and Renaudot (in the "Perpétuité de la Foi") that the Greeks, the Jacobites, and Nestorians still preserve this precatory form. This, however, cannot fairly be alleged against our belief that the priest exercises judgment in the sacrament of penance, and does really bind or loose. No one will deny that the bishop, in absolving an excommunicate person and restoring him to Church communion, exercised judicial power and authoritatively remitted ecclesiastical censures. Yet here, too, as well as in sacramental absolution, the form was precatory even as late as the time of Burchard, bishop of Worms, who lived at the close of the tenth century (Chardon, p. 644). Further, it may be said that absolution was sometimes given by a deacon, and Cyprian (Ep. xviii.,

[1] Morinus (lib. ii. cap. 3) believes he has proved that the confession of venial sins was common in the Church during the lifetime of Tertullian.

ed. Hartel, p.524), writing in the summer of 250 does certainly require the lapsed in danger of death to make confession (*exomologesis*) and receive imposition of hands from a deacon, if a presbyter cannot be found. But it is clear that he is speaking of absolution from censures, and indulgence granted through the intercession of the martyrs, and the distinctions already made in the article on ABSOLUTION are sufficient to meet this difficulty.[1]

2. Absolution is invalid unless given by a priest with ordinary or delegated jurisdiction over the penitent. This follows from the fact, attested by Scripture, that the priest in penance exercises judgment. A magistrate cannot bind or loose a man charged with theft unless the law subjects that man to his authority, or unless he has received special power from the Crown to try the case. The tribunals of the Church are not less carefully regulated than those of the State, since God is a God of order and not of confusion. The fundamental power to absolve is given at ordination, but its exercise depends absolutely on ecclesiastical authority. In earliest times absolution was given by the bishop alone, or by the bishop in union with the presbyters. After the rise of the Novatian heresy, the office of penitentiary priest was instituted. Later, parishes were established first in the large towns and then in the country, and from that time the accepted principle approved by the Fourth Lateran Council was that parishioners were bound to confess to their own priest or to another priest with his permission. Chardon (p. 425) reports a case from the twelfth century in which St. Ailert, monk of the abbey of Crespin in Hainaut, received power from Paschal II. and Innocent II. to hear the confessions of all who came to him. In 1227, Gregory IX. gave the Dominicans authority to hear confessions everywhere, and the same privileges, which led to bitter opposition, lasting for centuries, on the part of the seculars, were extended to the other mendicant friars and confirmed by many Popes. They were limited by the Council of Trent, as has been shown in the articles on ABSOLUTION and CONFESSION. (See Chardon, 423 *sqq.*) In all these disputes, the principle that absolution could only be given by a priest with jurisdiction was fully acknowledged, for the mendicants had of course jurisdiction, though it was extraordinary—*i.e.* not attached to their office, but directly conferred by the Pope. The Orientals also regard absolution as a judicial act, and do not dream that it can be given by any priest. Confession, according to an Oriental document, probably Coptic (cited by Denzinger, "Rit. Orient." tom. i. p. 100), cannot be made save to a priest, whether secular or religious, &c., who must have received this authority from the Patriarch or from his own bishop, with the consent of the clergy and chiefs of the people.

3. *The necessity of confessing all mortal sins* after baptism also follows from the very nature of the absolving power. Christ gave His Apostles authority to bind and loose, but they cannot exercise this discretion till the sins, as they are in the conscience of the penitent, have been submitted to their judgment. It is only in the case of mortal sins that this necessity arises—though, as a rule, it is expedient to confess venial sins likewise—for venial sin does not bind the soul over to evil and destroy the grace of God within it, or exclude absolutely from the kingdom of heaven, so that here there can be no strict necessity for absolution. It is needless to prove that certain mortal sins of a very aggravated character had to be confessed in the primitive Church, for this no instructed person will deny, and the writer of the article on Penitence in the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," edited by Smith and Cheetham, admits that this confession of the three "mortalia peccata" was obligatory, even if the sin had been secret. Possibly St. James may be alluding to the public confession when he says, "Confess your sins one to another"; for, as Döllinger ("First Age of the Church," p. 325) points out, this confession is mentioned in immediate connection with Extreme Unction. "'Confess to one another' refers to the priests called in to anoint the sick man and to pray for him, and to whom he is to confess his sins." Whatever may be thought of this interpretation, we have early evidence that confession much more extensive than that of the three great mortal sins (viz. murder, idolatry, and adultery) was known to the early Church. Origen (Hom. in Ps. xxxvii. n. 6, PG, xii. 1386) thus exhorts the sinner: "Look round diligently for one to whom you should confess your sins." He is to find a physician "learned and merciful" who will judge if his sickness is of such a nature that "it ought to be exposed in the meeting of the whole Church"; and again (Hom. in Luc. xvii., PG xiii. 1846), "if we reveal our sins not only to God but also to those who can heal our sins and wounds, our sins will be blotted out by Him who says, 'Behold, I will blot out like a cloud,'" &c. Basil's words are express. "It is necessary to confess our sins to those who are entrusted with the dispensation of the mysteries of God" (*ἀναγκαῖον τοῖς πεπιστευμένοις τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἐξομολογεῖσθαι.* "Reg. Brev. Tract. Respons. in Interr." 288, PG, xxxi. 1284). Further, what followed on the cessation of public penance is well worth consideration. This, in the case of secret sins, came to an end

[1] It is plain, however, from many decrees of synods, that deacons did hear confessions in cases of necessity, though, of course, they had no power to absolve. This practice lasted till late in the Middle Ages. Many also confessed to laymen at the hour of death, if a cleric was not to be found, and great scholastic doctors recommended this act of humiliation (Chardon, 417).

in the Church of Constantinople soon after the abolition of the presbyter ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας, or penitentiary, at the close of the fourth century. It came to an end because it was of human institution. But sacramental confession, being of divine origin, lasted when the penitential discipline had been changed, and continues to this day among the Greeks and Oriental sects.[1] So again, Leo, in a letter to the Bishops of Campania (Ep. clxviii., ed. Ballerini), desired the abrogation of public penance because of its deterrent effect, and because it was not of Apostolic institution; but he adds, "since it is enough that the guilt of consciences should be manifested to the priests alone by secret confession." An opinion, however, did prevail to some extent in the Middle Ages, even among Catholics, that confession to God alone sufficed. The Council of Châlons in 813 (canon 33, Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 1144) says: "Some assert that we should confess our sins to God alone, but some think (*percensent*) that they should be confessed to the priests, each of which practices is followed not without great fruit in Holy Church . . . . Confession made to God purges sins, but that made to the priest teaches how they are to be purged." This former opinion is also mentioned without reprobation by Peter Lombard ("Sentent." lib. iv. dist. 17). St. Thomas, in his commentary on the Sentences, says that what had once been a mere opinion was in his time, on account of the decision of the Church under Innocent III., to be accounted heresy, and ("Suppl." qu. 6 a. 3) he maintains that the necessity of confessing mortal sins after baptism exists by divine, and not merely by church, law.

4. We say nothing here of the sorrow for sin and purpose of amendment requisite in the sacrament, referring the reader for an explanation of this point to the article on CONTRITION, and we pass to satisfaction, which is the fourth and last part of penance. It is defined by Billuart ("Poen." diss. ix. 1) as a payment of the temporal punishment due to sin through works which are good and penal and are imposed by the confessor."

"Catholics," says Bossuet ("Expos. de la Foi Cath." viii.), "teach unanimously that only Jesus Christ, who is both God and man, was capable, through the infinite dignity of His person, of offering to God sufficient satisfaction for our sins. But, having satisfied superabundantly, He was able to apply this satisfaction in two ways, either by granting entire remission without letting any penalty remain, or, on the other hand, by commuting a greater into a lesser penalty—*i.e.* eternal into temporal punishment. As that former fashion is more complete and in better harmony with His goodness, He employs it in baptism; but we believe that He employs the second way in the case of those who fall back into sin after baptism, being, as it were, constrained to do so by the ingratitude of those who have abused His first gifts so that they have to suffer some punishment, although the eternal one is remitted. From this we must not infer that Jesus Christ has failed to make entire satisfaction for us; but, on the contrary, that, having acquired an absolute right over us by the infinite price He has offered for our salvation, He grants us pardon on the conditions, under the laws, and with the reserves which seem good to Him." He proceeds to argue that Protestants who allege that Christ could not have satisfied fully for actual sin, if He left us subject to temporal punishment, might as well say that Christ has not satisfied for original sin because He has left us subject to death and to other infirmities of the soul and body which are consequences of the Fall. "Similarly, we should not marvel that He who showed Himself so merciful to us in baptism should display greater severity when once we have broken our holy promises. It is just, nay, it is for our own good, that He, when He remits [the guilt of] sin along with the eternal punishment, should exact some temporal punishment from us in order to bind us to duty."

Scripture proves that God inflicts temporal punishment for pardoned sin, for Nathan said to David after he had acknowledged his double crime, "The Lord also has caused thy sin to pass away; thou shalt not die. Only because thou hast so made the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme through this matter, even the son that is born to thee shall surely die" (2 Kings or Sam. xii. 14). Dan. iv. 24 (so Heb., LXX, and Vulg.; "Authorized," iv. 27) is the classical passage for the doctrine that man has the power of making satisfaction for sin by good works. "Therefore, O king, let my counsel please thee, and redeem thy sins by justice, and thy perversities by showing kindness to the poor." Here, as in all other articles on dogma, we have given a literal translation from the original, and our version of this text is justified, while that of the "Authorized Version" ("break off") is excluded, both by the laws of the language and by the judgment of the best Protestant and Jewish scholars. We append our reasons in a note.[1] The penitential discipline

[1] Exception, however, must be made of the Copts and Ethiopians, with whom confession seems to have died out in the Middle Ages (Chardon, 403).

[1] The words occur in the Chaldee portion of Daniel, and the main question is, Does the Chaldee word פְּרַק mean "redeem" or "break off"? It can only mean "redeem." (1) The word is found once only in that small portion of the Bible which is written in Chaldee, but it is of very frequent occurrence in the Chaldee literature. It is used by Onkelos (Exod. xxi. 8) of "redeeming" a slave: a "field" (Lev. xxv. 25); in the other Targums for the redemption of the soul—"who hast redeemed my soul from every affliction" (2 Sam. iv. 9). Levy, in his Chaldee Dictionary, gives numerous instances of the use of the verb in Peal from the Targums. In all, except one, it must mean "to buy back," "redeem," &c.; it

of the early Church witnesses to the belief that satisfaction by penitential works is necessary in itself, and is required as a part of the sacrament of Penance. Nor did the early Christians consider satisfaction merely as means of deepening repentance, repairing scandal, and awakening salutary sorrow. Cyprian ("De Laps." 35, 36, ed. Hartel, pp. 571, 572) exhorts the lapsed "to be forward in good works by which sins are purged, to give frequent alms by which souls are freed from death," "to induce the Lord to pardon sin by perseverance in good works." Calvin himself acknowledges that all Christian antiquity admitted the necessity of penitential satisfaction. "I am little moved," he writes, "by passages which everywhere occur in the writings of the ancients concerning satisfaction. I see that some of them, I will say frankly nearly all whose works are extant, went wrong in this matter, or spoke too severely and harshly." ("Instit." iii. cap. 4, § 38, quoted by Billuart.)

It is to be noted, however, that satisfaction is in theological language an integral but not an essential part of the sacrament. In other words, the priest, both as judge and physician of the soul, is bound to impose a penance; and the penitent, if it is reasonable, is bound to accept it. Even if the penance is unreasonable, he must seek another penance and absolution from another priest. But whereas true supernatural sorrow with purpose of amendment, absolution, and, according to the common opinion, some outward confession of sin by word or sign, are always and in all circumstances necessary for the validity of the sacrament, still, in the case, *e.g.*, of a man in his agony, the priest may give absolution without imposing a penance. (Billuart, Diss. ix. a. 2.) In the ancient Church part at least of the penance was usually performed before absolution; at present the priest in most cases imposes the penance, and, if he judges that the penitent is well disposed, gives absolution. The difference is one of discipline and not of principle, for, with the exception given above, absolution is not given even now unless there is the resolution on the part of the sinner to perform the penance imposed upon him.

Many Protestant objections to the sacrament of penance, as administered among us, arise from misunderstanding. Confession to the priest tends to deepen and not to replace shame and sorrow for the offence done to God. It protects the sinner against self-delusion—for no man is a good judge in his own cause—and the priest is able to insist upon the duty of restoring ill-gotten goods, reconciliation with enemies, forgiveness of injuries, avoiding occasions of sin, retracting calumny, &c., in many cases when the sinner might be blinded by his own passions or interests. At the same time the priest affords the best protection against despair or indiscreet zeal. There is little in the laborious work of the confessional to satisfy curiosity, for the priest learns nothing except the number and species of sins committed, and he is bound under the most sacred obligations to abstain from all unnecessary questions, particularly from all such as might convey knowledge of sins previously unknown to the penitent. He has to decide according to the principles of an elaborate casuistry which he has studied for years, and in which he has been examined by his superiors, before he enters the confessional. There is little room for tyranny on his part, for the faithful know well that they may have recourse to any approved confessor. Here, as elsewhere, holy things may be profaned. But the Church deprives a priest of the power to absolve an accomplice, rigorously punishing any attempt to do so; and were a priest so miserable as to abuse the confessional for bad ends, then the person to whom he had spoken wrongly could not be absolved even by another priest till he or she had communicated the name of the criminous clerk to the bishop of the diocese. Such cases are necessarily of very rare occurrence; for sin of this kind would involve almost inevitable ruin to the priest. Of all pastoral ministrations we firmly believe there is none which involves a more self-denying devotion to a monotonous duty, none where the good effects are so plain and visible, and very few which are more seldom marred by human weakness and sin.

[The work of Morinus is a storehouse of learning. Much historical information will be found in Chardon's "Hist. des Sacr." See also Batiffol, "Études d'Histoire," i. 43; Rauschen, "Eucharistie und Buss-Sakrament," 105. For the dogmatic and moral questions see the theologians "De Poenitentia"; St. Thomas, 3ª, qq. 84–90; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. vi. tr. 4; Ferraris, *Poenitentiae Sacramentum.*]

PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE AND BOOKS. The right of punishing members for offences

never once bears the sense given it in the Protestant version. (2) Syriac, which is scarcely a distinct language from Chaldee, has the same word, ܦܪܩ. It occurs pretty often in the Peshito version of the N.T., and "redemit" is the first rendering given by Schaaf in his Syriac Lexicon. Thus it is used to render ἐρρύσατο (Coloss. i. 13), "and redeemed us from the power of darkness." Sometimes it means "to go away"; never "to break off." (3) The Vulgate rendering, "redime" is supported by the LXX λύτρωσαι. (4) It is adopted, sometimes even without a notice of the rendering given in the "Authorized" and Lutheran versions, by De Wette in his revision of Luther's Bible; by Ewald (*Propheten*, vol. iii. p. 366)—"löse deine Sünden durch Gerechtigkeit ein"; Hitzig (*Comm. on Daniel*, p. 67), who justly remarks that the rendering "break off" is contrary to the exegetical tradition, and has "no analogy to support it"; and by Gesenius. To these Protestant authorities we may add another, Bertheau, and the Rabbins, Eben Ezra and Saadia (cited by Hitzig), and a modern Jewish scholar, Fürst, in his Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance and in his Dictionary. Were the passage in Daniel Hebrew, the rendering "break off" could be supported by a comparison of Gen. xxvii. 40; but it is Chaldee, and common sense requires us to interpret a Chaldee word by Chaldee, not Hebrew, usage.

against its laws, and depriving them altogether or for a time of its privileges, belongs to any well-constituted society. It was exercised by the Synagogue (Lk. xvi. 2; Jn. vi. 2); Christ sanctioned the use of it in His Church (Mt. xviii. 15–17); and in 1 Cor. v. 1–5 we see St. Paul enforcing the penitential law of the Church against a notorious offender. Of course, this penitential discipline in the Christian Church, though analogous to the procedure of human societies, claims a higher origin and is of a much more serious nature. The power of inflicting spiritual penalties has been put into the hands of the Church by Christ Himself; it is exercised in His name; it may involve deprivation of the sacraments, which are the great appointed means of grace; and, on the other hand, it is the object of penitential discipline, not only to preserve the holiness of the Church, but also to awaken wholesome fear and sorrow in the heart of the offender while there is yet time, "that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord." Obviously, the Church must use this power in the way most likely at the time to benefit souls, and her penitential canons have varied much at different periods and in different places. Still, on the whole, it is possible to distinguish three distinct periods in the history of penance—the first extending from the beginning of the Church to the rise of the Novatian heresy in the middle of the third century (Morinus, lib. iv.), the second reaching to about the year 700 after Christ (*ib.* lib. vi.), the third to the eleventh century (*ib.* lib. vii.). Of these periods, the first represents penitential discipline in its initial stage; the second, in its full development and vigour; the third, in its decay. Most of what we have to say is taken from the great work of Morinus, "De Disciplina in Administratione Sacramenti Poenitentiae," in the Venetian edition of 1702.

First Period.—The sins for which public penance was inflicted were the three "mortal crimes" [1] (*crimina mortalia*, Cyprian, "De Bono Patient." c. 14, ed. Hartel, 407) of idolatry, murder, and adultery, committed after baptism. Tertullian adds "fraud" to the list of "graver and fatal crimes which cannot be forgiven" ("Pudic." 19; PL, ii. 1020); but, generally speaking, it was only the various forms of the three great sins which reduced a man to the rank of a penitent. Tertullian ("De Poenit." c. 9, PL, ii. 1243) has left us a vivid picture of penance as he was accustomed to see it practised. He describes penance, which was generally known, even among the Latins, as "exomologesis," because it involved open confession of sins, as a "discipline by which a man was prostrated and humiliated." He speaks of the penitents as lying on sackcloth and ashes, of the unwashed body, the feeding on bread and water, the fasting and prayer, the grovelling at the feet of the presbyters and others who had a name for sanctity, the groans and tears. As yet there was no formal division of penitents into grades, and penance, though severe, did not always last long. The Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 16), in a passage which may be fairly taken as a picture of the penitential discipline in the first period, orders a great sinner to be excluded altogether from the Church; then the deacons are to admonish him and introduce him to the congregation; then penance is to be inflicted (*στιβώσας αὐτὸν*) "in proportion to his sin, for two, three, five, or seven weeks," at the end of which period the bishop is to receive him into communion, with imposition of hands (*ib.* 18: *χειροθετήσας αὐτὸν ἔα λοιπὸν εἶναι ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ*), accompanied by the prayers of the faithful. Here we see the germs of the later and more formal system, though the penalty contemplated is slight. Cyprian (Ep. lvii., ed. Hartel, 650) announces his intention of admitting to communion those who had fallen into idolatry in a former persecution and had done penance since. His reason for this indulgence was that fresh persecution was at hand.

But while penance was comparatively light, admission to it was often hard to obtain. For in this early period penance was looked on rather as a grace shown to sinners than as a penalty which they had to bear. It was in the difficulty of being admitted to penance, not in the penance itself, that the severity of the early Church appears. For a brief period, even the Roman Church refused absolution utterly and altogether in the case of the three "mortal crimes." This absolution was granted till the middle of the second century ("Pastor Herm." Mandat. iv. 1, PG, ii. 919), but it must have been withdrawn probably shortly after the "Shepherd" of Hermas was written. (This is evident from the first chapter of Tertullian, "De Pudic." Compare also the words of Hermas, *loc. cit.*, "Servis Dei poenitentia una est," with Visio ii. 2, where it is said that soon the opportunity of performing penance will expire.) Zephyrinus (202–219) relaxed this severity in the case of adulterers (see the "De Pudic."), and his successor, Callixtus (219–222), admitted all sinners to communion after penance ("Philosophum." ix. 12), and this milder discipline became established. (See the "Epistle of the Roman Clergy," Cyprian, Ep. 30, ed. Hartel, 549.) In Africa, too, the discipline had become milder, for Cyprian (Ep. lv. No. 21, *ib.* 638) mentions the opinion of bishops in his province that "peace was not to be granted to adulterers" as a thing of the past. The Spanish Church continued to be more severe, for even after our period

[1] We have used such expressions as "mortal crimes," "offences," &c., to prevent confusion with "mortal sin" in the modern sense.

the Synod of Elvira, in 306, excluded great sinners from all hope of communion (see, *e.g.*, canons 1, 6, 8). Moreover, in no part of the Church was communion given to those who had fallen a second time after baptism into mortal crime. It was Pope Siricius (Ep. 1, "Ad Himer." c. 5), towards the close of the fourth century, who insisted on a more indulgent course. So, again, it was the ordinary practice to refuse communion to the dying if they had been previously excommunicated and had not done penance in health. We must remember, however, that sacramental absolution from guilt, canonical absolution from penitential discipline, censures, &c., and giving communion, are three distinct things, and the refusal of the first does not follow from that of the second or third. Hefele ("Concil." i. p. 155) and Funk ("Bussdisciplin," &c., 1867) believe that though canonical absolution and communion often were, sacramental absolution never was, refused to any sinner. But Hefele's editor, Leclercq, refuses to accept this view, i. 222.

Second Period.—After the rise of the Novatian heresy, the penitential system was fully organized. The Nicene Council, can. 13, established the principle that communion was to be given in the hour of death to penitents, however great their previous crime. We have seen that Pope Siricius extended this lenity even to relapsed penitents. St. Chrysostom, it is said (Socrates, "H.E." vi. 21), received penitents again and again, however frequent their relapses, and the Third Council of Toledo, in 589, speaks in canon 11 of a lax practice which permitted men to sin as often as they pleased, and present themselves anew to the priest for reconciliation. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 226.)

On the other hand, the list of "mortal offences" was enlarged. We find traces of such increase in the list of sins which were subjected to penance, in the canons ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa and Basil. "Many Fathers," says Morinus (lib. v. cap. v.), "who wrote after Augustine's time, extended this [the necessity of public penance] to all crimes which the civil law punished with death, exile, or other grave corporal penalty"; and he proves this by many quotations—*e.g.* from Popes Pelagius II. and Gregory I. Further, in the East certain grades of penance came to be recognized. The three higher grades are mentioned or alluded to in the canonical epistle of Gregory Thaumaturgus (can. 1, 8, 9; on the last, in which the grade of συστάντες or *consistentes* is alluded to but not mentioned by name, see the extract from the commentary of Zonaras in Routh, "Rell. Sacr." tom. iii. p. 279). The eleventh canon, which enumerates all four grades, is certainly spurious, and is much later than Gregory's time. (See Routh, *loc. cit.* p. 281.) Still, from the fourth century onwards, the Eastern Church divided penitents into four classes. They are thus described in the eleventh canon of Gregory in words which are quite accurate, and were probably added as a gloss to the authentic canons:—"Weeping" (the προσκλαίοντες, or *flentes*, were the lowest class) "takes place outside the door of the church, where the sinner must stand and beg the prayers of the faithful as they go in. Hearing" (the ἀκροώμενοι, or *audientes*, were the second class) "is performed within the gate in the porch, where the sinner must stand while the catechumens are present, and then go out. For hearing the Scripture," he says, "and the instruction, let him be expelled, and not be admitted to the prayer. Prostration" (the state of the ὑποπίπτοντες, *substrati*, the third class) "requires the sinner to stand within the church door, and to go out with the catechumens." (Before going, they prostrated themselves to receive the imposition of the bishop's hands with prayer, hence their name.) The *consistentes* (the last class—συστάντες, *consistentes*) "stand together with the faithful and do not go out with the catechumens. Last comes participation in the sacraments (ἁγιασμάτων)." The two lower grades were little known in the West, and the Latin Fathers generally mean by "penitents" the *substrati*, or ὑποπίπτοντες. A severe course of life—fasts, shaving of the head, wearing a peculiar dress, abstinence from the enjoyment and even sometimes from the business of life, were the hardships which penitents (under which term we do not include the *consistentes*) had to undergo. The penance lasted long years—*e.g.* the Canons of Basil, which represent the discipline of the whole East, impose fifteen years of penance for adultery, seven for fornication. Many canons of Councils speak of clerics as subjected to penance (*e.g.* Neocaes. can. 1; Illib. 76; I. Orange 4; I. Arles 29); but sometimes the degradation of a cleric was considered equivalent to the penance of a layman, and it was felt to be unfair that he should incur a double penalty for one crime. (So, *e.g.*, Can. Apost. 25; and the letter of Pope Siricius to Himerius, "Poenitentiam agere cuiquam non conceditur clericorum." Mansi, "Concil." tom. iii. col. 660.) With regard to the sick and dying, the rule varied at different times and in different churches. Cyprian (Ep. lv. 23, ed. Hartel, 641) lays down the principle that great and notorious offenders, who had done no penance before their sickness, "were to be excluded entirely (*omnino prohibendos*) from the hope of communion and peace." The Synod of Arles (*anno* 314), which represented the whole of the Western Church, also debarred death-bed penitents from communion (can. 22); but the Council of Nicaea (can. 13) relaxed this stringent rule. Still less was communion refused to secret

sinners who sought penance on their death-beds, or to such as were actually doing penance when sickness overtook them. After the organization of the grades or stations of penance, a penitent who had received communion in dangerous sickness was usually sent back to do penance in case of recovery. Sometimes he returned to the grade in which he had been before; sometimes he was placed among the *consistentes*.

Third Period, from the Seventh till the Eleventh Century.—Before this time the laws of public penance had been altered very seriously in the East. The office of penitentiary had been abolished at the close of the fourth century at Constantinople (Socrates, "H.E." vii. 16; Sozomen, "H.E." v. 19), and this led to the cessation of public confession and public penance for secret sins. The stations of penance are mentioned at the end of the seventh century in canon 87 of the Council in Trullo. But the Greek liturgies, except perhaps that of St. James and one used by the Abyssinians, contain no reference to the dismissal of penitents from the assembly of the faithful. About the beginning of the seventh century, as Morinus (*lib.* vii. 1) proves by citations from Bede, Egbert, Rabanus Maurus, &c., it was received as an axiom throughout the West that public penance was to be done only for public sins.

It must not be supposed, however, that the rigour of public penance had abated among the Latins. True, even public penitents no longer received the daily imposition of the bishop's hands, and they were no longer shut out from the very sight of the sacred mysteries. But all through this period a vast number of persons were to be seen in the churches "distinguished from [the rest of] the faithful by their dress, place [in the church], mourning, and whole manner of life" (Morinus, vii. 2). Some of them witnessed Mass at a distance from a spot inside the church; others took their place in a separate part of the church; a third class mixed with the rest of the congregation, but were forbidden to communicate (*ib.* 7). The bishop prescribed this penance, and the civil law compelled the offender to undergo it. Very often a man was forced to appear as a public penitent, though for one reason or other he had not been condemned or even tried by the civil court. It was enough if the ecclesiastical authorities had juridical proof of his guilt. In the early part of this period, the beginning of Lent, the "caput jejunii," as it was called, was looked on as the most fitting, though not the only time, for the solemn imposition of public penance (*ib.* vii. 19). Nor was private penance less severe. It differed from public penance only inasmuch as it could be imposed by a priest, whereas public penance was inflicted by the bishop or a priest specially empowered by him, and inasmuch as the solemn rites of public were omitted in private penance. The same long fasts and other austerities, the same long abstinence from communion were the penalties of secret sin. Every priest who heard confession was bound to use a "penitential book"—*i.e.* a book which contained the penalties attached to particular sins by the canons, Popes, Fathers, or custom, along with the forms to be observed in confession, absolution, and the rest. The Roman Penitential, and those of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and Bede, were those which had the highest repute in the West, but there were many others. These books were the guides of confessors down to the thirteenth century. A glance at the "Summary of Penitentials" given in Zaccaria's essay prefixed to the "Moral Theology" of St. Alphonsus will easily convince the reader of the severity which then prevailed. From the latter part of the tenth century flogging was added to the other penitential exercises, and at an earlier part of our period exile (mentioned in the Penitentials of Bede and in that known as the Roman) and perpetual retirement to a monastery were imposed as penances.

Fourth Period, Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Morinus, lib. x. cap. 16 *seq.*).—During this period the rigour of penance was greatly relaxed; public penance, except in certain cases, especially in that of heresy, almost disappeared, and on the whole we may note a transition to modern practice. The following were the chief causes of the change:—

(*a*) *The Redemption of Sins.*—Long before this time the practice had arisen of procuring exemption from canonical penance by giving alms, &c. This custom, indeed, is mentioned and condemned by an English council held in 747, and it was generally recognized in the ninth century. But such redemptions were at first partial, and only allowed when part of the penance had been done. This accorded with the spirit of the primitive Church, which remitted part of the penance to sinners who showed extraordinary sorrow and zeal. But from the end of the tenth or opening of the eleventh century penances due to sins were arithmetically computed—*i.e.* if seven years of penance were assigned for committing a sin once, twenty-one years were reckoned as the penalty due for committing it three times, and large alms, flagellation, recitations of the Psalter, were accepted as redemption of penance. Thus St. Peter Damian tells the story of a man who by cruel flagellation and frequent recitations of the Psalter accomplished a hundred years of penance in six days. The arithmetical computation of penance had made its performance in the old way impossible.

(*β*) Remissions of penance were freely granted for *works of piety*—*e.g.* contributions to aid in the building of churches, or even

works of public utility, such as building bridges or the like. As a rule, those indulgences were partial, but a complete remission of penance was often obtained by performing several good works. Maurice, who succeeded Peter Lombard in the see of Paris, built his great cathedral and four abbeys by means of indulgences. It is right to add that the Fourth Lateran Council protested against the reckless freedom with which these indulgences were given.

(γ) The *Crusades* did more than anything else to relax penitential rigour, and this, in the opinion of Fleury, was the most important effect they produced. As early as 1087 Pope Victor II. offered a general remission of penance to those who took up arms against the Saracens of Africa, after these had spoiled the abbey of Monte Cassino. In 1095 Urban II. offered the same reward to those who joined in the crusade. Secret as well as public sinners availed themselves of the opportunity; and when for two hundred years penance had been remitted to vast multitudes who took part directly or indirectly in these wars, it became out of the question to think of restoring the ancient rigour. It is curious to observe that bearing arms was just one of the things which penitents in ancient times were strictly forbidden to do. But it was supposed that the prohibition only applied to war between Christians.

(δ) The *Schoolmen* developed the opinion that absolution might be granted before the performance of penance; that the canonical penalties were arbitrary, or in any case might be remitted by the confessor, and not merely, as in former days, by the bishop.

(ε) The *mendicant friars*, who were constantly passing from place to place, became the favourite confessors, and it was impossible for them to defer absolution and stay to watch the progress of the penitent.

The Pontifical still contains an office for the expulsion of penitents from the church by the bishop on Ash Wednesday. The penitents are to approach in penitential garb, bare feet, &c.; ashes are to be placed on their heads, and the doors of the church shut against them till Holy Thursday. Such public ignominy is to be inflicted only for enormous crimes, and by the authority of the bishop, penitentiary, or other official to whom the power has been delegated. The Council of Trent, however (sess. xxiv. cap. 8), desires that public (but not solemn) penance be inflicted on public sinners, unless the bishop judge it to be inexpedient. St. Charles enforced this rule in his synods. But solemn or even public penance is now scarcely known. Still, in an English book published at Douay as late as 1743 with ecclesiastical approbation ("The Good Confessor," &c., by Samuel Marley, D.D., p. 522 *seq.*), the imposition of public penance for public sin is strictly enjoined upon the confessor. It is suggested, *e.g.*, that the penitent kneel at the church door during the chief Mass, with a light in his hands, and beg pardon of the congregation. Drunkenness is given as an example of a sin which should be expiated in this way. It is evident from the whole chapter that penances of this kind were still frequently imposed. (Morinus is the great authority on the subject. Chardon, 449 *sqq.*, gives a clear and useful summary of the facts. A much shorter but very interesting summary will be found in Fleury, Discours iv. and vi.)

Since the above article was written the early history of Penitential Discipline has been the subject of much discussion. According to the Protestant view the Church in the third century first became conscious of her power to forgive sins committed after baptism. (So Harnack, "Dogmengeschichte," i., especially pp. 439–444.) The Catholics, on the other hand, have denied any such discovery on the part of the Church: the Church always knew her power, but for wise reasons abstained from exercising it until such time as circumstances required it. (Funk, "Bussdisciplin" i. p. 158 *sqq.*, and "Das Indulgenzedikt des Papstes Kallistus.") Further, there is even among Catholics considerable disagreement as to whether the edict of Callixtus introduced a complete innovation in the practice of the Church, or was merely an ordinary incident which owed its notoriety to the attacks of the heretics. Batiffol ("Études d'Histoire, &c." p. 111 *sqq.*) and Funk are of the former opinion; Stufler and Esser of the latter. D'Alès, who has published an elaborate monograph on the question ("L'Édit de Calliste"), also inclines to the latter. The Protestant Lea ("Hist. of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church") maintains that the early Church made no claim to jurisdiction *in foro conscientiae*. He was triumphantly refuted by Vacandard, "Revue du Clergé Français," 1898–9 (see also "La Pénitence Publique dans l'Église Primitive"; "La Confession Sacramentelle dans la Primitive Église.")

PENITENTIAL PSALMS. A name given to seven psalms which express sorrow for sin and desire of pardon. The psalms are 6. 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, 142 (in the Vulgate numeration). Innocent III. ordered their recitation in Lent; Pius V. fixed the Fridays in Lent after lauds as the time at which they should be said, but they were not to be said on Good Friday or on a feast of nine lessons. There was no obligation of saying them in the private recitation of the Breviary, though those who do so may gain an indulgence of fifty days. The choir obligation was abolished by Pius X. The name and arrangement of the Penitential Psalms is very ancient. Possidius tells us that St. Augustine, when dying, caused the penitential psalms, which are few in number, to be

fixed on the wall opposite his bed. Probably our penitential psalms are meant. Cassiodorus (d. 565) gives a mystical reason for the number seven—viz. that sin is remitted by baptism, martyrdom, alms, forgiving others, converting others, abundance of charity, and penance. They are also mentioned in the oldest Roman Ordines (Gavantus, tom. ii. § ix. cap. 4). The antiphon "Ne reminiscaris," from Tobias iii. 3, attached to these psalms in the Roman Breviary, seems to have been added in the sixteenth century. (Maskell, "Monumenta Rit." vol. iii. p. 82.)

PENSIONS. At the Council of Chalcedon, Maximus, who had a short time before been substituted for Domnus as bishop of Antioch, requested the sanction of the Fathers to his assigning a pension out of the revenues of the see sufficient for the support of Domnus. The legates of Pope Leo, the other patriarchs, the entire synod, and the imperial judges assented to the request in principle, leaving it to Maximus to arrange the details according to his judgment of what was necessary.

Gregory the Great used to send clerks convicted of incontinence to various monasteries for penance, but required that the churches to which they belonged should supply them with adequate pensions, so that they should not be a burden on the monasteries.

An ecclesiastical pension is not canonical or permitted except under the following conditions: 1. The receiver must be an ecclesiastic, free from censure and irregularity; 2. The pension must be founded on a just cause; 3. He who creates the pension must have the faculty to do so, and such faculties are granted by the Pope, and may be, as some theologians think, by the bishops also; 4. The enjoyment of the pension ceases with the natural or civil death of the pensioner. (Thomassin, iii. 2. 29–31; Moroni, *Pensione Ecclesiastica.*)

PENTECOST.[1] The Feast of Weeks חַג שָׁבֻעוֹת was one of the three great feasts of the Jewish law. It was the feast of the ingathered harvest, and the later Jews regarded it as a solemn commemoration of the Mosaic legislation in the third month (Exod. xix. 1); but there is no trace of such a view in the Bible, or even in Josephus and Philo. It was kept on the fiftieth day after the first day of the Passover, Nisan 16, the second day of the Paschal feast being reckoned as the first of the fifty days (Lev. xxiii. 15, 16; cf. Ewald x. "Alterthümer," p. 399 *seq.*). Hence the Greek name πεντηκοστή, originally an adjective with ἡμέρα understood, and then treated as an independent substantive (*ἐν τῇ πεντηκοστῇ ἑορτῇ ἥ ἐστιν ἁγία ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδων*, Tob. ii. 1. There is nothing answering to this in the Chaldee or Hebrew versions as given by Neubauer, or in the Vulgate; but Sabatier's "Itala" has "in Pentecosten festo nostro qui est sanctus a septem annis"). To Christians the day became specially sacred, for on it at the third hour (*i.e.* about nine o'clock) the Holy Ghost descended miraculously on the Apostles. The ancient tradition that this Pentecost fell on a Sunday is confirmed by John xviii. 28, for if the Friday on which Christ died was the eve of the Passover, *i.e.* Nisan 14, then the 16th, the first of the fifty days, and the fiftieth day itself must both have been Sundays.

Pentecost was kept as a Christian festival from very early times. The word was used both for Whit-Sunday and for the whole period of fifty days after Easter. Irenaeus, in a lost work on the Pasch, is said to have mentioned the custom of praying erect during this season (see the work falsely attributed to Justin Martyr, "Quaest. et Respons." 115, tom. iii. P. 2, p. 180, in Otto's edition); and Origen, the "Apostolic Constitutions" (v. 20), as well as the Council of Elvira (*anno* 306, can. 43), speak of the feast on the day itself. There was no fasting during the whole period, for even the fast on the vigil was not known in the early Church; indeed, Quesnel thinks the custom in the Roman Church is not older than the twelfth century, though Meratus and Benedict XIV. ("De Festis," 515) believe its introduction must be placed much earlier. The Vigil of Pentecost was one of the two days on which solemn baptism was conferred, and hence the Missal prescribes a form for the blessing of the font on that day [see WHIT-SUNDAY]. Benedict XIV. also mentions as customs which prevailed in some places the blessing of the candle, for which a form is given by Martène ("De Antiq. Ecclesiæ Rit."), the blowing of trumpets at the "Veni, Sancte Spiritus," in the Mass of Whit-Sunday, the discharge of fire from the roof, the letting doves loose in the church, and the scattering of roses. The Sundays which follow till Advent are dated from Pentecost in the Roman Calendar. [See WHIT-SUNDAY.]

PEREGRINATIO SYLVIAE (ETHERIAE). A MS. of *c.* 385 which appears to have been written at Constantinople and which was discovered at Arezzo by Gamburrini in 1884. It is a cleverly written account of the travels in the East and a pilgrimage to the Holy Land of a noble lady from Southern Gaul or Spain. The authoress was at first supposed to have been a certain Sylvia, alleged to have been sister to Rufinus, Prefect of the Praetorium under Theodosius the Great; but the researches of the Benedictine Dom Ferotin have since shown that the pilgrim was really a Spanish devotee by name Aetheria (Etheria, Echeria, Egeria) possibly a relative of Theodosius himself. That she was a personage of some importance is clear from the attention everywhere paid her by officials and dignitaries, civil as well as ecclesiastical. She was even allowed the protection of a military escort. Her journey-

[1] For the derivation of the word Whitsunday, see that article.

ings took her through Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. The chief fragment of her book of travels, still extant, comprises a minute description of what she witnessed in the Holy Land and enables us to reconstruct satisfactorily the Church-life of the East in the fourth century. Sylvia or Etheria writes in the provincial Latin of her age, but is always pleasantly readable. She confines herself to narrative and description, and rarely intrudes her personal views and appreciations, much less does she ever digress, as was the custom of her contemporaries, into forced symbolisms.

Her experiences, written for the information of certain nuns ("sisters") or others in the West, while furnishing valuable topographical details concerning the Holy Places, are of the highest importance to the Liturgiologist. She wrote at the high tide of the movement guided by Pope St. Damasus and his friend St. Jerome which resulted in the grafting on the simpler Ritual of Rome of many features of the elaborate ceremonial of the East. Notable among these are the Palm Sunday Procession and the Good Friday Adoration of the Cross, of the one and the other of which Sylvia gives us a vivid description.

Sylvia herself was obviously greatly impressed by the splendour of the Jerusalem Rite. She dwells lovingly on the gorgeous festival hangings, on the innumerable lamps and candles, on the clouds of incense mounting to the roofs of the Basilicas, on the frequent and stately processions from church to church, and so forth. The services were in Greek, but there were officials present to explain the prayers and sermons in Syriac, the language of the people, and interpreters were likewise at the service of strangers who spoke only Latin. Nevertheless, Sylvia makes us feel that she found no substantial difference between the Jerusalem worship and that to which she had been accustomed in the West. Thus, she goes to what we should call a Sunday High Mass, and says that it was all just as on Sundays everywhere else (omnia secundum consuetudinem quae ubique fit die Dominica). Her only remark is that the preaching was so lengthy that the service did not end till very late. In fact, one after another, the Bishop and every priest present delivered a sermon.

In the fourth century, the Catholics of the Holy Land, our eye-witness tells us, were fervent indeed. The churches were thronged even during the hours of the night; there was almost continuous psalmody conducted by religious (*monazontes*) and the Lenten Fast was so rigorous that it was looked upon as a sign of weakness to want to eat more than once in forty-eight hours.

(See HOLY WEEK; HOLY PLACES, &c. Dom Cabrol's "Peregr. Sylviae" (1895) should be consulted; but the best edition is in Geyer "Corp. Script. Eccles. Hierosolym." (Vienna, 1898). See also the appendix to Duchesne's "Origines du Culte," and "Catholic Encyclopaedia," vol. viii. pp. 254 *sqq.*)

PERJURY. A lie confirmed with an oath. To call God as a witness of what is false implies either that He does not know the truth or that He would testify to what is false. It is therefore a grievous sin against the virtue of religion. (See OATH; St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 98.)

PERPETUAL ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. In very ancient times perpetual adoration of God by psalm and prayer was maintained by communities of monks, *e.g.* by the ἀκοίμητοι in the East [see ACOEMETI], and in the monasteries of Agaunum, founded by King Sigismund in 522, by the monks of Habendum in Lorraine, St. Denis and St. Germain in Paris, of Corbie, Dijon, St. Martin in Tours, St. Médard, St. Mary in Soissons, &c. Abbot Augilbert of St. Riquier in Picardy, who died in 814, left special directions for this perpetual adoration. When it died out in Gaul, and whether it ever spread into other lands, is not known (Falle, *Ew. Anbet. im Mittelalter* in the "Katholik" for 1868, ii. 228–32).

It was in France also that the perpetual adoration of the Eucharist began. Anne of Austria asked her confessor, M. Picotté, a priest of St. Sulpice, to make a vow in her name to God for the deliverance of France from the scourge of war. M. Picotté resolved to found a convent of nuns for the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and chose Mother Mechtilde of the Holy Sacrament to carry out his intention. She was born in 1614, at St. Dié in Lorraine, and was known in the world as Catherine de Bar. She became a nun of the order of the Annunciation, and afterwards, when her community had been scattered by war, she was a nun and then an abbess in the order of St. Benedict. The troubles of the time had driven her from place to place. She was at Paris at the time when M. Picotté was seeking to found his convent, and having ever since her fourteenth year intended to devote her life to the honour of the Blessed Sacrament, she entered readily into the priest's design. A little house was bought in the Rue Féron, and here Mother Mechtilde with her sisters began the perpetual adoration on March 25, 1654. The sisters observe the primitive rule of St. Benedict in all its rigour. One or more of them is always kneeling before the altar, and on Fridays a sister kneels there with a rope round her neck and a lighted torch in her hand from prime to vespers, to do penance for sinners. The feast of the Annunciation is observed by them as the feast of their foundation. Special constitutions were added to the Benedictine rule. These were examined at Rome, amended, done into Latin, and printed by the Camera Apostolica in 1705.

Soon new houses were founded and old Benedictine convents incorporated. In Great Britain Mother Mechtilde's nuns are established at Dumfries.

A similar order is that of the Monachette del Corpus Domini, founded by Hyacintha of Bossi in 1683. The nuns are tertiaries of St. Dominic.

In 1701 the Abbess of the Convent of Notre Dame de Valdorne in Champagne established a convent for perpetual adoration at Charenton, near Paris. The rule is that of St. Benedict with relaxations. A convent of Augustinians was devoted to the same purpose at Marseilles by Father Le Quien. At Rome a congregation of Franciscan tertiaries (enclosed), united for this purpose, was established in 1807 by Mary Magdalene of the Incarnation. They received special constitutions in 1818. Their first church was that of SS. Joachim and Anna by the Quattro Fontane; later, Gregory XVI. gave them the church and spacious convent of St. Mary Magdalene on the Quirinal. They have also houses at Naples and Innsbruck.

The example of these orders has been followed by many other communities of men and women in various orders, who keep up the perpetual adoration. Lastly, various lay confraternities have endeavoured, so far as possible, to carry out the perpetual adoration. Some of them are affiliated as a kind of third order to the institute of Mother Mechtilde. (Kaulen in "Kirchenlex."; Corblet, "Hist. du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie," with complete bibliography; McMahon in "Cath. Enc.")

PERPETUAL SUCCOUR, OUR LADY OF. A Byzantine picture of the Madonna and Child, brought to Rome in the fifteenth century and venerated in the church of San Matteo in the Via Merulana. When the church was destroyed by the French in 1812, all traces of the picture were lost for more than forty years. When it was discovered again, Pope Pius IX., who remembered it and had often prayed before it in its former days, took great interest in propagating the devotion to it. The Redemptorists, into whose keeping it came, instituted a confraternity of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour, which was approved by Pius IX. and richly indulgenced. Facsimiles of the picture have found their way into almost every part of the world. In America the title is usually known as Our Lady of Perpetual Help. The feast is now appointed for June 27. (Magnier in "Cath. Enc.")

PERSECUTIONS (during the first six centuries). The limits of the present work permit us only to give a brief general outline of the principal facts.

During the first century Christianity was to a great extent confounded with Judaism in the eyes of the Roman officials, and since the latter was a *religio licita*, the former shared the same privilege. The persecutions under Nero and Domitian were local and occasional; no systematic design of extirpating Christianity dictated them. Gradually, partly because the Jews took pains to sever their cause from that of the Christians, partly because, in proportion as Christianity was better understood, the universality of its claim on human thought and conduct, and its essential incompatibility with pagan ideas, came out into stronger relief, the antagonism grew sharper, and the purpose of repression more settled. Charges, various in their nature, were brought against the Christians; they were treasonable men (*majestatis rei*) who denied to the emperors a portion of their attributes and dignity; they were atheists, who, so far from honouring the gods of the empire, declared that they were devils; they were dealers in magic; lastly, they practised a foreign and unlawful religion (*religio peregrina illicita*). Possessed by such conceptions, a high Roman official, especially if he were a man of arbitrary or brutal character, or if Christians were indiscreet, could not lack pretext in abundance for persecution, even before any general edict of proscription had appeared. The rescript of Trajan (98–117) directed the policy of the government for a hundred years. "Search," he said, "is not to be made for Christians; if they are arrested and accused before the tribunals, then if any one of them denies that he is a Christian, and proves it by offering sacrifice to our gods, he is to be pardoned." The implication was, of course, that those who avowed their Christianity and refused to sacrifice were to be executed, as the adherents of an unlawful religion. All through the second century, the popular sentiment, whenever a Christian was put on his trial, raged against the accused; the mob, still for the most part pagan, believed every wild and monstrous calumny that was afloat against the sect. "If the Tiber overflows," says Tertullian, "if the Nile does not overflow, if there is a drought, an earthquake, a scarcity, or a pestilence, straightway the people cry 'The Christians to the lions!'" ("Apol." xl., PL, i. 479.) This popular aversion is noticed in the reports of the persecution in Asia Minor, in which St. Polycarp suffered (probably about 155, under Antoninus Pius), and of the terrible slaughter of Christians at Lyons and Vienne under Marcus Aurelius. In 202 Severus issued a formal edict forbidding conversions either to the Jewish or the Christian religion under heavy penalties. The persecution which ensued lasted ten or eleven years; but from about 212 to the reign of Decius (249–251) was a time of comparative peace, and Christians multiplied in every direction. Even upon the general population an impression was by this time made; and the

attitude of the mob, in the persecutions of Christians which happened after the middle of the third century, was at first apathetic, then respectful, finally even compassionate. Under Decius, who was an enthusiast for the ancient glories of the republic and empire, the systematic general persecutions began, which aimed at stamping out Christianity altogether. Fabian, the bishop of Rome, and St. Agatha in Sicily, were among the victims of the Decian storm. Fortunately it was short; but when it had passed over, the number of the *lapsi*, or those who in various degrees had given way under the pressure, was found to be very great. [See LAPSED.] Under Gallus there was peace, but Valerian (257) renewed the persecution. The martyrdoms of St. Laurence, St. Cyprian, and St. Fructuosus of Tarragona date from about this time. Again, from 260 (in which year an edict of Gallienus declared Christianity to be a legal religion) to 300, the government left the Christians undisturbed except for a few months (270) under Aurelian. In 303 the terrible persecution of Diocletian was ushered in by the destruction of the great church at Nicomedia. On the next day appeared an edict ordering that all buildings used for religious worship by the Christians should be destroyed, and that their sacred books should be given up to the authorities and burnt. Christians themselves were declared to be outlawed and civilly dead; they were to have no remedy in the courts against those who did them wrong; and they were to be subject, in every rank, to torture. A second edict ordered that all bishops and priests should be imprisoned; a third, that such prisoners should be compelled by every possible means to offer sacrifice to the gods. The extreme violence of this persecution did not last beyond two years; but in that time the blood of martyrs flowed abundantly in Palestine, Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Britain. A detailed account of the sufferings of the Christians in Palestine may be read in the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius. For some years after the abdication of Diocletian (305) civil war desolated the empire; but, after the fall of Maxentius, Constantine and Licinius, about the beginning of 313, published the famous edict of Milan, by which complete toleration was given to the Christians, and Christianity was placed on a footing of perfect equality with what had been till now the State religion. This edict was published some months later at Nicomedia, so that both in East and West the period of martyrdom was closed.

The persecution of Julian (361–3)—although martyrdoms were not wanting, *e.g.* those of SS. John and Paul—consisted rather in a studied exclusion of Christians from the favour of the court and government, together with a prohibition of teaching rhetoric, literature, and philosophy, than in actual measures of coercion.

There was a prolonged persecution of the Christians in Persia under the Sassanides, (fifth century).

The cruel persecution of the Catholics in Africa by their Vandal conquerors, under Geiseric (*Genseric*), Hunneric, and his successors (439–523), was motived partly by the hatred and contempt which these Teutons bore to all of Roman blood or nurture, partly by the inevitable antagonism between the Arian heresy which they professed and the Catholic creed, and partly by the policy of humbling and weakening those whom they could not hope to attach sincerely to their government.

The persecutions of the Spanish Catholics by the Arian Visigothic kings Euric and Leovigild, in the fifth and sixth centuries, were of no great intensity. For the persecutions of the English and Irish Catholics see ENGLISH CHURCH (Persecution Period); IRISH CHURCH (Period of Persecution). See MARTYRS.

(The great work on the ancient persecutions is "Histoire des Persécutions," by Allard; see also his "Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain," "Ten Lectures on the Persecutions," tr.)

PERSON. [See TRINITY.]

PETER'S CHAINS, FEAST OF. From the beginning of the seventh century, and how long before that it is impossible to determine, the festival of St. Peter *ad Vincula* was celebrated at Rome on August 1. The Greeks keep the corresponding feast on January 16; the Armenians on January 22. One of the lessons in the Roman Breviary for the day relates that the Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius the Younger, having obtained during a visit to Jerusalem the chains with which the Apostle had been bound by Herod's order, and from which he was miraculously set free (Acts xii.), brought them to Constantinople (439), and having deposited one of them in the church of St. Peter in that city, sent the other to Rome as a present to her daughter Eudoxia, who had married Valentinian III. Papebroch the Bollandist, who has a long dissertation on St. Peter's chains, under date June 29, and Baronius (a. 439), are both inclined to accept this story. There seems no means of fixing the date at which it first found its way into the Breviary.

But, besides these Palestinian chains, a very early tradition knew of other chains borne by St. Peter, those, namely, with which he was bound in the Mamertine prison at Rome during the Neronian persecution. The Acts of Pope Alexander, bishop of Rome, between 121 and 132, are believed by Papebroch to be genuine, and to have been compiled before 250. In these Acts a certain St. Balbina is spoken of as having sought and found the chains of St. Peter, which she gave

in charge to Theodora, sister of Hermes, the Praefectus Urbis. These must have been the Neronian chains, for neither tradition nor probability permits the supposition of a transfer of the Palestinian chains to Rome at that remote date.

In a sermon "De Vinculis," attributed to Bede, it is said that this Pope Alexander instituted a feast on August 1 in honour of St. Peter, and built the church called *ad Vincula*, in which his chains were wont to be kissed by a devout people. Filings of the chains of St. Peter were from a very early period enclosed by Popes in rings or keys, and sent to friends or correspondents to whom it was desired to show special favour. To this practice, in the opinion of Papebroch, St. Augustine (?) refers when he says that, "deservedly, through all the churches of Christ, the iron of those penal chains is esteemed more precious than gold." [1]

No Greek writer speaks of the removal of one of the chains to Rome, nor mentions Eudocia in connection with them. There is, however, a Greek oration, extant in MS. in several Italian libraries, on St. Peter's chains. Though commonly attributed to St. John Chrysostom, it is of uncertain date and authorship; Baronius would assign it to Proclus or Germanus, patriarchs of Constantinople in the seventh century; Papebroch sees no reason why it should not really have been written by Chrysostom. In this oration it is merely stated that the first Christian emperors brought a *chain* (not chains) from Jerusalem to Constantinople, and placed it in the church of St. Peter.

Two Roman churches at the present day recall the bonds of St. Peter; one, *S. Pietro in Vincoli*, is on the Esquiline Hill, the other, *S. Pietro in Carcere*, on the Capitol. In the former is preserved the chain said to have been given to Eudoxia; [2] the latter is on or near the site of the prison in which the Apostle was believed to have been incarcerated.

The feast of this day was called by our Saxon ancestors Lammas—*i.e.* Loaf-Mass; [3] solemn thanksgiving being made on it for the fruits of the earth, and offerings presented.

PETER'S CHAIR, FEAST OF. [See CATHEDRA.]

PETER'S PENCE (*denarius S. Petri, Romgesceot, Rom-scot*). An annual tax of one penny for every house in England, collected at Midsummer, and paid to the Holy See. It was extended to Ireland under the bull granted by Pope Adrian to Henry II.[4] The earliest documentary mention of it seems to be the letter of Canute (1031), sent from Rome to the English clergy and laity.[1] Among the "dues which we owe to God according to ancient law," the King names "the pennies which we owe to Rome at St. Peter's" (*denarii quos Romae ad Sanctum Petrum debemus*), "whether from towns or vills." It may hence be considered certain that the tax was deemed one of ancient standing in the time of Canute, but its exact origin is variously related. West Saxon writers ascribe the honour (for it was regarded as an honour by our forefathers) of its institution to kings of Wessex; Matthew Paris, who represents Mercian traditions, gives it to Offa, king of Mercia. Malmesbury makes Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred, the founder; so that the same king who instituted tithes would on this view have established "Peter's pence." But a writer very little later than Malmesbury—Henry of Huntingdon—attributes the grant to Offa, king of Mercia, who "gave to the Vicar of St. Peter, the Bishop of Rome, a fixed rent for every house in his kingdom for ever." Matthew Paris, in his "Two Offas" (printed by Wats), gives the Mercian tradition in an expanded form. Offa, visiting Rome in great state, besides other munificent offerings, burdens his kingdom with the "Rom-scot," which is to be paid to the Roman Church for the support of the English school and hostel at Rome. It was to be one silver penny (*argenteus*) for every family occupying land worth thirty pence a year. On the other hand, Layamon, the poet (writing about 1209, among West Saxon traditions), ascribes the institution to Ina, a king of Wessex. No certain conclusion can be arrived at; but, on the whole, it seems probable that the "Rom-scot" owed its foundation to Offa, with whose prosperous and successful reign the initiation of the thing would be more in keeping than with the troubled times of Ethelwulf, although the latter may well have consented to *extend* that which had been before only a Mercian impost to the West Saxon part of his dominions.

The "alms," [2] sent by Alfred to Pope Marinus, who then "freed" the English school at Rome, were probably nothing more than arrears of Peter's pence, the receipt of which made it possible for the Pope to free the inhabitants in the English quarter, and the pilgrims resorting to it for hospitality, from all tax and toll. Geoffrey Gaimar [3] is responsible for the curious statement that, in consideration of the Peter's pence (the "dener de la meison" given by Canute), the Pope made him his legate, and ordered that no Englishman charged with crime should be imprisoned abroad, or exiled, but should "purge himself in his own land."

It is probable that there was at all times great irregularity in the payment of the

[1] Serm. 29, *De Sanctis*. This sermon is rejected as spurious.

[2] In one form of the martyrology of Usuard (*Acta Sanctorum*, June, vol. vii.) there is a legend to the effect that when the chain sent to Eudoxia from Constantinople was brought in contact with the Neronian chain the two miraculously cohered. See also the lesson for the day in the Roman Breviary.

[3] A.-S. *Hlaf-Maesse*.

[4] Matth. Paris, ed. Wats, p. 95. But, as is well known, the genuineness of this bull is now disputed (see the last volume of the *Analecta Pontificia*).

[1] Flor. of Worc. a. 1031. [2] *Sax. Chr.* 883.

[3] See *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 821.

Rom-scot. It is recorded (Sax. Chr.) to have been sent to Rome in 1095, by the hands of the Papal nuncio, after an intermission of many years. Again, we read (*ib.*) of a legate coming into England in 1123[1] after the Rom-scot. In 1534 it was abolished.

The tribute, or cess, of 1000 marks (700 for England, 300 for Ireland), which King John bound himself and his heirs to pay to the Roman See, in recognition of the feudal dependence of his kingdom, was of course wholly distinct from the Peter's pence. After being paid by Henry III. and Edward II., but withheld by Edward I. and Edward III., it was formally claimed with arrears, in 1366, by Urban V. The Holy See was then at Avignon, and the fear that money sent it from England would be used in some way for the advantage of France was what chiefly caused the rejection of the claim. (See Lewis's "Life of Wyclif," p. 349.)

The ancient and mediaeval practice of paying Peter's pence was not revived until our day. During Pius IX.'s exile at Gaeta in 1849, and again after the seizure of the larger portion of the Papal States in 1860, the piety and indignation of the faithful induced them to make voluntary contributions in money towards the expenses of the administration of the Holy See. This fund was called in France "denier de Saint Pierre" and in England "Peter's pence" in imitation of the old tribute, and is still continued in many countries. (Daux, "Le Denier de Saint Pierre"; Hergenröther, in "Kirchenlex."; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

PETROBRUSIANS. An heretical sect of the twelfth century, the leaders of which, Peter de Bruys and Henricus, in so far as they attacked the hierarchy and preached simplicity of life, may be regarded as the forerunners of Arnold of Brescia. A letter of Peter the Venerable,[2] abbot of Cluny, is the chief source of information respecting them. Bruys propagated his opinions in Languedoc in the first twenty years of the twelfth century; he perished at the stake, through a movement of popular exasperation, in 1124. Henricus (who may perhaps be identified with the "Henricus haereticus" mentioned by Matthew Paris under the year 1151), after a long career of success, partly in Maine, but chiefly in Southern France, was tried at the Council held at Rheims, by Eugenius III., in 1148, and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. He died in the following year. The following abstract of the Petrobrusian tenets is given by a Protestant writer:[3] "They were strongly opposed to infant baptism, saying that you could wash a young child's skin, but you could not cleanse his mind at that early age. They objected to the building and using of churches, declaring that God could hear us whether we prayed in a tavern or a church, in a marketplace or in a temple, before an altar or before a stall. They maintained that crosses, instead of being held in reverence, should be destroyed and cast away; that the instrument by which Christ had suffered such agonies ought not to be made an object of veneration but of execration. They denied the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Prayers and Masses for the dead they utterly ridiculed and said that God was insulted by church singing; as He took pleasure only in holy affections, shrill voices and musical strains could neither win nor appease Him."

PHILOSOPHY. We are compelled from want of space to forgo any attempt at a history of philosophy as pursued within the Church, and must confine ourselves to the accepted definition of philosophy, a brief sketch of its development, and a few words on its relation to faith. There was really no systematic philosophy in the Church[1] till the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when the physical and metaphysical works of Aristotle became known in translations. Some of the Fathers condemned philosophy altogether (so, *e.g.*, Irenaeus, "Adv. Haer." ii. 14, 2, PG, vii. 750; ii. 25, 5; ii. 14, 5; Tertullian, "Praescr." 7, PL, ii. 19; the author of the "Philosophumena," vii. 19). Tatian and Hermias, among the Apologists, are equally bitter. Theophilus ("Ad Autol." ii. 8, 12; iii. 3, 7, 17) qualifies blame with faint praise. St. Athanasius professes his ignorance of a common philosophical term, and Basil his dislike of philosophy in general (see Newman's note in the "Oxford Athanasius," p. 52). Aristotle was regarded with special aversion (Iren. ii. 14, 5, PG, vii. 752; Tertull. "Praescr." 7, PL, ii. 19; "Philosophum." vii. 19). Others found in the heathen philosophers an acknowledgment of Christian mysteries, and looked on philosophy as a preparation for Christ (so Justin, of the Stoics and

[1] *Sax. Chron.*

[2] PL, clxxxix.

[3] J. C. Morison, in his *Life and Times of St. Bernard*; not a very wise book, but never consciously unfair.

[1] Nor, of course, in the New Testament, where philosophy is only mentioned once, and then in a bad sense (Col. ii. 8). On the other hand, great attention has been given by recent scholars—*e.g.* Ewald and Delitzsch in Germany; Hookyas, Kuenen, and Tiele in Holland—to the "wisdom" of the O.T. writers. The "wise" men, or sages, were undoubtedly a recognised class among the Hebrews, distinct from the priests on the one hand and the prophets on the other (see, *e.g.*, Jer. xviii. 18). Now, in the Hebrew Bible—specially in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes—we have the remains of this "wisdom literature," and it has this marked characteristic. The Jewish law, all the national prerogatives and peculiarities of Israel, fall into the background. So, on the other hand, does prophetic revelation (only once alluded to in Prov.—viii. xxix. 18). The wisdom is natural, and not dogmatic; cosmopolitan, not Israelite. Its main object is to regulate life by the data of experience. For this reason the prophets protest against some manifestations of this "wisdom," as being godless (Isa. v. 24, xxix. 14; Jer. iv. 22, viii. 9, ix. 23), while they show at the same time the influence of this "wisdom," or gnomic, literature on their own style (see, especially, Isa. xxviii. 23–29). So far, then, Proverbs, Job, &c., occupy the position of philosophy; but the Hebrew "wisdom" is not speculative, but practical. The Hebrew "sages" correspond, not to the Greek philosophers, but to the Greek "sages," the wise men who preceded the philosophers. Sensible remarks on the whole subject are made by Kuenen—*Onderzoek*, vol. iii. p. 88—and Tiele has treated the matter admirably—*Egypt. en Mesopotam. Godsdiensten*, p. 629 *seq.*

Heraclitus, "Ap." 2, 8; of Socrates, *ib.* 10; Clem. Al. "Strom." i. 5, p. 331, 333; with reference to Plato, v. 13, p. 696; vi. 15, p. 802; v. 13, p. 697; v. 14, p. 714; Origen, *e.g.* "C. Cels." vi. 8, where he quotes a spurious passage of Plato to show that he knew the "Son of God"). Now, both these views, in spite of their opposition to each other, agree in this, that they conceive of philosophy as external to Christianity. To Clement and those who think with him, philosophy is a friendly power which, partly from the "light which lightens every man," partly by borrowing from the Hebrew Scriptures, leads men to Christ; to Irenaeus and others it is a dangerous rival of the Church. The views are not really far apart, and the adherents of neither ever reached the scholastic theory that philosophy and theology are two independent sciences, each of which has a province of its own; Augustine, even, has no formal and complete system of philosophy; and though at the close of the patristic period logic was zealously cultivated, a philosophy in the strict sense had not begun to be. In the latter part of the eleventh century speculations on the nature of universal ideas began to excite attention in the Church, though the dispute was conducted in great measure with reference to the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, so that it was half-theological, half-philosophical. Roscelin, canon of Compiègne (about 1089), propounded the Nominalist view that universals are mere abstractions from individual things; he was a Tritheist in theology, was condemned at Soissons in 1092, and opposed by the Realists William of Champeaux (d. 1121) and Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109). Up to this time only a few of Aristotle's logical works were known in the West ("Categ.," "De Interpret.," besides Porphyry's "Isagoge"; after 1128, Aristotle's "Analytica" and "Topica"). About 1200, translations of Aristotle's metaphysical and physical writings appeared, and the influence of the great Arabic commentators on Aristotle (Avicenna, b. 980; the Pantheist Averroes, 1113–1198) began to tell. These metaphysical studies met with great opposition. A council of Paris in 1210 ordered Aristotle's metaphysical works to be burnt (Fleury, "H.E." lxxvii. 59); and the Papal legate, Robert of Courçon, in 1215 forbade the use of Aristotle's physical or metaphysical works, and this by order of Pope Innocent III. (Fleury, lxxvii. 39). This decree was modified by Gregory IX., and practically abrogated by Urban V., and soon the Aristotelian philosophy became supreme in the West. The Franciscan Alexander of Hales, born in Gloucestershire (d. 1245), was the first scholastic who was acquainted with all the works of Aristotle and knew something of the Arabian commentators. Albert the Great (d. 1280), St. Thomas of Aquin (d. 1274), Duns Scotus (d. 1308), differing as they did on many points, philosophical and theological, were all Aristotelians. All distinguished between the provinces of faith and reason, accepted the decisions of the Church as supreme in the former, and followed Aristotle as the great representative of human reason. A much freer position with respect to Aristotle was maintained by the later Nominalists. The first great leader of this school was the Franciscan Occam (provincial in England, theologian to Louis of Bavaria, d. 1347), who abandoned the Scotism of his order. He was followed by some Dominicans—*e.g.* by the Englishman Robert Holcott, by the great Frenchmen Peter d'Ailly and Gerson (d. 1429), and by Gabriel Biel (d. 1495), the last great Nominalist. The Aristotelian philosophy, on the whole, held its own within the Church till the time of Descartes. Jesuits like Suarez choose, indeed, between St. Thomas and Scotus, but they are professed Aristotelians.

To the Schoolmen generally philosophy is the "science of things through their ultimate causes, so far as such science is attainable by the light of nature." We say by "ultimate causes," for, whereas lower sciences, such as mechanics, chemistry, &c., borrow principles from other sciences, philosophy borrows from no other science: it considers "being as being," the nature of things in their widest aspect. It either deals with "being" in itself or with "being" as the object of and as ordered by reasoning, or with "being" as the object of and ordered by the will. The two latter classes (*ens rationale* and *morale*) are the subject-matter of two subdivisions of philosophy—viz. of logic and ethics. "Being" in itself—*i.e.* as ordered by God—may be considered as liable to sensible motion, and then it is the subject-matter of physics; or, again, we may consider "being" like that of God or the angels, which is superior to such motion, or, in our consideration of "being," abstract from sensible motion, then we get metaphysics (so Goudin, "Philosophia D. Thomae"). Logic, metaphysics, physics, and ethics, therefore, are the four subdivisions of philosophy, psychology[1] being merely a branch of physics. Next, philosophy reasons only from the light of nature, and has no direct connection with revelation. It proves, *e.g.*, the "being" of God, which can be done from His works; it does not investigate the doctrine of the Trinity, which is wholly beyond reason. Hence the marked difference between the scholastic philosophy and many modern systems, which latter claim to be a substitute for revelation, and to give, in the form of reason, that, so far as it is reasonable, which the uninstructed believe. Further, the Schoolmen taught that philosophy is the

[1] So, *e.g.*, Goudin and the older writers generally.

handmaid of faith: first, because it prepares the way for faith by establishing, *e.g.*, the spiritual nature of the soul, the existence of God, &c.; next, because, though it cannot prove revealed truths, it can show that they are not evidently contrary to reason; thirdly, because, whenever the provinces of philosophy and theology touch, the philosopher must, if need arise, correct his conclusions by the higher and more certain truth of faith. It is a Scholastic axiom that nothing can be true in philosophy which is false in theology. Observe, the Church does not teach philosophy; that is not her province. She merely declares a philosophy which rejects, *e.g.*, the primary truths of morals or religion, to be false. The correction of the false reasoning she leaves, and must leave, to others.

After Descartes there was an increasing defection from Scholastic philosophy among Catholics. The philosophy of Malebranche (d. 1715), bitterly opposed as it was by Bossuet ("Lettre 171, à un Disciple du P. Malebranche"), became very popular in France. The representatives of other Catholic schools of philosophy among Catholics hold a far lower place in the history of speculation. Such, during this century, were the Ontologists and Traditionalists in France; Hermes, Baader, Günther in Germany. Their systems were condemned on theological grounds by ecclesiastical authority, and are now all but forgotten. On the other hand, the philosophical works of the Spanish priest Balmes still enjoy high repute.

A great revival of the Scholastic, or rather of the Thomist, philosophy began some sixty years ago. Protestants themselves showed a more generous appreciation of the Schoolmen, and Catholics reverted to their teaching, partly from impatience at the instability of modern systems, partly because of the close connection between the Scholastic philosophy and the language used in the definitions of the later Church, partly because of the security felt in adopting a philosophy which was in proved harmony with Catholic doctrine. The philosophical works of Liberatore and Sanseverino are perhaps the best known among those of the "New Scholastics"; and a man of much higher ability, the Jesuit F. Kleutgen ("Philosophie der Vorzeit," 1860), has written an elaborate defence of Thomist principles. The Thomist philosophy is now taught in almost every seminary, and Leo XIII., in the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris," approved and urged the teaching of the philosophy of St. Thomas. It must be remembered, however, that the physics of the Schoolmen, which no one thinks of defending, are yet an integral part of their philosophy. And, however high St. Thomas may rank as a philosopher, it is none the less true that a person who accepts his theories because they are his thereby renounces the study of philosophy altogether and confuses the methods of philosophy with those of faith. It is fair to say that Kleutgen is very far from such unreasonable exaggeration, and W. G. Ward confesses himself utterly unable to understand the reasoning of persons who speak as if the most intellectually dutiful sons of the Church were those who accept every "philosophical proposition current among the Scholastics" ("Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority," p. 541). The best account of the history of the Scholastic philosophy will be found in Ueberweg's "History of Philosophy." It has been translated. (It is not possible within our limits to name a tithe of the modern Catholic works on the subject. In English we have the excellent Stonyhurst series: John Rickaby, "First Principles of Knowledge" and "General Metaphysics"; Joseph Rickaby, "Moral Philosophy"; Boedder, "Natural Theology"; Walker, "Theories of Knowledge"; Maher, "Psychology." The numerous Latin manuals will be familiar to students.)

PHOTINUS. A disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra and bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia. He began to teach his heresy as early at least as 344, when he was condemned by an Antiochene synod. He distinguished between the Word and the Son. The former, in the strict sense (the λόγος ἀνώταρος), was not a Person, but the immanent reason of God. The Holy Ghost was merely the energy of God, and Christ no more than a man born miraculously of a virgin (so Hefele-Leclercq, i. 845; but this is not certain), who could be called "Son" only in an improper sense, because the Word of God wrought in Him with special power. His opinions were very much those of modern Socinians, and for this reason Petavius speaks of the latter as "Photiniani." Photinus was condemned both by Semi-Arians and Catholics, but there has been great difference of opinion among Catholic scholars as to the number and dates of the synods which condemned him. Petavius and Sirmond dispute at length on the matter. Some account of the controversy will be found in Hefele-Leclercq, i. 841. Photinianism was rejected as a heresy in the General Council held at Constantinople in 381.

PHOTIUS. [See GREEK CHURCH.]

PIARISTS. By this name are known the regular clerks of the *Scuole pie* (religious schools), an institute of secondary education founded at Rome by St. Joseph Calasanctius in the last years of the sixteenth century. This foundation was sanctioned as a congregation under simple vows by Paul V. in 1617, and as a religious order four years later by Gregory XV. The first children taught in the schools were collected from the streets, and the founder was content, after their religious education had been well provided for, to have them instructed in reading and

writing only; but by degrees the programme was extended until, besides all the subjects of a good modern education, it embraced Latin and Greek and philosophy. Houses of the order were soon planted in various Italian towns, and in 1631 the Cardinal Bishop of Olmütz introduced the Fathers into Moravia. Alexander VII. in 1656 insisted that they should return to the status under which they could only take simple vows; but, thirteen years later, Clement IX. reinstated them in the full privileges of a religious order. The Piarists appear to have never entered France or Great Britain, or any country outside the limits of Europe. The chief centres of their activity have been, and are, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Spain. About 1870 they numbered some 2000 religious. [Hélyot; "Kirchenlex."]

PICPUS, CONGREGATION OF. A deacon in the seminary of Poitiers, Pierre Coudrin by name, when the infidel government of France dispersed (1792) all students under training in the episcopal seminaries, resolving not to be false to his vocation, and hearing that the Bishop of Clermont was in hiding somewhere in Paris, went there, found him out, and received priest's orders at his hands. During the ten years of persecution which followed, Coudrin, who was of course one of the *prêtres non assermentés*, exercised his ministry in the midst of danger, hardship, and poverty, in the dioceses of Poitiers and Tours. Gradually he matured the plan of a new congregation which, while protesting in the most direct way against the prevalent unbelief by maintaining the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, should undertake the preparation of candidates for the priesthood, and also the work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen. The Bishop of Mende, whose household he entered, sympathized in his projects and aided him to realise them. With the bishop's help Coudrin instituted (1805) his congregation in the buildings known as of Picpus, in the Faubourg St. Antoine, Paris. The approbation of the Holy See was given in 1817. Seminaries in various parts of France were confided to the Fathers of Picpus; and, in 1825, the third fundamental aim of the institute began to be realized, when Leo XII. sent six of its members to preach the faith in the islands of the Pacific. From that time their missionary activity has gone on with an ever-increasing development, chiefly in South America, Australasia, and Oceania. Father Damien, the apostle of the lepers (d. 1889), was a member. They are also established in England and in the United States.

The history of the earlier congregation of Picpus, a reform of the third order of St. Francis founded by Vincent Mussart at Franconville in 1594, is given at considerable length by Hélyot, who was himself a member of it. (Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongregationen.")

PILGRIM, PILGRIMAGE (*peregrinus*, *peregrinatio*; It. *pellegrino*; Fr. *pèlerin*). The well-known line, "Coelum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt," contains but a half-truth, for universal experience attests the stimulating, recreative, and enlightening power which mere change of scene often exerts on the mind of man. These effects are likely to be enhanced when the change has a moral motive. "Movemur enim," says Cicero, "nescio quo pacto locis ipsis in quibus eorum, quos diligimus aut admiramur, adsunt vestigia" (we are inly stirred by the very spots where the traces exist of those whom we love and admire).

The pilgrimages of the Jews to Jerusalem at the time of the great festivals were matter of precept and obligation. The pilgrimages to Pagan shrines (of Jupiter Tyrius, or Melcarth, at Gades, of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome, of Apollo at Delphi, Diana at Ephesus, &c.), and those flockings of innumerable worshippers to shrines of Rama and Crishna, which take place in our own day, usually proceed on the assumption that the power of the divinity whose help is sought is locally circumscribed, but that within the limits of his own jurisdiction it is indefinitely great. The Christian creed, according to which "God is a spirit" to be sought and found not specially "on this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem," but wherever the true worshippers approach Him in spirit and in truth, might seem at first sight to afford little encouragement to pilgrimages. For, as St. Jerome [1] says—and other Fathers hold similar language—Christians "dare not confine the omnipotence of God to one narrow corner of the world. . . . From Jerusalem and from Britain the court of heaven is equally open." Nevertheless, so certain is it that religious impressions, blunted and weakened by the daily business of the market-place and the street, require in most minds to be often graven afresh (and that by means of impulses coming from without, for it would be vain to trust to the sufficiency of those coming from within), that the Church has from the first—while admitting the danger of abuses, and taking measures to prevent them—approved the use of pilgrimage to holy places as a very potent help and incentive to a devout life. She also favours the practice, because she recognizes the undoubted fact that God has often granted, and still grants, interior and exterior favours, graces, and miracles at particular places or shrines, to honour certain mysteries, saints, &c.

Scudamore, in the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities" (Smith and Cheetham), has collected with praiseworthy industry a multitude of facts bearing on the conditions under which pilgrimages were made in the first eight centuries. It would appear from the letters of Paula and Eustochium (included among

[1] Cited by Scudamore, in the article noticed below.

those of St. Jerome) that from the date of the Ascension to their own day a continued stream of pilgrims had resorted to the Holy Places. The first recorded pilgrim is St. Alexander (third cent.), who is said to have visited Jerusalem in fulfilment of a vow. Of the devout journey of Helena, the mother of Constantine, whose faith and zeal are said to have been rewarded by the discovery of the true Cross, we have a full relation from the pen of Eusebius. The "Peregrinatio Etheriae (Sylviae)" [*q.v.*] is a charming record of the pilgrimage to the Holy Places of a Spanish (?) lady at the end of the fourth century. The French bishop Arculfus visited Jerusalem in the seventh century, and, after his return, told his story to Adamnan, abbot of Iona, who embodied the narrative in his tract, "De Locis Sanctis." In the eleventh century, Palestine having fallen into the hands of the Seljukian Turks, Christian pilgrims were subjected to many indignities, the report of which in Europe led eventually to the first Crusade. [See HOLY PLACES.]

The usual motives for a pilgrimage were: (1) The desire to realize the objects of faith and quicken religious feeling in the soul; (2) the fulfilment of a vow; (3) some special benefit—as when Chaucer's pilgrims went to Canterbury—

The holy blissful martir for to seke,
That hem hath holpen whan that thei were seke;

(4) the execution of some penitential task, whether self-imposed or enjoined by the clergy. At the same time the danger of relying too much upon the benefits of a pilgrimage were not overlooked. "Qui multum peregrinantur, raro sanctificantur" ("De Imit. Christi," i. 33).

The more celebrated shrines, towards which the currents of pilgrimage have set strongly, are: (1) those of our Lord, in other words, the Holy Places in Palestine [see HOLY PLACES];[1] (2) those of the Blessed Virgin; (3) those of angels and saints. Among the sanctuaries of our Lady, which have been, or are, thronged by the resort of pilgrims, may be mentioned Walsingham (on the pilgrimage to which Erasmus wrote a tract), Einsiedeln in Switzerland, Chartres and Fourvières in France, Maria Zell in Germany, Loreto in Italy [see LORETO]; and Guadaloupe and Montserrat in Spain. The grotto of Lourdes, [*q.v.*], since the event of 1858, has become the centre of attraction to an immense concourse of pilgrims. Among the sanctuaries of angels and saints may be named the "limina Apostolorum," or the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul on the Vatican Hill, St. James of Compostela, the church of St. Michael on Monte Gargano (the devotion of Norman pilgrims to which led to the Norman conquest of Naples), and the shrine of our own St. Thomas of Canterbury, a pilgrimage to which is the apt setting of the well-known "Tales" of Chaucer. (There is an excellent art. in the "Cath. Enc." by Bede Jarrett; see also Rock, iii. 356–380; Waterton, "Pietas Mariana Britannica"; "Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society.")

[1] These have been, since the fifteenth century, in the guardianship of the Franciscan order.

PIOUS SOCIETY OF MISSIONS. Founded by the Ven. Vincent Mary Pallotti in 1835. It consists of (1) priests, clerics, and lay-brothers; (2) religious sisters; (3) affiliated ecclesiastics and lay persons. The object of the society is the preservation and propagation of the Faith especially among emigrants and persons living among non-Catholics. There are Italian, American, English, and German provinces. Their most successful work has been among the numerous Italian emigrants in the United States and South America.

The well-known celebrations of the Holy Sacrifice in the different rites of the Church during the octave of the Epiphany at the church of S. Andrea della Valle, were inaugurated by Pallotti in 1835. (See Vogel, in "Cath. Enc.")

PISA, COUNCIL OF. Gregory XII. (Angelo Corrario) had been elected Pope in 1406, the Antipope Benedict XIII. (Peter de Luna) in 1395, and Europe was divided between the two "obediences." After much negotiation, both Gregory and Benedict were induced to promise to adopt the way of cession, in pursuance of which each would have withdrawn his claim to the pontificate. But misunderstandings arose, and the promises were not kept. The schism had now lasted thirty years, producing confusion and bewilderment throughout the Christian world. The leading cardinals on both sides, in view of this disastrous state of things, met together, and agreed, since no other way of restoring unity seemed feasible, to ignore the claims of both rivals, and themselves summon a general council, to meet at Pisa on March 25, 1409. The council met on the day appointed; its twenty-third and last session was held on August 7 following. From first to last, twenty-four cardinals, four patriarchs, eighty bishops, a hundred and two proctors of bishops, eighty-seven abbots, two hundred delegates of abbots, besides a great number of generals of orders, doctors, deputies of universities, and ambassadors, attended the council. With little more than four months the synod finished the business for which it was convened. It first cited the rival claimants to appear; on their failing to do so, it declared itself to be the lawful representative of the Universal Church, and to have power to judge all pontifical pretensions; it decreed that all Christians ought to withdraw their obedience both from Gregory and Benedict; it entertained an act of accusation against them; after hearing evidence, it pronounced the sentence of deposition against them both, and declared the Holy See to be vacant;

it rejected the claim of Robert, Gregory's supporter, to the imperial throne, and recognized Wenzel; lastly, it arranged for the holding of a conclave from which Card. Philargi came forth as Pope, and took the name of Alexander V.

Hefele says of this council: "Neither ecclesiastical authority nor the most trustworthy theologians have ever numbered it among the oecumenical councils" ("Conc." Introd.). Its unfortunate issue (Gregory and Benedict both refusing to yield, and there being thus three claimants for the papacy, down to the time of the Council of Constance) he attributes partly to the perversity of the temporal princes, but chiefly to the council itself; to the erroneous theory on which they based the deposition of Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII.—viz. that by their conduct they were heretical against the article "Unam Sanctam Cath. Ecclesiam"—a theory which no one believed in, and again to their violence and precipitation in resorting to extreme measures ("Conciliengesch." vi. 901).

Nevertheless Bellarmine calls it a General Council, and looks upon it as "neither clearly approved nor clearly rejected."[1] Not the former; for Martin V. would not absolutely call Alexander V. Pope, though recognizing the validity of some of his acts; and St. Antoninus will not allow that either he or his successor was a true Pope. Not the latter; for many good theologians (*e.g.* Natalis Alexander, Raynaldus, and Ballerini) affirm that both the Council and the Pope whom it created were legitimate; nor would Alexander VI. have taken that title if it had been generally believed that Alexander V. was no true Pope. So far from that, "it may almost be called the common opinion," proceeds Bellarmine, "that both Alexander and John his successor were true Popes."

An English prelate, Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, acted a conspicuous part in the proceedings at Pisa. (ANTIPOPES; Salembier, "Le Grand Schisme"; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," tr., i. 178 *sqq.*; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," i. 228 *sqq.*)

PISCINA. The word, which signified originally "a fish-pond," came to mean in classical writers of the silver age a basin, bath. In the early Latin Church it was employed as an equivalent for κολυμβήθρα, the Greek word for the baptismal font. In the Middle Ages it was the common term for the small niche in the wall on the Epistle side of the altar containing a perforated basin of stone, through which the water used in washing the priest's hands was poured. Earlier in the Middle Ages the ablutions were also poured down the piscina. Examples of mediaeval piscinae abound in old English churches. They are sometimes to be seen in modern Catholic churches (Rock, iv. 194).

[1] *De Conc. et Eccl.* i. 8.

PISTOIA, SYNOD OF. Leopold, grand duke of Tuscany and brother of the Emperor Joseph II., began in 1780 to introduce many changes in the discipline, worship, &c., of the Tuscan Church. In 1782 he suppressed the Inquisition and he also interfered in doctrinal matters, recommended the "doctrine of St. Augustine" and the Biblical commentary of the Jansenist Quesnel. His chosen ally was Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato, formerly vicar-general to Incontri, archbishop of Florence. In 1786 Leopold laid before the Episcopate of the Duchy fifty-seven articles for the "reform of the Church" in the Jansenist and Febronian sense. Only three bishops, of whom Ricci was one, accepted them. That same year (September 18), the Synod of Pistoia met. Tamburini was the promotor and 234 priests were present. The Jansenist doctrines on grace were approved. But besides this the principles of a spiritual democracy were asserted. God, it was said, had given power to the Church, and it was the Church which communicated it to the pastors, including even the Pope. Bishops were to be practically independent of the Pope, the priests in diocesan synods were to be judges of faith and discipline, &c., &c. Lastly, a multitude of decrees were passed condemning practices common in the Church—*e.g.* devotion to the Sacred Heart, missions, use of Latin in the Mass, the influence of scholastic theology, multiplication of religious orders, feasts, &c., &c.

The destruction of altars, images, &c., under Ricci's direction, set the Tuscan populace in an uproar; they stormed his palace in 1787, and he had to resign his see. The bishops, with scarcely an exception, were firmly opposed to the Pistoian decrees, from which eighty-five propositions were condemned by Pius VI. in the bull "Auctorem fidei" of 1794. Solari, bishop of Noli, in the Genoese territory, was the only prelate found publicly to oppose the bull. Ricci himself in 1805 made a recantation, and was reconciled to Pius VII., though it appears from the bishop's letters that his sentiments were not really changed. Solari joined himself to the Constitutional bishops in France. (From Hergenröther's "Kirchengeschichte," &c. The acts of the synod were printed at Pistoia; also at Pavia 1789, Laibach 1791, Bamberg 1794. The "Auctorem fidei" may be read in Denzinger's "Enchiridion." Gelli edited the "Memorie" of Ricci "with documents," Florence, 1865.)

PLACET REGIUM. [See CANON LAW, p. 104; EXEQUATUR.]

PLAIN CHANT. [See CHANT.]

PLURALITY OF BENEFICES. Among the canons of the Council of Chalcedon (451) is one forbidding the cumulation of two or more benefices in the same hands. The

Council of Trent [1] decrees that, whereas there are many who, "deceiving not God but themselves," seek by fraud or collusion to hold several benefices at once, no one for the future, whatever his rank in the hierarchy, shall be appointed to more than one ecclesiastical benefice, provided always such benefice be sufficient for his support. If it be not so, he may lawfully hold another along with it, provided the two be not *incompatible*. The incompatibility of benefices is a wide and intricate subject; for the purpose of this article it is sufficient to say that one chief cause of incompatibility is the existence of an obligation to continuous personal residence in regard to both benefices, as in the case of two bishoprics, two parishes, two canonries, &c.

Notwithstanding what has been said, the instances of Papal dispensations, authorising the same person to receive, and even to hold, several benefices together, are undoubtedly numerous. This is explained by Navarrus [2] in the following manner:— "If," he says, "his Holiness grants to one holding several benefices others in addition, it is not that he has the intention of dispensing in contravention of the decree aforesaid, but because he believes that all the benefices are necessary for the suitable maintenance of the petitioner, and that otherwise his confessor will not give him absolution, unless first he shall have resigned, or have the firm intention of resigning, such of the benefices as are not necessary for his suitable maintenance. There are, however, special cases, as to which canonists are agreed that, if the good of the Church so require, the Pope may grant a dispensation for validly holding two or more benefices, even though they are *per se* incompatible."

Important decrees against plurality were passed by the Third Council of Lateran (1179), the Fourth Council (1215), and also by the Council of Trent (1545–1563). (Ferraris, *Beneficium*, art. vi.)

PNEUMATOMACHI. [See MACEDONIANS.]

POLYGAMY. [See MARRIAGE.]

PONTIFICAL. A book containing the rites, some of which can be performed by a bishop only, others only by priests specially empowered by the bishop. Such books were compiled in the Middle Ages from the old Sacramentaries and Ordines by bishops for their own use and that of their successors. Pontificals probably came into use during the eighth century, the earliest extant being that of Egbert, archbishop of York from 732 to 766. The copy in the National Library at Paris seems to have been written in Egbert's lifetime.[3] "Ordinarium" was another name for the Pontifical. It occurs in the gloss on the "Clementina Unica [of Clement V.] de Jurejurando," and in a necrology of Paris, both quoted by Catalani. Zaccaria ("Biblioth. Rit.") gives a list of MS. Pontificals of French and German dioceses. According to Maskell, there is an imperfect Bangor Pontifical (thirteenth century) in the possession of the dean and chapter, a perfect Pontifical of the Sarum use, and an imperfect Pontifical from Winchester in the Cambridge Library, three or four imperfect Pontificals in the British Museum, an Exeter Pontifical (twelfth century) in the cathedral there. It will be seen how very rare English MS. Pontificals are. Neither the Bodleian nor the British Museum has one perfect copy. MS. Pontificals were, of course, not multiplied like Missals or Breviaries.

The first printed edition of the Roman Pontifical was edited by A. P. Piccolomini, Episcopus Picentinus, in 1485. Albertus Castellanus dedicated another edition, in which, he says, he had made many changes, to Leo X. It was revised under Clement VIII., again corrected under Urban VIII., Benedict XIV. revised it, and finally in 1888 a new typical edition was published by order of Leo XIII. The bulls of these Popes (1596 and 1644) require all bishops, &c., strictly to conform to the Roman Pontifical so revised. This must be understood of bishops belonging to the Latin Church, for the Catholic Greeks, Maronites, &c., have their own Pontificals, of which Zaccaria gives a list. There is a learned commentary on the Roman Pontifical in three volumes by Catalani. This article has been compiled from the Prolegomena to Catalani's edition, from Zaccaria's "Bibliotheca Ritualis," and from Maskell's "Monumenta Ritualia."

POOR CLARES. This is the second order of St. Francis, called the "Povere Donne," or, in French, "Clarisses." Their founder was the virgin St. Clare, born at Assisi, of which St. Francis also was a native. When very young she heard of the seraphic life led by St. Francis in his little convent of the Portiuncula, and aspired to imitate it. Against much opposition she renounced the world, and was received by St. Francis at the Portiuncula in 1212. Her sister Agnes soon joined her; the church of St. Damian was assigned to them; and in a short time she had no lack of followers. Within eight years the order had spread into both France and Spain. Cardinal Ugolino, who was protector of the whole order of St. Francis, placed St. Clare and her nuns temporarily under the rule of St. Benedict, adding some constitutions of great austerity. Under these they observed a perpetual fast, and on three days of the week in Lent fasted on bread and water; they lay on boards; their habit was rough and of coarse material; and they could not speak to one another at

[1] Sess. xxiv. c. 17, De Ref.
[2] Ferraris, "Beneficium," art. vi.
[3] So Scudamore (art. "Pontifical," in Smith and Cheetham). But Maskell (*Mon. Rit.* vol. i. p. 132) says the MS. was written about the beginning of the tenth century.

any time without the superior's leave. In 1224 St. Francis gave a written rule to St. Clare, which contained several mitigations of that which they had hitherto observed; they were now not to fast on Christmas Day, nor ever on bread and water; moreover, the silence imposed was confined to certain hours of the day. Like the friars, they were not to possess any landed property. This rule was approved by Innocent IV. in 1246.

A Bohemian princess renounced the world in 1234 in order to serve God in this order, which by her means was propagated in Bohemia and in the German countries adjoining it. St. Clare died in the odour of sanctity in 1253. Various modifications of the rule given by St. Francis having found their way into several convents, Cardinal Cajetan, with the approbation of Urban IV., drew up in 1264 a rule, substantially agreeing with, but somewhat mitigated from that given by St. Francis, which was adopted by the great majority of the daughters of St. Clare. Some, however, particularly in Spain and Italy, preferred to follow the unmitigated rule. The order was thus divided into two branches, the larger being known by the name of Urbanists, the latter by that of Clarisses.

The reform of St. Colette (1436) consisted in bringing back a number of convents in France and Flanders to the exact observance of the rule of St. Francis.

The first monastery of Franciscan nuns or Minoresses founded in England (1293) was outside Aldgate, to the East of London; the house soon came to be called "the Minories," a name which the locality still retains. At the dissolution, besides this house, there were two other convents of Poor Clares, at Bruisyard, in Suffolk, and Denny, in Cambridgeshire.

The government and direction of the order, being divided between a Cardinal Protector and the superiors of the Franciscans, were for a long time a subject of controversy and difficulty; until, early in the sixteenth century, Julius II. placed the Poor Clares entirely under the jurisdiction of the general and provincials of the Friars Minor.

In the time of Hélyot this order possessed 500 convents, with more than 2,500 religious. The French Revolution swept most of their houses away. (Thomas of Celano, "Vita S. Clarae," in *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. 2; Robinson, "Life of St. Clare"; Cuthbert, "Life of St. Francis," ch. iv.; Joergensen, "Saint François d'Assise," ch. v.)

POOR MEN OF LYONS. [See VALDENSES.]

POOR, LITTLE SISTERS OF THE. This admirable institute was founded in 1839 by the curé of Saint Servan in Brittany (Abbé le Pailleur) aided by four women of humble birth, for the support, relief, and nursing of aged or infirm poor persons. The sisters are entirely dependent on the charity not only of the faithful but also of many non-Catholics. At present (1914) they have more than 300 houses in many different countries. The Sisters of Nazareth are an offshoot of the order. (Connelly, "The Little Sisters of the Poor"; Steele, "Convents of Great Britain"; Ram, "Little Sisters of the Poor.")

POPE. The word (*πάππας* or *πάπας*, originally a childish word for father, Lat. *papa*) was given at first as a title of respect to ecclesiastics generally. Among the Greeks at this day it is used of all priests, and was used, as late at least as the Middle Ages, of inferior clerics. In the West it seems to have become very early a special title of bishops. Thus the Roman clergy (Cyprian, Ep. viii. 1, ed. Hartel, p. 485) speak of the Bishop of Carthage as "the blessed Pope" ("Benedictum Papatem"). Even as late as the sixth century, the title of Pope was sometimes given to metropolitans in the West. (See Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 182.) Gradually, however, the title was limited to the Bishop of Rome, and we find a synod of Pavia in 998 (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 890, iv. p. 653) rebuking an archbishop of Milan for calling himself Pope. Gregory VII., in a Roman Council of the year 1073, formally prohibited the assumption of the title by any other than the Roman Bishop. It is, of course, in this last and most restricted sense that we use the word here. By the Pope we mean the Bishop of Rome, who is, according to Catholic doctrine, the successor of St. Peter, and as such the vicar of Christ, the visible head of the Church, the doctor and teacher of all the faithful. We propose to give some account (1) of the place St. Peter occupies in Scripture; (2) of the position of the Pope in the Ante-Nicene age; (3) of the testimonies of later Fathers and councils; (4) to sketch the position of the Pope in the Church of the present time. Obviously, in a subject so vast we cannot do more than direct attention to the chief points.

(1) *The Position of Peter in the New Testament.*—Peter was first brought to Christ by his brother Andrew. "And Jesus, looking at him, said, Thou art Simon [*i.e.* "hearer"], the son of John [Ἰωάνου is the reading best supported], thou shalt be called Cephas," which is interpreted Peter—*i.e.* stone or rock. The three synoptic evangelists agree in putting Peter's name first in the list of the Apostles, and all note the change of his name from Simon to Peter ("He conferred on Simon the name of Peter," Mk. iii. 16; "Simon, whom also He named Peter," Lk. vi. 14; "first Simon, who is called Peter," Mt. x. 2), and later the reason for the change of name appeared. The change of name in itself must have been strange and significant in the ears of a pious Jew. He could

scarcely fail to remember the depth of meaning which had lain in the change of Abram's name to Abraham, or how Jacob had won the glorious name of Israel, which was the pride and the joy of his descendants. And besides, "Rock"[1] was one of the most familiar names for that God who was at once the strength of His people, their impregnable fortress and refuge, their shelter in the noon-day heat of persecution. Christ Himself explained the reason for which He had changed Simon's name to Peter. Hitherto He Himself had been the visible head of that society which He had gathered round Him and He needed no vicar. But soon His disciples were to see Him on earth no more, and He promised to provide His visible Church, after He had gone to Heaven, with a visible head. Peter had confessed that his Master was "the Christ the Son of the living God." Christ accepted and rewarded this confession, which sprang from divine faith. Peter had said Christ was the Son of God, "And I," Christ replied, "say to thee that thou art Peter [or rock],[2] and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth will be loosed in heaven" (Mt. xvi. 18–19).

Four promises to Peter "of power and pre-eminence in the Church" are contained in these words. In a sense all the Apostles became the foundation-stones of Christ's Church (Ephes. ii. 19, 20; Apoc. xxi. 14). But Peter was to be its chief foundation-stone. He is not to derive his strength from the Church; but, on the contrary, Peter is to draw his strength from Christ, and the Church from Peter. Next, the Church built on Peter cannot fail. The gates of the invisible world, strong as they are, will not enclose and so prevail against the Church; nay, they themselves will at last be broken and will give up their dead; but the Church built on Peter will endure till death is "swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. xv. 54), and even then the Church will not cease to be; only the Church which fights and struggles here will be changed into the Church which triumphs and reigns in heaven. Thirdly, while the Church lasts, Peter (and his successors) will hold its keys. Christ, who has the "key of the house of David," Christ, who opens and no man shuts, shuts and no man opens, continues to be the Master of the house; but Peter is the steward to whom the keys are committed. He admits to and excludes from the Church in his Master's name. In other words, he is the centre of the Church's unity. All, from the great Apostle of the Gentiles down to the most obscure of the Church's children, hold their place and exercise their functions in subordination to Peter. Fourthly, what he binds and looses on earth is bound and loosed in heaven—*i.e.* he is the ultimate earthly judge of what is lawful and unlawful. He is to lay down the laws and conditions on which communion with the Church and participation in its privileges depend, and the decisions of his tribunal here will be ratified in the heavenly court.[1]

Once more before His Passion Christ made a promise to Peter which brought the strength he was to have for his future office, and by virtue of Christ's help, into sharp contrast with his sin and frailty as a man. He was to deny his Master three times, but this denial was not to involve the loss of faith or to deprive him of his supernatural strength as the future rock of the Church. "Satan has sought for you [plural—*i.e.* the Apostles] to sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee [singular—*i.e.* for Peter] that thy faith may not fail, and thou, being once converted [when thou hast once turned to Me], strengthen thy brethren" (Lk. xxii. 31, 32). No intelligent reader can fail to notice the significant change of number here. Temptation is common to Peter with the other Apostles. Satan has "asked for" them all, that he may sift them by temptation and separate them like chaff from the wheat. But it is for Peter specially that Christ prays,

[1] "Rock" (צוּר) is constantly used as a title of God (see, *e.g.*, *Deut.* xxxii. 4, "The rock—perfect is his work"; 1 Sam. ii. 2; Isa. xxx. 29; Ps. xviii. 32 (and so סֶלַע). Once only is God called a "stone" (אֶבֶן)—viz. in Gen. xlix. 24, "the shepherd, the stone of Israel." But probably we should point, with Ewald, Dillman, and others, רֹעֵה, "the shepherd of the stone of Israel," with reference to Gen. xxviii. 18 *seq.*; xxxv. 14, &c. Keil, Kalisch, &c., maintain the Masoretic reading.

[2] It has often been urged that Peter does not mean "rock," but "stone," πέτρα being the word for "rock." Sound scholarship will not support this distinction or the inference drawn from it. Christ calls Simon Πέτρος, not πέτρα, simply because πέτρα could not stand as a man's name. This is fully admitted by Meyer, one of the most eminent N.T. scholars—perhaps the most eminent who has appeared in our own time. He quotes, to show how commonly πέτρος occurs in the classics with the meaning "rock," Plato, *Ax.* p. 371; Soph. *Phil.* 272; *O. C.* 19, 1591; Pind. *Nem.* iv. 46, x. 126. "Christ," he says, "declares Peter a rock because of his strong faith in Him"; and again, "The evasion often taken advantage of in controversy with Rome—viz. that the 'rock' means, not Peter himself, but the firm faith and the confession of it on the part of the Apostle—is incorrect, since the demonstrative expression, 'on *this* rock,' can only mean the Apostle himself." We may add that Cephas (כֵּיפָא) is a common word in the Chaldee Targums for "rock"—*e.g.* "in the shadow of the rock" (Targ. on Isa. xxxii. 2. Other instances in Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*). In the Syriac form it occurs very frequently in the Peshito, where it means, (1) "rock"; (2) "stone"; (3) "Peter." Thus, in the text before us (Mt. xvi. 18) we have the very same word for Πέτρος and πέτρα: "Thou art Cephas [ܟܐܦܐ], and on this Cepha I will build my Church."

[1] Usually, "binding" and "loosing" are taken to mean "retaining" and "remitting" sins. But "bind" and "loose" were the technical words with the Rabbis (see הִתִּיר אָסַר in Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. et Rabb.*) for "prohibition and permission;" and it is very hard to see how Christ's words could have conveyed any other sense to His hearers,

because on him, the man of rock, on him and him alone, the faith of the Church depends. It is his peculiar office to strengthen his brethren. Even so determined a Protestant as Bengel admits that "this whole speech of our Lord presupposes that Peter is the first of the Apostles, on whose stability or fall the less or greater danger of the others depended (*quo stante aut cadente caeteri aut minus aut magis periclitarentur*)."

After the resurrection Christ graciously allowed St. Peter to atone for his threefold denial by a threefold declaration of love, and again, under a new metaphor, Christ committed to him the fulness of jurisdiction. Christ was, and ever is, the Good Shepherd, but in a few days His visible presence was to be withdrawn, and on earth Peter was to be chief shepherd of Christ's flock. "Feed my lambs." "Be the shepherd of My sheep" (perhaps "little sheep," προβάτια). "Feed my sheep" (perhaps προβάτια again). The Church was still Christ's flock ("my lambs," "my sheep"), but Peter is entrusted by Christ with the office of feeding both the old and the little ones of the flock. The duty of feeding the young and "the watchful care and rule over maturer Christians" (Westcott, *ad loc.*) are alike laid upon him. The gift of the Holy Ghost, the power of remitting and retaining sins, are bestowed on the other Apostles as well as upon St. Peter. But Peter alone receives the keys of the Church; he alone is the rock on which the Church is built; on the faith of him alone the faith even of the other Apostles depends; he alone is made the shepherd of the whole flock.

This primacy of Peter after Christ's ascension clearly manifests itself even in the scanty records of the New Testament, though it must not be forgotten that the personal infallibility of the other Apostles and the fact that they were free to extend their missionary conquests throughout the earth made their relation to Peter very different from that between the Pope and bishops of later times, who have no gift of infallibility and whose jurisdiction is confined to the limits of a particular diocese. Still, as has been said, the subordination of the other Apostles to Peter does evidently appear. At his instigation steps were taken to fill up the vacancy in the Apostolic College, and he laid down the rules of the election. "The punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, the anathema on Simon Magus, the first heretic, the first visiting and confirming the churches suffering under persecution, were all his acts. If he was sent with St. John by the Apostolic College to the new converts at Samaria, he was himself member and president of that college. So the Jews sent their high-priest Ismael to Nero: and St. Ignatius ('Philad.' 10, PG, v. 837) says that the neighbouring churches in Asia had sent, some their bishops, some their priests and deacons" (Döllinger, "First Age of the Church"). He was indeed the Apostle of the Circumcision, in this following Christ, who had said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. xv. 24), while St. Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 7). This, however, involved no more than a division of labour, and in no way derogated from St. Peter's position as chief of the Apostles and head of the whole Church. On the contrary, it was St. Peter who was taught by revelation "to call no man common or unclean," and who first publicly and solemnly opened the gates of the Church to the Gentiles by the baptism of Cornelius (Acts x.). St. Paul did not enter upon his peculiar office of preaching to the Gentiles till after his fifteen days' conference with St. Peter (Gal. i. 18), and this though he constantly insists on the fact that his doctrine and Apostolic authority came to him direct from heaven. About A.D. 51 an Apostolic council was held at Jerusalem to decide the controversy with the Judaisers. "Certain men coming down [to Antioch] from Judaea kept teaching the brethren, 'Unless ye are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'" It is often alleged that St. James's position in the assembly is quite inconsistent with St. Peter's primacy. The very contrary seems to be the case. No doubt St. James says (Acts xv. 19), "I judge"—*i.e.* "I give a decision for myself and my brother Apostles." But we cannot understand the history till we observe that there were two questions before the council: one a question of doctrine—viz. Is circumcision necessary for salvation? and then a question of expediency—What disciplinary decree will be most likely to promote peace between Jewish and Gentile converts? On the former question St. Peter pronounces authoritatively. He is the first to speak. He tells the assembly that God had ordained that the Gentiles should hear the Gospel "through my mouth," that God had "purified their hearts by faith," that He had made no difference between Jew and Gentile, that both were to be saved by the grace of Christ. Thereupon "the whole multitude was silent," and heard Paul and Barnabas recount their missionary experience (v. 12). St. James refers to and accepts St. Peter's doctrinal decision (v. 14), and proceeds to give his own judgment on the practical rules to be laid down—viz. abstinence from things offered to idols, things strangled, blood, &c. It was natural, on Catholic principles, that St. Peter should pronounce the doctrinal decision; it was also natural and fitting, in the circumstances, that St. James should give his judgment on the practical rules, for St. Peter and St. Paul were both parties in the dispute, already committed to the cause of freedom and spirituality; while, on the other hand, St. James, the head of the chief Jewish church, was just the man likely to conciliate the

Pharisaic party. Further, in a famous passage (Gal. ii. 11), St. Paul says of himself that he "withstood Peter to the face, because he was condemned" (*κατεγνωσμένος—i.e.* "his conduct carried its own condemnation with it," Lightfoot, *ad loc.*). But there was no question of error in faith. St. Paul himself circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews who were in those parts (Lystra and Iconium)" (Acts xvi. 3). So St. Peter, when he went to Antioch, withdrew from eating with the Gentile converts and acted against the principles of Gospel liberty he had maintained at Jerusalem shortly before. This proves, no doubt, that St. Peter was capable of error in judgment and of vacillation. It is no argument against his primacy, nor does it show that he could teach the Church false doctrine, or cease to be the rock on which its faith is built. In short, the Gospels in plain and unmistakeable terms recount the divine institution of the Petrine primacy. There is nothing to contradict and something to confirm the Gospel view of Peter's primacy in the Apostolic records, and the natural exposition of Christ's words remains in its rights.

(2) *The Pope in the Ante-Nicene Age.*—It is the constant tradition of the earliest Christian writers that Peter held the first place among the Apostles. Tertullian ("Praescr." 22, PL, ii. 34; "Monog." 8) asserts that Peter is the rock on which the Church was built, and, again, that Christ left the keys to him and "through him to the Church" ("Scorp." 10), which last words exactly tally with the Catholic doctrine that Peter is the fountain-head of all spiritual rule and jurisdiction. Clement of Alexandria ("Quis Dives," c. xxi. p. 947) speaks of Peter as "the elect, the chosen one, the first of the disciples." Origen declares that Peter was "the great foundation of the Church, the most solid rock on which Christ founded" it, that he was "the prince of the Apostles" ("In Exod." Hom. v. PG, xii. 329; "In Luc." Hom. xvii.).[1] It is impossible to give in full all or nearly all the passages in St. Cyprian which express his belief in St. Peter's primacy, for he is never weary of asserting it. We may quote, however, the following words: "Peter, on whom the Church had been built" (Ep. lix. 7, ed. Hartel, p. 674); "One Church founded on Peter" (Ep. lxx. 3, p. 769); "Peter, to whom the Lord entrusted the feeding and the care of His sheep, on whom He set and founded His Church" ("De Habit. Virg." 10, 194); "One is the Church and founded on one, who also received its keys" (Ep. lxxiii. 11, p. 786); "Peter, on whom He built His Church and from whom He instituted and showed the origin of unity" (Ep. lxxiii. 7, 783). Cyprian has been sometimes understood to mean that St. Peter received his power as the representative of all; that he merely stood for the Apostles who were all one in dignity and jurisdiction. But the words just cited go far beyond this. Christ, according to Cyprian, did not merely show the unity by giving the keys to Peter alone, but He "instituted" the unity of the Church from Peter—*i.e.* He made the Church one by giving it one visible head. We may also refer to Ep. lxvi. 8, p. 732; Ep. xliii. 5, 594. It is true that in one of his letters (Ep. lxxi. 3, p. 773) Cyprian argues that the controversy on the validity of heretical baptism must be decided "by reason, not custom," and urges that even Peter, "whom the Lord chose as the first [*quem primum elegit*; Peter, of course, was not chosen first in order of time], and on whom He built His Church, when afterwards Paul disputed with him about the circumcision, made no arrogant claim or insolent assumption, so as to say that he held the primacy and that those who were new and had come later should rather give way to him; nor did he despise Paul because he had been previously a persecutor of the Church, but he admitted the counsel of truth and easily agreed to the good reason which Paul asserted." But St. Cyprian here is not denying St. Peter's primacy; on the contrary, he implies his belief in it. What he says is that St. Peter did not assert his authority on that occasion, and this simple statement of fact would be accepted by all. Cyprian's works ("Sentent. Episc." 17, p. 444) supply us with another testimony from one of his contemporaries and fellow-bishops to the general belief that Christ "built the Church on Peter." We conclude with another illustration, which has an interest of its own. The "Homilies," falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome, betray their Judaizing and heretical character in this among other ways, that they exalt the dignity of St. James, "the bishop of bishops," and of the Mother Church of Jerusalem. Yet even there we find St. Peter called "the foundation of the Church" (p. 10, ed. Dressel: p. 6, ed. Lagarde), "the firm rock which is the foundation of the Church" (Hom. xvii. 19; see also viii. 5).

St. Peter's connection with the Roman Church as its founder is proved by historical evidence which cannot be set aside, except by an extreme scepticism which would serve equally to undermine the historical character of the New Testament. The New Testament itself is silent about St. Peter's presence at Rome, except that St. Peter, in his first Epistle, sends greetings from the Church in Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13), which all ancient writers, with, so far as we know, only one late and insignificant exception (that of Cosmas Indicopleustes), understand to mean Rome. Many internal arguments from the N.T., ably stated by Döllinger ("First Age of the Church," p. 97 *seq.*), support this view. But, apart from

[1] For the passages in which Origen seems, but only seems, to hold a contrary view on the title "rock," see the note of Huetius on Origen, "In Matt." tom. 12.

this, we have abundant evidence from the earliest ages and from every quarter of the globe. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (about 170), in a letter to the Roman Christians (apud Euseb. "H.E." ii. 25), mentions the fact that both the Corinthian and Roman Churches were "planted" by Peter and Paul (*τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν*), and that both died as martyrs there at the same time. About 190, Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John, speaks ("Adv. Haer." iii. 3, PG, vii. 848) of the Roman Church as "greatest, most ancient, known to all, founded and constituted by the most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul." "Having founded and built the Church [of Rome], the blessed Apostles entrusted to Linus the administration of the episcopacy." Caius, a Roman presbyter under Zephyrinus (200–218), says: "I can point out the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian road, you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church" (Euseb. "H.E." ii. 25). A little later, the African Tertullian tells us ("Adv. Marc." iv. 5, PL, ii. 366) that Peter and Paul left to the Romans "the gospel sealed with their blood"; that Clement, bishop of Rome, was ordained by Peter ("Praescr." 32, PL, ii. 45); that at Rome Peter suffered like his Master ("Praescr." 36, PL, ii. 49). This early evidence from Greece, Gaul, Africa, and Rome itself is so certain and so sufficient that we do not care to dwell on evidence which is merely probable. The language of St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John ("Rom." 4, PG, v. 809), as Bishop Lightfoot justly remarks (in his edition of Clem. Rom. p. 46), "seems to imply that they [Peter and Paul] had both preached in Rome," and the preaching and death of the two Apostles there appear to have been the subject of a very early work, "The Acts of Peter and Paul" (see Hilgenfeld, "Nov. Test. extra Canonem Recept." fascic. iv. p. 68). Against this uniform tradition nothing can be advanced on the other side. It was this connection of Peter with Rome which made "the Chair of Peter" an accepted name for the Roman see. Thus Cyprian (Ep. lix. 14, p. 683) uses the following words of persons who had been concerned in the schism of Felicissimus and had gone to Rome: "They dare to sail to the see of Peter and to the chief church [*ad ecclesiam principalem*], from which the unity of bishops [*unitas sacerdotalis*] has arisen." The early Church thus believed in the primacy of Peter, and also held that the Roman Church is "the Chair of Peter."

Nor is direct testimony to the authority and supremacy of the Roman Church wanting. At the very beginning of patristic literature Ignatius describes the Roman Church as "presiding in the place of the region of the Romans," and again, as the Church "which presides over charity" ("Rom." ad init., PG, v. 801). Hefele, in his edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," takes this latter phrase to mean a presidence over "the whole congregation of Christians," who are bound together by charity, and this interpretation is defended at length by Hagemann ("Römische Kirche," p. 681 *seq.*). So too Duchesne: "Le sens le plus naturel de ce langage, c'est que l'Église romaine préside à l'ensemble des églises. Comme l'évêque préside dans son église aux œuvres de charité, ainsi l'Église romaine préside à ces mêmes œuvres dans la chrétienté tout entière." And he quotes Harnack as being of the same opinion (Duchesne, "Églises Séparées," p. 128). In any case the primacy of Rome over the Christian world is acknowledged, for had Ignatius meant to confine the primacy of the Roman Church to Rome itself, the assertion would have come to this, that the Roman Church presided over itself, which has no meaning. "Presides" (*προκάθηται*) is the very word which St. Ignatius uses (*e.g.* "Magnes." 6, PG, v. 764) to describe the authority of the bishop in his own diocese; and this acknowledgment is all the more important because it comes from one who was himself bishop of Antioch, which also could boast of its connection with St. Peter. Tertullian makes communion with the Apostolic Churches—*i.e.* the Churches founded by Apostles—the test of Catholic unity ("Praescr." 21 *et passim*, PL, ii. 33); but Rome alone he calls "the happy Church, into which the Apostles poured all their doctrine with their blood" ("Praescr." 36, PL, ii. 49). The words Tertullian wrote after his lapse into Montanist heresy disclose still more plainly the power claimed by the Pope in his day. For he ridicules the "peremptory edict" of Zephyrinus the Roman bishop and his pretence to speak as "bishop of bishops." "I want to know," he exclaims, "how you usurp this authority for the Church." [1] And at once he answers his own question by supposing that the Pope does so on the strength of the words, "On this rock I will build my Church," "To thee have I given the keys of the kingdom of heaven," "Whatsoever thou shalt bind or loose on earth, will be bound or loosed in heaven." (Tertull. "De Pudic." 21, PL, ii. 1025). But the most important testimony to the authority of Rome in the first ages of the Church is that of Irenaeus. He wrote the third book of his work against heresies, in which the words which we are about to quote occur, between 184 and 192.[2]

[1] *I.e.* for the Roman Church, because founded by Peter. "Idcirco praesumis et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam."

[2] In iii. 21 he mentions Theodotion's version of the O.T., which was not published before 180 (see Field, *Hexapl. Orig.* tom. i. p. 38); and in iii. 3 he speaks of Eleutherus (177–190, according to Jaffé, *Regest. Pontif.*) as actual bishop of Rome. With the exception of a few fragments, the work of Irenaeus only remains in a Latin version. Massuet (Diss. ii. § 53), Lachmann (*N.T. Graece et Latine*, Praef. p. x), and Westcott (*N.T. Canon*, p. 280)

But he "is rightly included in what may be called the Apostolic family" (Newman, "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical," p. 200), for he was the disciple of St. Polycarp (Iren. ad Florin. apud Euseb. "H.E." v. 20), who was the disciple of St. John. He had singular opportunities of knowing the mind of the Church throughout the world, for he was brought up in Asia Minor, he was bishop of Lyons, and twice at least he came into intimate relations with Rome. Irenaeus then appeals ("Adv. Haer." iii. 3, PG, vii. 848), in attacking Gnostic error, to the Apostles. They, he insists, had perfect knowledge, and delivered the truth in its fulness to the Church. He points out that different churches are able to trace back the succession of their bishops to the Apostles, and, since it would be tedious to enumerate all these churches, he has recourse to the Church of Rome, founded by "two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul." "Pointing to the tradition which this Church has received from the Apostles, to that faith which has been announced to the whole world, and which has come even to us by the succession of bishops," we confound all who err from the right way. "For with this Church, because of its more powerful principality,[1] every church must agree—that is, the faithful everywhere [2]—in which [3] [*i.e.* in communion with the Roman Church] the tradition of the Apostles has ever been preserved by those on every side." Then he enumerates the series of Popes, beginning with Linus. According to St. Irenaeus, the faithful all over the world must agree with the teaching of the Roman see, in which the tradition of the whole Church is virtually contained. This assent is due because Rome has the "more powerful principality," and this principality rests on the Apostolic dignity of the Roman Church, as the whole context shows. When Irenaeus wrote, general councils had not been dreamt of. It was from the Apostles, not from them, that the Roman Church derived her supreme power. Nor, again, does Rome depend upon the assent of the faithful; on the contrary, it is the faithful all over the world who are bound to agree with her. This passage has been the crux of Protestant theologians. For two centuries and more they have been devising a variety of interpretations, no one of which has found general acceptance even among themselves. Ziegler admits that the saint, "passing, as it were in prophecy, beyond himself, anticipates the Papal Church of the future," that he marks out Rome "as the chief seat of Apostolic tradition, as the centre which sustains and unites the whole Church." ("Irenäus," 1871, p. 151.)[1]

We cannot expect many instances of the exercise of Papal power at this time. Time was needed to develop the principles contained in the Apostolic tradition on "the Chair of Peter," and, besides, the hand of the persecutor was heavy on the Church. Still, indications of Roman supremacy are not wanting in the facts of early history. "The heretic Marcion, excommunicated in Pontus, betakes himself to Rome." "The Montanists from Phrygia come to Rome to gain the countenance of its bishops; Praxeas from Asia attempts the like." "St. Victor, bishop of Rome, threatens to excommunicate the Asian churches." "St. Stephen refuses to receive St. Cyprian's deputation, and separates himself from various churches of the East; Fortunatus and Felix, deposed by Cyprian, have recourse to Rome; Basilides deposed in Spain, betakes himself to Rome." "The presbyters of St. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, complain of his doctrine to St. Dionysius of Rome; the latter expostulates with him and he explains." (Newman, "Development," p. 157 *seq.*; cf. Duchesne, "Églises Séparées," p. 135.[2]) No doubt the early Fathers spoke and acted at times in a manner inconsistent with their own utterances elsewhere on Roman authority. This was perfectly natural, seeing that they had indeed the tradition of the Church, but not formal definitions or even a developed theological system to guide them. It would, of course, be a monstrous anachronism were we to attribute a belief in Papal infallibility to Ante-Nicene Fathers. Our contention simply is that the modern doctrine on Papal power is the logical outcome of patristic principles. It is another and a very different thing to say that the early Fathers themselves saw all this, and they were of course furthest from seeing it when they were irritated by an unwonted

consider that the version was known to Tertullian, and therefore nearly contemporaneous with the Greek. Massuet's conclusion was contested by Sabatier (*Vetus Italica*, Praef. n. 93) and the Benedictine authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. i. "S. Irénée," § 2. In any case, the fidelity of the Latin is admitted on all hands. The Syriac Fragments, published by Harvey in 1857, would prove this, "if a doubtful cause needed support" (Harvey's *Irenaeus*, vol. ii. p. 431).

[1] "Principalitas" can only mean "principality" or "supremacy." It occurs: iv. 38, "God holds the principality"; ii. 30, God "is above every principality and domination." In eight other places it is used of the supreme God of the Gnostics. So, i. 26, 1, "the principality which is above all," "the principality which is above everything." It is used—as we know from the Fragments of the original Greek preserved in *Philosophum.* x. 21; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* i. 15—to translate *ἀνθεντία*, "authority" or "supremacy."

[2] "Undique" = "ubique," as Thiersch and Stieren admit. Cf. iii. 24, 1, "Praedicationem ecclesiae undique constantem," with i. 10, 2, "Praedicatio veritatis ubique lucet."

[3] "In qua," "in which"—*i.e.* "in union with which," or "in the unity of which." Cf. "Salutem in eo dedit" (iii. 12. 4); "Quod perdideramus in Adam" (iii. 18, 1); and "In qua una cathedra [sc. Petri] unitas ab omnibus servaretur" (Optat. *Schism. Don.* ii. 2).

[1] The interpretation given in the text is that of the Gallicans Natalis Alexander, Bossuet, Massuet, and Ceillier; also of Döllinger, *Church History*, Engl. Transl. i. p. 256, and Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. p. 409. Interpretations mutually destructive will be found in Salmasius, *De Primatu*, p. 65; Grabe, *ad loc.*; Neander, i. p. 259; Gieseler, i. p. 175.

[2] "Le centre d'une future orthodoxie était évidemment là (à Rome). Sous Antonin (138–161) le germe de la papauté existe bien caracterisé" (Renan, "Rome et le Christianisme," p. 153, cf. p. 172).

interference on the part of Rome or opposed to Rome in theological controversy. And it deserves to be carefully remembered that there is no counter-theory to be found in the Fathers of the Ante-Nicene age. The external unity of the Church is their constant theme. But if the see of Peter was not the centre of unity, then what was? If two bishops anathematized and refused to communicate with each other, how were the faithful to know which of the two was in the unity of the Church? If we do not take the chair of Peter as the centre of unity, then the Ante-Nicene Fathers supply no answer to the question. They never mention general councils or appeal to a majority of the bishops throughout the world. Yet, if each bishop is to be independent and subject to God alone, we should have a thousand Popes instead of one, and the unity of the Church would be shattered into pieces.[1] Our opponents may complain that the early Fathers do not speak fully enough on the authority of Rome, that their acts and dicta are occasionally inconsistent with Roman claims. They cannot say with any show of reason that the drift of patristic teaching tends to any definite theory of church unity, other than that of the Catholic Roman Church.

(3) *The Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.*—Here the difficulty lies, not in finding proofs that Papal supremacy was asserted and recognized, but in selecting typical instances from the mass of evidence. "More ample testimony," says Cardinal Newman, "for the Papal supremacy, as now professed by Roman Catholics, is scarcely necessary than what is contained" in a series of passages which he quotes. ("Development," p. 148 *seq.*) "The simple question is whether the clear light of the fourth and fifth centuries may be fairly taken to interpret to us the dim, though definite, outlines traced in the preceding"—*i.e.* the Ante-Nicene age. The following are among the most striking passages in which the Fathers maintain not only that the Pope holds a supremacy of jurisdiction by divine right, but also that communion with him is the necessary condition of Catholic unity.

Optatus (lib. ii. c. 2, 3, PL, xi. 947): "You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was bestowed on Peter first, in which Peter, head of all the Apostles, sat, in which one chair unity was to be preserved (*servaretur*) by all, that the rest of the Apostles might not maintain each his own chair, that he might be at once a schismatic and a sinner who against the chair which stands by itself (*singularem cathedram*) set another." He then enumerates the Popes from Peter down to Siricius, the Pope of his own day.

The Council of Aquileia, in which St. Ambrose took a chief part, begs in a letter to the Emperor Gratian that he will "not permit the Roman Church, the head of the whole Roman world and that sacred faith of the Apostles, to be disturbed, because from it the rights of venerable admonition flow forth for all" (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 52). St. Ambrose tells us ("De Excessu Satyri," i. 47, PL, xvi. 1306) that his brother, in places where the schism of Lucifer prevailed, if he doubted the orthodoxy of a bishop, asked him "if he communicated with the Catholic bishops, that is, with the Roman Church."

St. Jerome (Ep. 15, PL, xxii. 355) addresses these words to Pope Damasus: "Following none but Christ, I am associated in communion with your Holiness—that is, with the chair of Peter. On that rock I know the Church was built. Whosoever eateth the lamb out of this house is profane. If anyone is not in the ark of Noe he will perish when the floods prevail. . . . I know not Vitalis; I will have none of Meletius; Paulinus is strange to me. Whoso gathereth not with you scattereth; that is, he who is not on Christ's side is with Antichrist."

"Come, my brethren," says St. Augustine to the Donatists ("Ps. contr. Don.," PL, xliii. 30), "if you wish to be grafted in the vine. . . . Reckon up the bishops even from the very see of Peter. . . . That is the rock which the haughty gates of hell do not overcome." In 416 a council of sixty-eight bishops at Carthage, and of fifty-nine at Mileve in Numidia, condemned Pelagius, whose doctrine had been anathematized five years before in another council at Carthage. Each of the two last councils sent letters to Pope Innocent, begging that Apostolic authority might be given to their decrees ("Ep. Concil. Carthag." Galland. Epp. Innoc. 26; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 183, 184). Another letter was sent to the Pope by Augustine and four other bishops, in which they tell him what had been done against Pelagianism. All these letters are full of deference to the Apostolic See, and the Bishops of the Council at Mileve tell the Pope that heretics were more likely to yield to his authority, which was "derived from the authority of Holy Scripture" ("auctoritati tuae ex scripturarum sacrarum auctoritate depromptae," Galland. Ep. 28). Innocent replied, commending them for following the old rule which prescribed that answers should come to all the provinces from the Apostolic fount. Before Rome spoke, but after the provincial councils, St. Augustine (Ep. 178) admits that "Pelagianism was not yet fully excluded from the Church." After the councils had been confirmed by Rome, after the rescript came, he thought that by the letters of Innocent "the whole doubt had

[1] Cyprian, indeed, does, in the stress of controversy, commit himself to a theory of absolute episcopal independence (Ep. lv. 21, p. 639). But he distinctly contradicts himself even in the same Epistle (lv. 24, p. 642) and lxiv. 1, lix. 9, pp. 717, 676.

been removed" ("Contr. Ep. Pelag." ii. 3, PL, x. 574). Pelagius himself had promised "to condemn all which that see [the Roman see] had condemned" (August. "De Peccat. Orig." 7). We need not dwell on the claims made by the Popes themselves. "The canons themselves have decided," says Pope Gelasius (492–6) writing to Faustus, "that no one whosoever shall appeal from this see, and so provide that it shall judge the whole Church and itself be judged by none. . . . Timothy of Alexandria, Peter of Antioch, Peter, Paul, John, not one, but many, bearing the episcopal name, by the authority of the Apostolic see alone, were cast down. . . . Therefore, we are in no fear lest the Apostolic judgment be reversed, to which the voice of Christ, tradition, and the canons have given the decision of controversy throughout the whole church." (Mansi, "Concil." tom. viii. 16 *seq.*) At an earlier date—viz. in the year 422—Pope Boniface had spoken of the Roman see as that "from which, if any divide himself, he becomes an outcast from the religion of Christ" (Galland. Epp. Bonifac. 14).

It may be objected that all this is Western evidence. But testimony quite as strong comes to us from the East. In 341 (or, as some think, 342) Pope Julius, with a synod of fifty Italian bishops (see Athanas. "Apol. contr. Arianos," ad init., and the epistle of the Synod of Philippopolis, Mansi, tom. iii. 130) restored two Eastern prelates, St. Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople, to their sees. "He" (Pope Julius), says the Greek historian Socrates ("H. E." ii. 15), "in accordance with the prerogatives of the Roman Church, established the bishops in outspoken letters, sent them back to the East, restored each to his own see, and laid his hand upon those who had rashly deposed them." Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, was reinstated on producing a letter of restitution from Pope Liberius (Basil. Ep. 263, PG, xxxii. 980). Chrysostom and his persecutor Theophilus appealed to Pope Innocent. The latter also addressed himself to the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia, but that the appeal was made specially to Rome appears from the statement in a letter from Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, who was a friend of Chrysostom's—viz. "that he abode by the judgment of the Romans" (ὡς ἐμμένει τῇ κρίσει τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων). See the life by Palladius, himself a contemporary of Chrysostom, cap. 3. But it is in the proceedings of the two great Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon that Roman supremacy, with its divine sanction, shines forth most clearly. Cyril did not dare to break off communion with Nestorius till he had consulted Pope Celestine. He begged the Pope to declare his mind on this point (Mansi, "Concil." tom. iv. 1011 *seq.*). The Pope told his legates to act, not as disputants, but as judges (Galland. Ep. Cel. 17). The Fathers of Ephesus passed sentence on Nestorius, "compelled and constrained [ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες] by the sacred canons and the letter of our most holy Father and fellow-minister Celestine, bishop of the Roman Church." (Mansi, iv. 1207.) John of Antioch, after a schismatical resistance to Pope and council, returned to Catholic unity. Whereupon Sixtus III. reminds him that he has learnt by experience "what it is to think with us. Blessed Peter, in the person of his successors, has handed down what he has received. Who would wish to cut himself off from the first of the Apostles, taught by our master Himself?" (Galland. Epp. Sixt. III. Ep. 6.) The Fathers of Chalcedon acknowledge that the Pope had presided over the council through his legates "as head over the members," that the Pope "is appointed for all (πᾶσι καθιστάμενος) interpreter of the voice of Peter"; they say that "Dioscorus had dared to restore Eutyches to the dignity of which he had been deprived by his Holiness," and had "turned in his madness against him to whom the Saviour had entrusted the guardianship of the vine." They mention the 28th canon, and ask its confirmation, that "the establishment of good discipline (εὐταξίας), as well as of faith, might be attributed" to Leo. Finally, they gave an account of all that had been done to the Pope, "that he might confirm it" (εἰς βεβαίωσιν, Mansi, tom. vi. 148 *seq.*). Next year the Emperor Marcian wrote to Leo that doubts had arisen in the minds of many whether his Holiness had confirmed the decrees of the council (τὰ τυπωθέντα ἐβεβαίωσεν). One more instance and we have done. The Formulary or Libellus of Pope Hormisdas was signed in 519 by the Bishop of Constantinople, and imposed by the Byzantine emperor upon all the bishops within his dominions. It contains the following words: "Whereas the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be set aside, in which He says, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church'; the above words are confirmed by the effects, since in the Apostolic see religion has ever been preserved without stain. Anxious, therefore, by no means to be severed from his hope and faith, and following in all things the constitutions of the Fathers, we anathematize all heretics, especially Nestorius, &c. . . receive and approve all the encyclical letters of Pope Leo, which he wrote concerning the Christian religion. Whence, as we have said before, following in all things the Apostolic see, and proclaiming all its constitutions, I hope I may attain" (we are not responsible for the grammar) "to be with you in the one communion which the Apostolic see proclaims, in which is the perfect and true solidity of the Christian religion. (Mansi, tom. viii. 407; Hefele-Leclercq, ii. pp. 1024, 1052.) This

Libellus was also approved by the Eighth General Council.

Such was the tradition of East and West, long before the forgery of the False Decretals, long before schism rent the Eastern patriarchates from the obedience due to the Holy See. With good right, therefore, did the Council of Florence define "that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles; that he is the true vicar of Christ; that he is head of the whole Church, Father and doctor of all Christians; that to him [in the person of] blessed Peter was given full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church, as also [1] is contained in the acts of oecumenical councils and in the holy canons." It is necessary to bear in mind that all Catholics, Gallican as well as Ultramontane, accepted the belief that the Roman Church is the centre of unity, and that communion with her is the test of Catholicity. "The Son of God," says Bossuet, "since He willed that His Church should be one. . . . instituted the primacy of St. Peter to maintain and cement it." The chair of Peter "is the common centre of all Catholic unity." ("Exposition de la Foi Catholique," 21.) "The Catholic Church from her birth has had for a mark of her unity her communion with the chair of St. Peter, so that, remaining in it, as we do, without letting anything separate us from it, we are the body which has seen those who have severed themselves fall on the right hand and the left" ("Première Instruction Pastorale sur les Promesses de l'Église," n. 32). "We grant that in Church law there is nothing the Pope cannot do, when need requires it" ("Def." xi. 20). He looked on Archbishop Fénelon's submission to the Pope, who condemned his book, as a natural act of "ecclesiastical subordination," for "there is one chief bishop, there is one Peter appointed to guide all the flock, there is one Mother Church established to teach all the others; and the Church of Jesus Christ founded on that unity, as on an immovable rock, cannot be shaken" ("Relation des Actes et Délibérations" on Quietism, vol. xx. p. 505, in the edition of Bossuet, by Lachat, Paris, 1864).

(4) *The Vatican Decrees.*—In two important particulars the last council went beyond the principles accepted by Gallicans. First it defined that the Pope has not only "the office of inspection and direction," but also "the whole fulness of supreme power" in discipline as well as faith, and that this power is "ordinary and immediate over all and each of the pastors and of the faithful." This is in no way meant to derogate from the rights of bishops, or to make them mere delegates or vicars of the Pope. On the contrary, the council teaches that they too have "ordinary and immediate jurisdiction" in their dioceses, that they have been "placed by the Holy Ghost," that they have succeeded to the position of the Apostles," that they are "true pastors." It may be well to quote on this point two theologians whom no one will suspect of watering down the Ultramontane doctrine. Speaking of the allegation that Ultramontanes "consider the episcopate as the Pope's mere creation and vicegerent, just, *e.g.*, as the Roman Congregations are," W. G. Ward replies that "every Catholic would repudiate such a tenet as erroneous and even heretical." (See Ward, "Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority," pp. 376, 377.) So again, Dr. Murray (author of the treatise "De Ecclesia," &c.) writes: "Christ established not episcopal order merely, but episcopal jurisdiction. That is, He ordained that there should be for ever in the Church, besides the universal pastor, pastors having particular flocks, with power to teach, legislate, inflict censures," &c., &c. The Pope may for a just cause withdraw jurisdiction from a particular bishop, but he cannot destroy the *corpus episcoporum*. Such is the true sense of the Vatican decree, and plainly it is in perfect harmony with the exposition given above of Christ's words to St. Peter, "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep." The whole flock and each member of it are given to St. Peter's charge. His successors draw their authority over each Christian from Christ Himself. The Pope, in virtue of his office, has direct power over each Christian in any particular diocese; the bishop of that diocese has the same power attached to his office, but the bishop must exercise it in union with and subordination to the Pope. There is no difficulty in supposing that superior and inferior may both have ordinary jurisdiction in the same place. Thus the ordinary right which the constitution might give a sovereign to try legal cases by commission would in no way make it impossible for the appointed judges also to exercise ordinary jurisdiction.

Next, the Vatican Council teaches "that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedrâ*—that is, when he, using his office as pastor and doctor of all Christians, in virtue of his Apostolic office defines a doctrine of faith and morals to be held by the whole Church,

[1] "Quemadmodum etiam" (*καθ' ὃν τρόπον*) is now proved to be the true reading. It is found in the original copy signed by the Council (Milanesi, in the *Giornale Storico degli Archivi Toscani* for 1857, pp. 196–225; and Cecconi, in the *Armonia* Feb. 1870). It was in the "authentic" copy of the Colbertine library (Bossuet, *Def. Cler. Gall.* vi. 11); in the authentic copy of the Vatican (see the letter of Mamachius, Orsi, *Rom. Pont.* vi. 11); in the fifteenth century copies of the Vatican (Facsimiles in *Civiltà*, Feb. 5, 1870). Of these last, one has "etiam" written "et," whence probably the false reading "quemadmodum et" crept into the text of Blondus and obtained some currency in the printed copies. Brequigny (*Mémoires de la Société des Inscriptions*, tom. xliii. 306 *seq.*) denies (against the authors of the *Nouvelle Diplomatique*, v. 315 *seq.*) that any of the four originals mentioned by Syropulus exist. He admits, however, that the MS. copy at Florence was made before the departure of the Greeks, so that in any case the question is completely settled.

he, by the divine assistance, promised to him in the blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer was pleased to invest His Church in the definition of doctrine on faith or morals, and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable in their own nature and not because of the consent of the Church" ("Pastor Aeternus," cap. 4). The Pope in himself is subject to error like other men; his infallibility comes from the Spirit of God, which on certain occasions, and under certain conditions, protects him from error in faith and morals. He has no infallibility in merely historical or scientific questions. Even in matters of faith and morals he has no inspiration and must use the same means of theological inquiry open to other men. He may err as a private doctor; nor is any immunity from error granted to books which he may write and publish. The Vatican Council only requires us to believe that God protects him from error in definitions on faith or morals when he imposes a belief on the Universal Church.

So understood, the Papal infallibility follows by logical consequence from principles already illustrated in this article and that on the CHURCH. Our argument is not addressed to Protestants. They must understand and accept the infallibility of the Church, and the position of the Holy See as the foundation of faith and centre of unity, before they can understand or accept the Vatican definitions. It is against the Gallican theory that we are arguing now, and we therefore take for granted the Catholic principles which Gallicans held.

We have seen that from the earliest times the faith of Peter and his successors has been taken as the foundation of the Church; indeed, so much is implied in Christ's words to the chief of his Apostles. Peter, says Bossuet, by his confession of Christ's Godhead "attracts to himself that inviolable promise which makes him the foundation of the Church. The word of Jesus Christ, which makes what He wills out of nothing gives such strength to a mortal. Let it not be said or thought that St. Peter's ministry ends with himself; that which is to serve as the support of an eternal Church can never end. Peter will live in his successors; Peter will ever speak in his chair; this is what the Fathers say, and 630 bishops at the Council of Chalcedon confirm" (Sermon à l'Ouverture de l'Assemblée-générale du Clergé). Now, if Peter and his successors are the foundation of an infallible Church, of a Church, moreover, unchangeable in constitution, they themselves must be infallible. If they were to impose a false belief on Christians, the faith and infallibility of the Church itself would be shaken.

Let us turn once again to Bossuet, and see how he expounds Christ's charge to Peter, "Confirm thy brethren." Christ, he says, "does not merely give a commandment to Peter individually": Peter receives "an office which [Christ] founds and institutes in His Church for ever." "There was always to be a Peter in the Church to confirm his brethren in the faith; it was the most fitting means of establishing that unity of sentiments which the Saviour desired above everything; and that authority was so much the more necessary for the successors of the Apostles, inasmuch as their faith was less stable than that of those from whom they sprang" (*de leurs auteurs*, "Méditations sur l'Evangile," lxxii.). But if the bishops are infallible because confirmed in the faith by Peter's successors, those who hold Peter's place must be themselves infallible. Further, if the see of Rome, which is by divine appointment the head of the Church and the centre of unity, solemnly and persistently made false belief a condition of communion, then one of two things must follow—either the body of the Church would accept the heresy which the Pope propounded and so forfeit its infallibility, or else would maintain the truth, and be left without the head and centre of unity given by Christ. Either consequence is a sheer impossibility on Gallican, no less than on Ultramontane, principles.

It must not be supposed for a moment that the Pope is an absolute monarch. He cannot, as we have already shown, annul the constitution of the Church ordained by Christ. His power of definition is limited by a multitude of previous definitions due to his predecessors, to the councils, to the ordinary exercise of the Church's magisterium through the pastors united to the Holy See.

(5) *The Pope's Election; the Exercise of his Powers; Titles, &c.*

(*a*) *Rome and the Papacy.*—As a matter of fact the Pope is and always has been Bishop of Rome, and, according to the common opinion, this connection between Rome and the Papacy exists by Divine law. According to others, however (*e.g.* Soto, apud Billuart "De Fide," diss. iv. a. 4), the Pope might choose another see, or might govern the Church without holding any special see at all.

(*β*) *Papal Election.*—In the first ages the Bishop of Rome was chosen, like other bishops, by the clergy and people, with the assent of the neighbouring bishops, and the person elected was consecrated by the Bishop of Ostia. The Christian emperors decided doubtful elections, while Odoacer and Theodoric the Great claimed the same right as kings of Italy. Felix III. was actually nominated by Theodoric, and other Italian kings received a sum of money for confirming Papal elections. After Justinian recovered Italy, the election of a new Pope was notified to the Exarch of Ravenna and confirmed

by the Byzantine emperors. From the eighth century onwards the influence of the Eastern empire over Italy declined, and the Papal elections were disturbed by factions in the city. The canon in which Hadrian I. concedes the right of nomination to Charlemagne is spurious; still, as a rule, the election took place in the presence of commissioners from the Carlovingian emperors. After the deposition and death of Charles the Fat, the Papal elections became once more and for a long time an object of factious contention, till the Roman emperors began once again to exert their influence. The first German Pope, Gregory V., owed his nomination to imperial favour, and four German bishops were raised in succession to the Papal dignity by Henry III. The decree of Nicolas II. in 1059 marks a new era. The cardinal bishops [CARDINAL] were to elect, with the approval of the clergy and people, "saving the honour due to our beloved son Henry, who is now king and will be, as we hope, by God's favour, emperor according as we have already granted to him and his successors, who have obtained this right personally from the Apostolic See." Gradually the influence of the Roman emperors fell away, and the election rested in the hands of the cardinals alone, no distinction being made between the cardinal bishops and other members of the Sacred College. Something has been said on the present mode of election and the chief enactments on the subject in the article on CONCLAVES, and to this we refer our readers, adding, however, the following facts from Ferraris (art. *Papa*). Ecclesiastical and, as is commonly held, divine law, make it impossible for a Pope to nominate his successor. The election is in the hands of the cardinals. In the event of all the cardinals being dead, some think the right of election would pass to the Canons of St. John Lateran, others to the Patriarchs, others to a general council. The cardinals are not bound to choose one of their own body; a layman, and even a married man, may be lawfully elected. In modern times Austria, France, and Spain have been allowed to exclude any single candidate, provided they notify their objection before the election is made. This, of course, is a mere concession, not a right. Portugal and Naples have claimed to exercise the same power, but have never been allowed to do so. [See VETO.]

(γ) *Coronation, &c., of the Pope.*—If the newly-elected Pope is not already a bishop, he must first be consecrated as such. This ceremony sometimes takes place quite apart from the coronation (as in Clement XIV.'s case), sometimes in connection with it, either before (Gregory XVI.) or during the Papal Mass. Before consecration he is the Pope, the supreme head of the Church, able to decree, rule, name, or depose bishops, and exercise every duty of pontifical jurisdiction; but he cannot ordain or consecrate till he has himself received the imposition of hands from other bishops, inferior to himself, and holding under and from him their sees and jurisdiction. The coronation ceremony is performed at St. Peter's, according to a rite dating from the latter part of the fourteenth century. As the Pope enters the church a clerk of the papal chapel holds up before him a reed surmounted by a handful of flax. This is lighted; it flashes up for a moment and then dies out at once as the chaplain chants "Pater sancte, sic transit gloria mundi," "Holy Father, thus passeth away the world's glory." This is done three times. The Mass is begun as usual, but before the incensation of the altar the *Blessing of the Pontiff-elect* is pronounced by three cardinal bishops, each of whom recites a prayer over him. After the collects come the so-called *Laudes*, that is, the threefold supplications to God for the welfare of the new Pope. The coronation itself takes place after Mass in the balcony over the portico of St. Peter's, overlooking the great piazza. The second cardinal deacon takes off the mitre which until now the Pope has worn, and then the senior places the tiara on his head, whereat the people cry out *Kyrie eleison*. Either on the same day or shortly afterwards the Pontiff goes to take possession of St. John Lateran, receiving the homage of the Jews on his way. But since the occupation of Rome (1870) many of these ceremonies have been curtailed. The Pope reckons his pontificate from his coronation day, although of course he is Pope from the day of his election. (Wiseman, "Last Four Popes"; Thalhofer, *Krönung*, in "Kirchenlex.")

(δ) *The Insignia of the Pope* are the *pedum rectum*, or straight crosier; the *pallium*, which he wears constantly; the *tiara*, or triple crown. [See TIARA; CROSIER; PALLIUM; KISS.] He is addressed as "Your Holiness," "Beatissime Pater," &c., and he speaks of himself as "Servus Servorum Dei." [See the article.]

(ε) *The Actual Exercise of Papal Power.*—The Pope is Bishop of Rome, Metropolitan of the Roman province, the only real Patriarch in the West (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 552 *sqq.*, on the 6th Nicene Canon). Even these offices, as held by him, differ in this from the same offices as held by others—viz. that the Pope holds them without having to render an account of his administration to any earthly superior. No line of demarcation can be drawn between the Pope's exercise of Papal and Patriarchal power. The fulness of the latter is included in the former, and, as a matter of fact, the Pope for long did not exercise throughout the whole West the power which the Eastern Patriarchs wielded in confirming the election of bishops, &c. It is still true, however, that the Pope exercises more immediate

power over bishops in the West, where there is no other Patriarch, than in the East, with Patriarchates of its own. We need not, however, consider here the Papal government in the East. The number of Greeks and Orientals who acknowledge the Pope's jurisdiction is very small, and enough has been said on the subject in other articles—*e.g.* in those on the various Eastern rites. We speak only of the Pope's power as exercised in the Latin Church, and we take as our guide Cardinal Soglia ("Institut. Juris publici Eccles." lib. ii. cap. 1).

The Pope, then, is the supreme judge in all controversies of faith, and he may, and does, exercise the power immediately or through the Sacred Congregations. Thus he may condemn or prohibit books, he may reserve to himself the canonization of saints, he may alter the rites of the Church in matters which are not essential. Often, on such occasions, the Pope, though exercising his supreme power, does not speak *ex cathedrâ* or claim infallibility. To him the supreme direction of discipline belongs. He may enact laws for the whole Church, and dispense from the common Church law. It is his duty to see that the canons are observed and to this end he may send legates and nuncios to distant provinces and receive appeals from all persons in all parts of the world. He reserves to himself the hearing of the "greater causes"—*e.g.* grave charges against a bishop. He can inflict censures, such as excommunication, on all Christians, and reserve to himself the power of absolving from certain sins. He alone can erect, suppress, and divide dioceses, translate or deprive bishops, and that without crime on their part, if the general good requires it; he alone can confirm the election of bishops or appoint coadjutors with right of succession. Bishops are required at various intervals to visit the *limina Apostolorum* and give an account of their ministry. Lastly, the Pope alone can approve new religious orders, and exempt them, if he sees fit, from episcopal jurisdiction.

(The brothers Ballerini, "De Primatu" and "De Potestate Summ. Pontif." are among the most useful books on the subject. But theologians and canonists without number have treated of it, and it would be vain to attempt an account of the literature in the space at our command. We may, however, mention Allies, "St. Peter, His Name and Office." The English reader will find the Patristic evidence given at length in Allnatt, "Cathedra Petri," and Waterworth, "The Fathers on St. Peter and his Successors." On the Anglican side Bishop Gore, "The Roman Catholic Claims," answered by Dom Chapman; Puller, "The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.")

PORTEFORIUM (*portean, portuary, portius, portuasse, porthoos, portfory*) was the common word in England for the Breviary. Originally the name was meant to denote that the book was portable, but the original meaning was forgotten and the word used of copies, however large. The word is as old as *Breviarium*, and though of constant occurrence in English documents and literature, does not seem to have been known on the Continent. (Maskell, "Mon. Rit." vol. i. p. xcviii *scq.*)

PORTER. [See OSTIARIUS.]

PORTIUNCULA. This was one of the three churches, at or near Assisi, which were repaired by St. Francis. "The old little church, . . . like the holy chapel at Loreto, is enclosed in the middle of a spacious church, annexed to a large convent in the hands of Recollects or Reformed Franciscans; it is the head or mother house of this branch of the order." [1] Here, according to the common tradition (of which, however, there is no trace in the five oldest biographies of the saint), Jesus Christ appeared to St. Francis in 1221, and "bade him go to the Pope, who would give a plenary indulgence to all sincere penitents who should devoutly visit that church." [2] Two years later, Honorius III., at the request of St. Francis, granted the indulgence (commonly known in Italy as the "Pardon of Assisi"), confining it to the 2nd of August, and to the Church of the Portiuncula. Gregory XV. (1622) extended it to all the churches of the Observant Franciscans, including the Recollects or Reformed, between first Vespers and sunset on August 2. Innocent XI. (1678), in favour of the same churches, allowed this indulgence to be applied by way of suffrage to the relief of the souls in Purgatory. Finally, the indulgence of the Portiuncula can be gained in all churches in which the Third Order of St. Francis is canonically established (Moroni). The subsequent declarations of the Popes have removed all doubt as to the fact that the Portiuncula is a genuine indulgence which may be gained by the faithful on fulfilling the conditions. But the question of its origin is still doubtful. The silence of the early biographers has been attributed to opposition of the cardinals to so extraordinary a favour. (See Cuthbert, "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," Appendix ii.; Joergensen, "Saint François d'Assise," Appendice i. 503. Kirsch maintains that the indulgence was invented by the "spiritual section of the friars about 1288," "Der Portiuncula Ablass" in "Theol. Quartalschrift," 1906.)

PORT-ROYAL. [See JANSENISTS.]

POSSESSION, DEMONIACAL. A state in which an evil spirit, by God's permission, inhabits the body of a rational being. The devil is able in this way to torture the body, to deceive the senses by hallucinations, and indirectly, because of the connection between soul and body, to torture the soul, to impair and pervert its faculties. He cannot, however, inhabit the soul, for this is a power which

[1] Alban Butler, Oct. 4. [2] *Ibid.*

belongs to God alone; much less can he master the free will and force the possessed person to sin. But he may increase to a fearful extent the power of temptation, overpower the body, and even produce insanity, in which last case the possessed person may of course commit actions outwardly sinful, for which he is not responsible. (Mt. viii. 28–34, Mk. v. 1–29; Lk. viii. 26–39.) In obsession (also called *circumcessio*) the devil attacks the man in an extraordinary manner from without—by presenting, *e.g.*, phantoms to the senses—but does not inhabit the body or exert an abiding and immanent influence. [See ENERGUMEN; EXORCIST.]

POST-COMMUNION. A prayer or prayers, varying with the day, said after the priest has taken the ablutions. In the Gelasian Sacramentary it was always followed by a prayer over the people, and this is still the case in the Ferial Masses in Lent, when the Post-Communion is still succeeded by the "Humiliate capita vestra Deo" and the "Oratio super populum." All the Western liturgies conform in this part to the same type. The Ambrosian has a "Post-Communio"; the Gallican a "Collectio post communionem" and a "Consummatio vel ad plebem."

In the Mozarabic rite, however, the prayers after Communion are invariable. (Le Brun; Benedict XIV.; Hammond; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc.")

POSTIL. Originally, a note or commentary on a passage of Scripture, the derivation being, *post illa verba textus*. Since such commentaries often took a hortatory or homiletic form, the word *postilla* came to be used for a short sermon. The sense of "commentary" appears in the title of the celebrated fourteenth-century work of Nicholas de Lyra, "Postilla in universa Biblia." [GLOSSA ORDINARIA.] A verb *postillare*, "to compose a commentary," also came into use.

POSTULANT. (*Postulare*, to ask.) One who is seeking entrance into a religious order. In the art. NOVICE it has been shown that before being admitted to take religious vows a candidate must pass through a period of probation. The first stage of this probation, or rather a preliminary to it, is a short time spent in the religious house before the reception of the habit, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the candidate has the dispositions suitable for the order. This is the stage of "postulancy." If it is passed satisfactorily the postulant receives the habit and enters upon the stage of novitiate.

POVERTY. [See EVANGELICAL COUNSELS.]

POWER OF KEYS. [See PENANCE; EXCOMMUNICATION; POPE.]

PRAGMATIC SANCTION. By this term the mediaeval lawyers understood a solemn edict, adopted and published with every formality by the sovereign of a country, with the advice of his councillors and of the estates of the realm. To the English reader the name is chiefly familiar in connection with the celebrated instrument by which Charles VI., emperor of Germany, endeavoured to secure for his daughter Maria Theresa the peaceable succession to all the dominions of the House of Austria. Among Pragmatic Sanctions which have dealt with ecclesiastical affairs, three are specially noted. The first, which is ascribed to St. Louis (1268), grants many liberties and privileges to the Church of France. For an account of the second, passed at Bourges by Charles VII. (1438), see the articles GALLICANISM and CONCORDAT. The third (1446) preceded the concordat between Eugenius IV. and the German nation; on which see CONCORDAT.

PRAEMUNIRE. [See PREMUNIRE.]

PRAGMATISM. [See MODERNISM.]

PRAYER. One of the acts of the virtue of religion (see that art.). All intelligent creatures are bound to think about God and to hold converse with Him; in other words, to pray to Him. Prayer in this wide sense may be defined to be the raising of our minds to God: *ἀνάβασις νοῦ πρὸς θεὸν*, "ascensus mentis ad Deum." It may be either purely mental [see MEDITATION] or vocal, that is, expressed in language. The four great acts of prayer are Adoration (the acknowledgment of God's supreme majesty and our entire dependence upon Him), Thanksgiving, Petition, and, in the event of our having offended Him, Contrition. The third of these, Petition, is so important that the word prayer (*precari*) conveys this notion alone; and it is of this that we shall here chiefly speak.

The objections to prayer arise from two entirely opposite errors, chance and fate. If all that happens takes place without any kind of power to regulate it, or if everything is governed by rigid law which cannot be controlled, then of course it is useless to pray. But reason and revelation alike tell us that the world is ruled by the Providence of God. We firmly uphold the existence of law in the universe, but at the same time we maintain that God, the author of this law, can counteract, suspend, or change it at His pleasure. Thus we pray for rain, fine weather, or health because we believe that God is the Lord of heaven and earth, "Who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will" (Eph. i. 11; cf. Mt. v. 45; Acts xiv. 14–16). How God brings about the answers to our prayers cannot be exactly determined. The late W. G. Ward discussed the subject in a pamphlet entitled, "Science, Prayer, Free Will, and Miracles."

Prayer, being an act of religion, should be addressed to God. We pray to Him, not because He does not already know our needs, but because He wills that we should ourselves put them before Him and beg Him to grant

them. Although our Lord said, "Your Father knoweth that you have need of these things" (Mt. vi. 32), yet He also told us "that we ought always to pray, and not to faint" (Lk. xviii. 1). It is God alone Who can give us what we ask for. This, however, does not prevent us from praying to certain of God's creatures. We ask God directly to grant us our petitions; we ask the Blessed Virgin, the angels, and the saints to ask God to grant them. "And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angels" (Apoc. viii. 4).

Should we specify our petitions, and, if so, what may we ask for? St. Thomas considers that the opinion of Socrates, that we should merely ask for what is good for us, is only partially true. Some things we know to be certainly good for us, and these we may specify: the Lord's Prayer contains a number of specific petitions. This being granted, the general rule is that laid down by St. Augustine: we may pray for whatever we may lawfully desire. Hence we may ask for even temporal blessings, not indeed for their own sake, but as aids to our spiritual welfare. According to the Apostle we should pray for all men (1 Tim. ii.). Charity bids us help our neighbour on the road to salvation, and prayer is one of the most potent means of doing so (1 Jn. v. 16; James v. 16; Rom. xv.). The order in which we should pray for others follows the order of charity, and depends upon their nearness to us and their needs. With regard to enemies, we are bound to pray for them in general—not excluding them from the benefit of our prayers. To pray for them specially belongs not to precept but to counsel (Mt. v. 44).

It is obvious that as prayer is a thinking about God and speaking with Him, it should be performed with great attention and devotion. Merely to utter the words is no prayer. "This people honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me" (Mt. xv. 7). St. Thomas distinguishes three kinds or degrees of attention: to the words, to the meaning of the words, and to the objects of the prayer, that is, to God and what we pray for. It is the last kind that is required. To keep one's attention fixed on an unseen object is difficult, and consequently we are very liable to mind-wandering when we pray. But if our distractions are not wilful—if whenever we recollect ourselves we try once more to fix our attention on God—our prayer is not altogether unfruitful. To be wilfully distracted would be sinful. The best plan is to collect our thoughts for a few moments before kneeling down. "Before prayer prepare thy soul, and be not as a man that tempteth God" (Ecclus. xviii. 23). The various degrees of prayer are spoken of in the article on MEDITATION. (See St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 83, and the well-known little work of St. Alphonsus, "On Prayer." The subject is treated in all ascetical writings.)

PRAYER, APOSTLESHIP OF. An association founded in 1844 by the Jesuits at Vals, in the diocese of Puy. The Popes have shown their approval of its spirit and work by many briefs and privileges. According to the statutes granted by Leo XIII., in 1892, its canonical constitution is as follows: The Apostleship of Prayer is a work of piety, by means of which the faithful endeavour to enkindle in themselves and others zeal for prayer, according to the desire and after the example of the most Sacred Heart of Jesus, "always living to make intercession for us." In order to attain the end proposed, the associates may most profitably employ not only prayer but also all other sorts of good works, such as the frequent reception of the sacraments, &c. To gain the indulgences, the associates must add to their morning prayers an offering of all the prayers, works, and sufferings of the day for the intention with which our Lord Jesus Christ offers Himself in the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar. The work of the association is governed by a general director, who is named by the Superior-General of the Society of Jesus. The general director may, in different countries, appoint diocesan directors with the consent of the respective ordinaries, whose jurisdiction must always be scrupulously respected. No one has power to receive new members except the local directors and promoters, who possess diplomas issued by a diocesan director. For further information see a pamphlet entitled "What is the Apostleship of Prayer?" The organ of the association is the "Messenger of the Sacred Heart."

PREACHERS, ORDER OF. [See DOMINICANS.]

PREACHING. Christian preaching began with our Lord Himself, who entrusted the continuation of the work to His Apostles At first the Christian congregations were instructed not only by "teachers" in the common acceptation of the term, but also by "prophets," to whom the counsels of God were revealed in an extraordinary manner—a gift which might include a knowledge of the future, though this was not necessarily the case. Later, the Fathers speak of preaching as a chief part of the bishop's office. In Africa, till St. Augustine's time, it was not usual for priests to preach ("Vita Possid." 5, PL, xxxii. 37), and this was also the case in the time of Socrates ("H.E." v. 22) at Alexandria. On the other hand, Origen preached in Palestine while only a layman, or at least not a priest (Euseb. "H.E." vi. 19). Even in the African Church preaching by laymen, at the request of the clergy, became a permitted use (*laicus praesentibus clericis nisi ipsis rogantibus docere non audeat*, c. 98 of the so-called Concil. Carthag. IV. *anno* 398). According to a well-known statement of

Sozomen ("H.E." vii. 19)[1] sermons had not been preached at all in the Roman Church till the middle of the fifth century, but possibly the truth is that down to St. Leo's pontificate there had been no great preacher or formal sermons in the Greek style at Rome. The preacher sat during his sermon; the people sometimes sat, sometimes stood. Sermons were delivered on Sundays and feasts, and Chrysostom's homilies on Genesis prove that sermons were delivered daily in Lent. In the East sermons were often very long. Chrysostom's discourse lasted sometimes for two hours. In the West they were generally short. Chrysostom, the two Gregories, Basil in the East, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Gregory the Great in the West, were the great preachers of the Patristic period.

For a long time they had no successors who came near them in eloquence. The Synod of Mayence in 847 (c. 2) requires each bishop to have a book of Latin homilies, and turn them "in linguam rusticam Romanam aut Theotiscam" (German) for the good of the people. Peter Damian in the eleventh, and St. Bernard in the twelfth century, were conspicuous preachers. A new era began with the rise of the mendicant orders. Tauler, Suso, in the fourteenth century, St. Vincent Ferrer (d. 1419) and Savonarola in the fifteenth, Louis of Granada in the sixteenth, were Dominicans; Bernardine of Siena and John Capistran in the fifteenth were Franciscans; John of Avila (d. 1569), a secular. Enormous crowds surrounded the great preachers of the later middle age, and sometimes persons actually died from the emotion which the sermon awoke in them.

Important regulations on preaching were enacted by the Council of Trent (sess. v. De Reform.; sess. xxiv. De Reform. cap. iv.). The council teaches that preaching is the "principal office of bishops," and requires bishops, parish priests, and all who have the cure of souls, to preach personally, or in case of lawful impediment by deputy, at least on Sundays and solemn feasts. Further, during the fasts, and particularly during Advent and Lent, the bishop is to provide sermons daily, or at least three times a week. Regulars preaching in their own churches must first be examined and approved by their superiors and must seek the bishop's blessing, nor are they to preach even there against the bishop's will. In other churches they cannot preach without episcopal licence. Bishops are to warn the faithful that they are bound to hear the word of God in their own parish church, if they can do so without inconvenience. The sermons are to be short and simple, and of a practical character.

We can only mention a few of the great preachers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the golden age of preaching. In France the names of Bossuet, Bourdaloue (1632–1704), Massillon (1663–1742) will occur to all. De la Colombière, S.J. (d. 1682), and Fléchier, chiefly remembered for his funeral orations (d. 1710), are prominent in the second class. In Italy the great preacher was the holy Jesuit Segneri (d. 1694); in Portugal, Vieira, also a Jesuit (d. 1697). In the 19th century the great preachers have been the Italian Theatine Ventura, and in France the Jesuit Ravignan, the great Dominican Lacordaire, and Mgr. Dupanloup. The Germans have never reached the level of French or even of Italian eloquence. Still, Veith, who preached at Vienna, Cardinal Diepenbrock and Forster, bishops of Breslau, the Jesuit Father Roh and others, have won high reputation. In the English-speaking countries we have had Wiseman, Newman, Manning, and the Dominican Father Tom Burke. (The latter part chiefly from Kraus, "Kirchengeschichte." See also Beecher in "Cath. Enc."; Keppler in "Kirchenlex." The manuals of Pastoral Theology usually have some chapters on the subject.)

PREADAMITES. The first author of the Preadamitic system, as Zaccaria calls it, is said to have been Giordano Bruno, a Dominican (who abandoned his order and the Catholic religion), though there are traces of it in Rabbinical writers. It was developed by a French Calvinist, Isaac de la Peyrère, in a book entitled "Praeadamitae, sive Exercitatio super versibus 12, 13, et 14, cap. v. Epist. ad Rom., quibus inducuntur primi homines ante Adamum conditi," in the year 1655 (not 1652 as Calmet has it). He held that Adam was the progenitor of the Jews only, and that the Flood, which was local merely, did not destroy the nations who had inhabited the earth long before Adam's creation. He appealed, *e.g.*, to the words of Cain, Gen. iv. 14, "Every one who findeth me will kill me," to Cain's building a city, to the impossibility of supposing that the Antipodes were peopled in prehistoric times from Asia, &c., &c. Peyrère became a Catholic, and retracted his system, which cannot be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine of original sin, at Rome ("ad Philotimum Ep.") in 1657. He died with the Fathers of the French Oratory in 1675, aged 82. (Zaccaria, "Prolegom. in Petav. de Op. Sex Dierum." The dogmatic theologians treat of Preadamism in connection with Creation. See also Reusch, "Bibel und Natur," 437.)

PREBEND (Lat. *praebenda*). The term is probably derived from the daily rations issued to soldiers. A prebend is the share in the revenues of a chapter [CHAPTER, CATHEDRAL] or collegiate church, enjoyable by each canon or prebendary. The latter are not strictly members of the chapter, though entitled to a share in its funds. A capitulary

[1] οὔτε δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὔτ' ἄλλος τις ἐνθάδε ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας διδάσκει. Valesius, in his note on the passage, quotes Cassiodorus, who had lived at Rome, as witness to the same fact.

of Charlemagne orders that no canon should hold a benefice along with a prebend; those found doing so were to be deprived of both. When the common life of canons was generally discontinued, in the course of the tenth century, a division was made of the Church revenues into episcopal and capitular, and each canon enjoyed his share of the latter, which was still called his prebend, together with—at least in the case of the senior members of the chapter—a prebendal residence. (Ferraris; Smith and Cheetham; Taunton; "Kirchenlex.")

PRECENTOR. The religious, or the canon, who in a cathedral, collegiate, or monastic church has the chief charge of the choral service. The word corresponds to the French "chantre," Lat. *cantor*. The precentor in a monastery "presided over the singers, choristers, and organist, and instructed the monks to sing, chant, and read. His place was in the middle of the choir, on the right side; he began the chant first, and corrected all mistakes and irregularities; he made provision for writing the tables of the monks, keeping the *Liber diurnalis* or chapter-book, reading the martyrology, and announcing the anniversaries; he arranged the processions, superintended the education and correction of the novices, and had charge of the books, presses, and furniture of the choir. He also provided parchment and ink for the writers, colours for illuminating, and materials for binding the books" (Yates's "History of the Abbey of St. Edmund's Bury," p. 198).

PRECIOUS BLOOD. (1) *Relics.*—Beyrout, Bruges, Saintes, the imperial monastery of Weingarten, the English monasteries of Ashridge and Hailes, have claimed to possess relics of the Precious Blood (Faber, "Precious Blood," p. 294). St. Thomas says (3ª, q. 54, a. 2) that all the particles of blood which Christ shed in His Passion were reassumed by Him in His resurrection, "but that blood which is kept in some churches as relics did not flow from Christ's side, but is said to have flowed miraculously from some image of Christ when struck"—*i.e.* it never was the blood of Christ at all. Observe, the saint makes no exception, and speaks doubtfully of the supposed miracles. Benedict XIV. ("De Fest." § 374) admits the possibility that some particles of Christ's blood may not have been reassumed, and may remain as relics. In this case they are not united to the Godhead, and it would be the crime of idolatry to give them divine worship.

(2) *Confraternities.*—F. Faber mentions a very ancient one at Ravenna; one at Rome erected under Gregory XIII. and confirmed by Sixtus V., afterwards merged in the confraternity of the Gonfalone. Its members were priests and preached missions. An arch-confraternity was set up in the church of San Nicolò in Carcere by Albertini, bishop of Terracina, and Bufalo, canon of San Marco under Pius VII. A confraternity was founded at St. Wilfrid's, in Staffordshire, in 1847, and transferred to the London Oratory in 1850.

(3) *Orders.*—There was a Cistercian congregation of nuns, entitled Bernardines of the Precious Blood, at Paris in the middle of the seventeenth century. Bufalo, who died in 1837, founded a congregation of Missioners of the Precious Blood, and another congregation of Nuns of the Precious Blood. (See Faber, "Precious Blood," c. vi.)

(4) *The Feast* was instituted and fixed for the first Sunday of July by Pius IX. after his return from Gaeta. In the new Calendar it is kept on the first day of July. There was formerly a Mass and office for the Friday after the fourth Sunday in Lent.

PRECONIZE (*praeco*, a public crier). When the preliminary inquiry at Rome, required by the Council of Trent and several Papal constitutions in the case of those nominated to the higher ecclesiastical dignities, has terminated favourably for the person designated, a report to that effect is made in secret Consistory by the Cardinal Protector of the nation to which the candidate belongs, and after the cardinals present have all given their opinions on his eligibility, the Pope—if the majority be in his favour—pronounces his solemn approbation of the appointment. This approbation is termed the "preconization," and the Pope is said to "preconize" the archbishop, bishop, or other dignitary, whose cause has been brought before him. The approbation is posted up *ad valvas ecclesiae*, and a bull of preconization is expedited to the candidate. [See BISHOP, § iv.]

PREDELLA. The highest step of the sanctuary, on which the altar stands.

PREDESTINATION. St. Augustine's definition—viz. "God's prevision and preparation of benefits by which those who are freed [*i.e.* from eternal death] are most certainly freed" ("De Dono Persev." cap. 14 PL, xlv. 1014)—is generally accepted by scholastic theologians. They are all[1] agreed that God predestinates from all eternity the number of elect, that He bestows the grace needed to obtain eternal life without any respect to merits on their part, either before or after grace is conferred, so that life eternal is His free gift; and, on the other hand, that no adult enters heaven except because he has of his own free will corresponded to the grace of God, and none are lost eternally except by the perversity of their own will, since God sincerely desires all men to come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. But if we ask why, seeing God gives grace enough to all, and desires the salvation of all, some are

[1] An exception, apparently, should be made of Catharinus, quoted by Petavius, and of Pighius, of whom something is said by Schneemann. Both seem to graze Semi-Pelagianism.

saved, others reprobate, theologians give different answers.

(1) According to the Thomists, "God's purpose of efficaciously conducting some rather than others to salvation has no reason on our part, but depends entirely on God's mercy and free will" (Billuart, "De Deo," diss. ix. a. 4). To those who are predestinated God gives grace efficacious in its own nature, and so orders it that they die in His grace; to others He gives grace which is merely sufficient [see the article on GRACE], and to which, as a matter of fact, nobody corresponds, though all have the power of doing so.

(2) A large number of Jesuit theologians, known as Congruists, hold, like the Thomists, an absolute predestination to glory, irrespective of merits foreseen. God gives to the predestinate the same grace as to the reprobate; but to the former in circumstances under which He foresees they will accept it, to the latter in those under which He foresees they will not do so. Such was the opinion of Suarez (after his return to Spain), of Bellarmine, Antoine, and many others. A decree of the Jesuit general Aquaviva made it the recognized teaching of the society, but the decree seems to have been practically inoperative. (See Schneemann, "Controv. de Div. Gratiae Liberique Arbitrii Concord." cap. 16.)

(3) A large number of Jesuits—*e.g.* Toletus, Maldonatus, Lessius, Vasquez, Valentia, and Suarez, while he taught at Rome (so Schneemann, *loc. cit.*)—admit that predestination to grace, but deny that predestination to glory, is irrespective of merit foreseen. God decrees, they say, to give grace to all, and predestinates those who, as He foresees, will correspond to it, the rest being reprobate.

It is to be carefully observed that the Thomists admit, just as much as Lessius, that God desires the salvation of all, and gives all sufficient means of attaining that end. Whether their theory is logical and consistent is another question, and one on which the Church has never pronounced. It is a matter of philosophy and logic rather than of faith. On the other hand, no Catholic may hold with Gottschalk, a German monk of the ninth century, or with Calvin in later times, that God willed the salvation of the predestinate alone, so that the reprobate perished necessarily.

The history of patristic opinion is given with his usual fulness of learning and critical discernment by Petavius ("De Deo," libb. ix. and x.). Augustine most certainly held and constantly asserted predestination not only to grace but to glory without respect to merits foreseen. (See, *e.g.*, a decisive passage, "De Correptione et Gratia," cap. vii., PL, x. 923.) Nobody, says Petavius—who was himself of the contrary opinion on the theological question—nobody could doubt this unless "blinded by party spirit" (*loc. cit.* cap. vi.). But the same great scholar shows how very different the opinion of the Greek and earlier Latin Fathers was; and Augustine, though he rightly exercised a mighty influence on the subsequent Church, has no claim to represent the whole of her tradition. (See GRACE; St. Thomas, 1ª, q. 23; Ruiz, "De Praedestinatione et Reprobatione"; the dogmatic theologians "De Deo," "De Gratia," *e.g.* Franzelin, "De Deo Uno," p. 598 *sqq.*; Scheeben-Atzberger, "Dogmatik," iv. 244.)

PREFACE. A prelude or introduction to the Canon of the Mass, consisting in an exhortation to thanksgiving made by the celebrant, in the answers of the minister or choir, and a prayer ending with the Sanctus, in which God is thanked for His benefits. In our missals the title "Canon Missae" now stands after the Sanctus, but the whole Preface is really part of the Canon. "Originally it was counted as such. In the Gelasian Sacramentary the rubric 'Incipit canon actionis' stands before 'Sursum corda.' The reason of this is plain. The Canon is one long prayer, the Eucharistic prayer (Prayer of Consecration). In accordance with the fact that our Lord at the Last Supper took bread and wine and gave thanks, *in all rites* this prayer is in the form of a *thanksgiving*." (Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 315.) The Greeks have only one Preface, which in the Clementine liturgy is extremely long. The Gallican and Mozarabic rites, on the other hand, are rich in Prefaces, and so originally was the Roman-liturgy, which from the sixth till about the end of the eleventh century had a special Preface for nearly every feast. About 1100 the number was reduced in most churches of the Roman rite to ten—viz. the common one, found in nearly all the ancient Sacramentaries, and nine others named in a letter falsely attributed to Pelagius, predecessor of St. Gregory, and cited in the "Micrologus," &c.—viz. the Preface of Christmas, Epiphany,[1] Lent, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, the Trinity, the Apostles, the Cross. Urban II. is said by Gratian, who lived fifty years later, to have added the Preface of the Blessed Virgin in 1095. The Sarum Use had "proper Prefaces" for the "Conception, Nativity, Annunciation, Visitation, Veneration, and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin." "The York Use added another for the days between Passion Sunday and Easter. The Hereford appointed the same Preface from Palm Sunday to Easter." (Maskell; the rest of the article is from Le Brun and Hammond. See also Fortescue, "The Mass," ch. viii.)

PRELATE (*praelatus*). A general name for an ecclesiastical dignitary, whether among the secular or the regular clergy, who has a jurisdiction inherent in his office, and

[1] So Le Brun, tom. ii.; but the letter, as given in Leofric's Missal, omits the Preface for the Epiphany and substitutes one for the dead (Maskell, *Ancient Liturgies of the Church of England*, p. 103 *seq.*).

not merely one transmitted to him as the delegate of a superior. The designation is extended in a wider sense to the prelates of the Pope's Court and household, as having a superiority of rank.

Prelature, or prelacy, is the status of a prelate. When the first Scotch Presbyterians raved against "Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism," prelacy in their mouths was not exactly equivalent to "episcopacy"; they meant that they were in rebellion against canon law and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is true that they erected a new jurisdiction, far more burdensome and inquisitorial than the old one; on which see Buckle's "History of Civilisation," vol. ii. chap. v. (Ferraris, "Regularis Praelatus"; Taunton.)

PREMONSTRATENSIANS. This celebrated order of regular canons was founded by St. Norbert in 1119, at a place called Prémontré (that is, "foreshown"), a lonely valley in the forest of Coucy, near Laon. Several other sites had been offered to the saint in vain; but as soon as he saw this valley he said "Here is the place which the Lord hath chosen." A monastery was built, which remained the mother house of the order till the French Revolution; it is now in ruins. St. Norbert was soon joined by thirteen companions, to whom he gave the rule of St. Austin to observe, with certain constitutions framed by himself. The habit of the Norbertines was white; hence they were commonly called in England the White Canons. Their founder imposed on them perpetual fasting, and an entire abstinence from meat; but, as in other orders, mitigations after a time crept in, followed by a general relaxation, which in its turn led to several remarkable reformations. The Abbot-General at Prémontré exercised a general supervision over the whole order down to 1512, when all the abbeys in England and Wales were subjected to the Abbot of Welbeck. There were at one time, according to Hélyot, a thousand Premonstratensian abbeys, many provostships and priories, and five hundred houses of nuns. In England, at or shortly before the Dissolution, there were thirty-four houses; the names are given below.[1]

[1] Houses marked *n* were nunneries; those marked *c* cells:—

Alnwick.
Barlings (Linc.).
Bayham (Suss.).
Beauchief (Derb.).
Bileigh, near Maldon (Essex).
Blancland (Northumb.)
Bradsole, nr. Dover (Kent).
Broadholm (Notts), *n*.
Cockersand (Lanc.).
Coverham (York).
Croxton (Leic.).
Dale (Derb.).
West Dereham (Norf.).
Durford, near Rogate (Suss.).
Easby (York.).
Eggleston (York.).
Hagnaby (Linc.).
Halesowen.
Hornby (Lanc.), *c*.
Irford (Linc.), *n*.
Kaylend, near Naseby (Northants), *c*.
Langdon (Kent).
Langley (Norf.).
Lavendon (Bucks).
Leiston (Suff.).
Newbo, near Grantham (Linc.).
Newsham (Linc.).
Shap (Westm.).
Sulby (Northants).
Tichfield (Hants).
Torre (Dev.).
Tupholme (Linc.).
Welbeck (Notts).
Wendling (Norf.).

Lecuy, the last abbot of Prémontré, was a man of exceptional force and nobleness of character. Driven from his abbey in 1790, he bore his unbent and undishonoured head through all the mournful or shameful scenes of the Revolution, and, living far on into the next century, died in his ninety-fourth year in 1834. A few months before his death, the old man compiled a short tract on the history of his order; from these touching and simple pages the reader will thank us for making the following extract:—

"Of this illustrious order, once so widely extended, the *débris* only are left. Its impoverishment began with the English schism.[1] The Reformation caused it yet further losses by the suppression of a great number of houses in the countries which embraced it. The abbeys in Spain, about 1573, separated themselves from the body of the order in order to form a congregation apart, retaining, however, the habit and the statutes. Under the Emperor Joseph II., other suppressions took place in the hereditary provinces; still, besides the French abbeys of either observance, which numbered before 1789 about one hundred, there remained in Belgium and different parts of Germany some very fine establishments, distinguished by their regularity and love for ecclesiastical learning. Notably, Swabia, where the abbots were prelates of the empire, had lost nothing; and in spite of so many suppressions the order of Prémontré might still be called flourishing. At the Revolution all the French houses suffered the fate of other ecclesiastical institutions, enveloped in a common proscription. The invasion of Belgium by revolutionary armies extended to that country the measures of destruction taken in France; what the order still possessed in Germany perished along with the great sees and rich endowments of the German Church, sacrificed to a system of indemnities, at the time of the formation of the Confederation of the Rhine. Of the splendid heritage of St. Norbert, subject to the crosier of Prémontré, there remained in 1805 ten abbeys, of which two, in Prussian Silesia, had been till then religiously maintained by the kings of Prussia, though Protestants. It was but natural, when the Catholic princes seized the property of religious, that those who were not so should follow their example, and these two abbeys ceased to exist."

There are abbeys in Belgium, Holland, Austria, Hungary, and a few houses in England and in the United States.

A community of French Premonstratensians has been established at Storrington, in Sussex, on land given by the Duke of Norfolk. (Hélyot and his *continuator*; Dugdale's "Monasticon.")

PREMUNIRE. The statute of Premunire (16 Rich. II. c. 5), passed in 1393, was designed

[1] See above.

by the king and parliament of England to check evasions of the existing statutes against provisors—*i.e.* persons appointed to English benefices or dignities by Papal provision. The Holy See had employed various means, including excommunication or the menace of it, for the protection of persons whom it had "provided" to benefices, and for the punishment of all who might interfere with them. On this account a severe penal clause was inserted in the above-mentioned statute, to the effect that if any man should pursue or obtain in the court of Rome excommunications, bulls, or other things, against the king's crown and regality, or bring them into England, or receive or execute them, "such person or persons, their notaries, procurators, maintainers, abettors, fautors and counsellors, shall be out of the king's protection, their goods and chattels, lands and tenements, shall be forfeited to the king, and their persons attached wherever they may be found."[1] Execution of process under this statute was by means of a writ called of "Premunire"—from the first words, "Premunire [*praemonere*] facias"—whence in time the statute itself was so called. (Stephen, "Commentaries," book vi. ch. vi.)

PRESBYTERA. The wife of a presbyter, especially a wife who had come under the operation of the rule which rendered the continence of clerics necessary. The position of such persons is dealt with by the canons of the Council of Tours (567). In these cases the presbytera usually went into a convent, but without taking the habit. (Smith and Cheetham.) The word is also used for aged widows who devoted themselves to the service of the altar; and in the Greek Church it is applied to superiors of convents of women (Ducange).

PRESBYTERIANS, SCOTTISH. The doctrine and discipline of Presbyterians, founded upon the teaching of Calvin and his management of ecclesiastical affairs at Geneva, were perhaps embraced as early in England as in Scotland, for Christopher Goodman, an Englishman, was associated with Knox when they were both in exile in Mary's time, and sat in the First General Assembly held at Edinburgh. But since the form of Protestantism which first prevailed in England and supplanted the Catholic Church there was that of the English episcopalian reformers [see ENGLISH CHURCH], and Presbytery did not rise into importance until much later, we shall here almost confine our remarks to the subversion of Catholicity in Scotland, and the introduction of new ecclesiastical arrangements in its place.

Before the destructive fanatical outbreak which is associated with the name of John Knox, the Catholic Church in Scotland had thirteen sees—of which two, St. Andrews and Glasgow, were metropolitan—and upwards of 100 monasteries, large and small. Of these, nineteen belonged to the Austin Canons; the magnificent establishments of Holyrood, Jedburgh, Scone, and St. Andrews were among the number. The Franciscans had thirteen houses, the Dominicans eleven, the Cistercians ten; among these last were the abbeys of Melrose and Newbattle. The Benedictines had nine or ten abbeys and cells, including Dunfermline, Arbroath, and Lindores. Among the six Premonstratensian houses was Dryburgh, the ruins of which still charm the traveller by their incomparable grace. The rest were distributed among the other orders. That the Scottish clergy, both secular and regular, stood greatly in need of reformation is an indisputable fact; but how far corruption had gone is a point which cannot be easily determined. If we attach credit to the rhetoric of Knox and his followers, we must believe that the whole clerical body in Scotland, with scarcely an exception, was stained with avarice and conscious hypocrisy, and sunk in gross immorality, sloth, and gluttony. But the interest which these men had in making such assertions believed would make us suspend our belief in them, even if there were no rebutting evidence. On the whole there seems good reason for accepting on this subject the contemporary testimony of Bishop Lesley.[1] The Bishop of Ross says that some of the bishops had been for a long time past engaged in political and diplomatic business, and that others lived too freely (*liberius viverent*), forgetting their sacred functions, so that the whole hierarchy had become lowered in popular esteem. The pernicious system of holding abbeys *in commendam* was in full vigour; thus Lord James Murray, a bastard son of James V., was commendatory abbot of St. Andrews. As to the priests and monks, Lesley declares that most of them, in either order, were persons of piety and virtue; but he adds that there was one vice—licentious living—of which many of them, and another—great negligence in preaching—of which nearly all were guilty. He mentions it as a deplorable circumstance that the people had not been provided with an elementary catechism, for want of which they often could not tell whether what the sectaries taught them was true or not.

"The Reformation," says a modern historian[2] of the Kirk of Scotland, "was baronial in Scotland, monarchical in England." Almost all the nobles who had been detained as prisoners in England after the battle of Solway Moss (1542) returned home Protestants. The English monasteries had been just dissolved, to the great enrichment of their brother aristocrats south of the

[1] Lingard, *Hist. of England*, vol. iii.

[1] *De Origine*, &c., p. 68.

[2] Dr. J. Cunningham; see notice, end of art.

Tweed; Lollard preachers were everywhere, and their denunciations of a wealthy and powerful priesthood, electric as was then the condition of the religious atmosphere, fell upon willing ears. A countryman of their own was soon found, who in extravagance and fluency of reviling left the English Lollards far behind. John Knox, born in Haddingtonshire in 1505, studied with some distinction at the universities of St. Andrews and Glasgow, having attended the lectures of the eminent theologian John Mair, or Major. He probably imbibed Lollard opinions very early: if before his ordination, his voluntarily placing himself under the control of the canon law is a remarkable act. The death at the stake in 1527 of Patrick Hamilton, who had studied at Wittenberg and brought home Lutheran opinions, seems to have made a deep impression on him. However, he became a priest, and thus was canonically bound to continence, an obligation which he set at naught by marrying, not once only but twice.

Not only was there a strong Lollard party in Scotland between 1530 and 1540, but several Franciscan and Dominican friars took up warmly the cause of ecclesiastical reform, and preached against abuses and superstitions. Of this there is ample evidence in the history which bears the name of Knox. As late as 1545 the bulk of the people were attached to the old faith;[1] Knox speaks of Edinburgh in 1546 as "drowned in superstition"; but in the fifteen years which followed a great change is said to have taken place.

George Wishart, a friend of Knox, was burnt for heresy in 1545; and, partly in revenge for this, Cardinal Beaton was assassinated at St. Andrews by members of the reforming party in 1546. Knox hastened to St. Andrews and made common cause with the assassins. He is supposed to have renounced his priesthood some time before,[2] and to have arrived at the conclusion that ecclesiastical functions could not be lawfully discharged but in obedience to a "call" from some reformed congregation. The men of blood to whom he had joined himself gave him the desired "call," and Knox became a minister. We hear of controversies between him and representatives of the Catholics. The volubility, earnestness, and audacity of the man were amazing; but we see that he "abounds in his own sense"; his incapacity for taking in any but the one narrow view of religion to which he had committed himself is manifest from the account of these disputes which he has himself transmitted; and when we find him resolutely maintaining that no rites or ceremonies are lawful, unless "God in express words hath commanded them,"[3] we are able to take the measure of his spiritual wisdom. Every Presbyterian at this day who countenances Dr. Lees' innovation of organs in the kirk, since organs are nowhere "expressly commanded," falls under the ban of the patriarch of his religion. In a sermon preached about the same time Knox defined the Roman Church to be "the last beast," and the head of it to be "the Man of Sin," the "Antichrist," and the "Whore of Babylon." This violence is easily accounted for. Knox intended to violate the canons and marry;[1] and he knew that if the Catholic Church and the canon law retained their ascendency in Scotland, he, as a married priest, would not only lose the career to which his ambition urged him forward, but also be in danger of punishment. On the other hand, if he and his friends could overpower the Church and establish their own sect, the highest ecclesiastical rank, along with a commanding position in the State, was at once within his reach.

The French king sent an expedition which compelled the surrender of St. Andrews, and Knox, being taken along with the garrison, was condemned to the galleys. For some years French and Catholic influences were in the ascendant; and Knox, after his release, deemed it best to retire to England. In 1549 a reforming council met at Edinburgh under Archbishop Hamilton, attended by six bishops and fourteen abbots, and enacted sixty-eight disciplinary canons. Two years later the Parliament passed an Act imposing severe penalties on any who should "contemptuously make perturbation in the kirk in the time of divine service." When Mary came to the throne (1553), Knox found his way to Geneva, and came under the influence of the powerful mind of Calvin. To this intercourse he chiefly owed the specific Presbyterian beliefs—viz. that some are predestinated to eternal life, and some—the greater number—to eternal damnation; that bishop and presbyter are two different names for the same office; and that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, although the faithful really and truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet that Body and that Blood are in heaven and not on earth, and the elements undergo no change. Superior as it is to the shallow commonplaces of Zwingli, this doctrine can hardly be said to be less mysterious, though much less logical, than that of transubstantiation, which the Calvinists rejected with so much heat.

Between 1554 and 1560 Mary of Guise, the queen regent, mother of Mary Queen of Scots, administered the government in her daughter's name. During all this time a fierce struggle was going on between the men of the old and the new opinions. The Protestant noblemen, headed by the Earls of Argyll, Glencairn, and Morton, met together in 1557,

[1] Cunningham, i. 218. [2] *Ibid.* p. 223. [3] *History*, p. 80.

[1] He did, in fact, marry Margery Bowes two years afterwards.

and drew up the "First Covenant." They pledged themselves thereby to establish the "Word of God and His congregation," and to support these with all their strength against the "congregation of Satan," by which they meant the Catholic bishops and clergy. They were hence called the "Lords of the Congregation." The bishops did what they could to strengthen the hands of the regent, who, however, from political motives, desired to keep in with both parties. Walter Milne, an old man who had once been a priest, but had gone over to the Reformers, was burnt at St. Andrews in 1558.[1] But the bishops were not really strong; the tide was setting the other way; and Knox felt emboldened to return to Scotland. While the tension of feeling on each side was at its height, he went to Perth, the fair city on the Tay, then embellished with several religious houses of great beauty. He preached a sermon against "idolatry," after which there was a riot; images, altars, and pictures were destroyed and defaced; the Carthusian abbey was plundered and greatly damaged, and the monks ill-used; the Dominican and Franciscan friaries were destroyed. The ruin of Scone Abbey followed. Knox then went into Fife, and continued this line of preaching; more destruction of art monuments was the result. Defying the inhibition of the archbishop, he preached at St. Andrews (1559), and immediately afterwards the magistrates and the mob "proceeded to destroy the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries, and to rifle and deface all the churches in the town."[2] The cathedral, which was also the church of the Austin Canons, a building of rare beauty, was dismantled about the same time. There was now a state of actual war, and the Lords of the Congregation marched upon Edinburgh, "flushed with these victories over the monuments of idolatry and architecture" (*sic*).[3] Here is the true Puritan ring; it is not only against what he calls superstition, but against the "sublime and beautiful" that the Puritan revolts. Art withers under his tread, like grass beneath the hoofs of the Calmuck cavalry.

The struggle was marked by several sudden changes of fortune; the Scotch Protestants showed little courage, and their English allies little skill. The French troops who had come to support the regent, and garrisoned Leith, were well handled and gained some remarkable successes; but they were foreigners, and this told heavily against them. In April 1560 the regent died; her death led to a negotiation, and indirectly to the triumph of Protestantism. The young queen, whose husband, Francis, had just succeeded his father Henry II., was absent in France; the Catholics were left without any natural leaders. By the treaty of Edinburgh (July 1560) made between the French envoys of Francis and Mary and English plenipotentiaries (Cecil and Sadler), acting on behalf of the Scotch nobility and people, it was agreed, *inter alia*, that the forces on both sides should be disbanded and the French troops return home; that a parliament or convention of the three estates should meet on August 1, and that any complaints of wrongs done to them, made by bishops, abbots, or other churchmen, should be considered by the Parliament and redressed, "as they should find according to reason."[1]

The event soon showed that Cecil had overreached the French envoys in the negotiation. The wrongs of which the churchmen had to complain were serious enough—*e.g.* while the hostilities lasted the Bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, and Ross had been driven by the sectaries from their houses and dispossessed of all their property; the monasteries of Dunfermline, Melrose, and Kelso had been plundered, and the lands and movables of churchmen seized upon in every part of the country.[2] It was the evident intent of the treaty that wrongs such as these should be redressed. But when the Parliament met, being composed, as to the great majority, of enthusiastic or deeply interested sectaries, it proceeded to pass bills for the subversion of the Catholic religion; after which, it is needless to say, they did not find it "according to reason" to give the bishops any compensation whatever.

Before these bills were adopted, a confession of faith in twenty-five articles, drawn up by Knox and his party, was read in Parliament, faintly opposed by the Catholic members, who seem to have been helpless and stupefied, and accepted by the Assembly. To a large extent the doctrine of these articles is sound; they err rather by exclusion than by inclusion. One capital error regards the Church Catholic, which (art. xvi.) is said to consist only of the elect. On the Eucharist, the Calvinistic doctrine described above is asserted (art. xxi.).

On August 24, 1560, the Parliament passed a bill by which it was ordered that none should "say Mass, nor yet heere Mass, nor be present thereat, under the paine of confiscation of all their goods, and punishing of their bodies at the discretion of the *magistrates*." A second bill, dated the same day, declared that the Bishop of Rome had thenceforward no authority in Scotland, and decreed punishments against any who should recognize such authority. Such was the Scottish "St. Bartholomew's Day."

In Knox's "History" these bills are described as "Acts"; but they were not

[1] Altogether, about twenty Protestants appear to have suffered death in Scotland in the cause of religion from 1527 to the end of the struggle.

[2] Cunningham, p. 253. [3] *Ib.* p. 260.

[1] Calderwood, ii. 8.

[2] At Aberdeen, through the firmness of the Earl of Huntly and the Lesleys, a brave stand was made, and the agents of rapine were foiled for a considerable time (Lesley, 571, 574).

really so, for they required the royal assent or ratification; this Sir James Sandilands was sent into France to demand, but Mary steadily refused. They were first ratified by the Regent Murray in 1567. This single fact throws a sinister light on the conduct of the Protestant party towards the unhappy queen before her flight to England and during her imprisonment there. But the new religion, in Knox's view, "from God hath full power, and needed not the suffrage of man";[1] whether legal or not, it was forced upon the people of Scotland with all the power of the secular arm. When Mary (1561) returned to her kingdom, and required the liberty of her religion in her private chapel at Holyrood, Knox said, doubtless with perfect sincerity, that "one Masse was more fearfull to him than if ten thowsand armed enemies were landed in anie part of the realme."[2] This sentiment, according to the experiences of many of the saints, is precisely that of the devil on the same subject. The Lords controlled him on this point, nor did they pay much regard to his "Book of Discipline," calling many things in it, particularly the proposal to devote the Church property to the sustentation of the ministers of the Kirk, "devout imaginations." What is called the "First General Assembly" was held in December 1560; it was attended by six ministers, among whom were Knox and Goodman, and thirty-six lay delegates.

Some doubt appears to exist on the question how many of the bishops joined the movement. Bishop Lesley distinctly states[3] that in 1561 only one had done so, the Bishop of Galloway; according to Dr. Cunningham,[4] the Bishops of Caithness and Orkney also became Protestants.

All this time there was a party among the nobles favourable to the retention of episcopacy and the use of the English prayer-book; and in process of time, when James VI. grew to manhood, he became persuaded that bishops were a necessary support to the regal power, and maintained a small Protestant hierarchy side by side with the ministers and the General Assembly. Knox himself, who had declared against bishops many years before,[5] submitted shortly before his death (1572) to the introduction of episcopacy, "in order to secure the episcopal revenues."[6] The form of Presbyterian polity as now seen in Scotland was chiefly the work of a man of high ability and sincere conviction, Andrew Melville. He was the master spirit of the General Assembly of 1580, which absolutely condemned episcopacy, and the chief framer of the "Second Book of Discipline," in which the system of church courts and assemblies, one above another, and each strengthened by a lay representation—kirk-session, presbytery, synod, general assembly—is minutely and skilfully laid down. In this able document the proper functions of the Kirk and the state are distinguished with great judgment; and the separation of the two powers, and the exaltation of the Kirk to the highest place, are asserted in language which strikingly recalls the definitions of the bull "Unam Sanctam." The Assembly of 1581 also adopted the famous "Negative Confession," chiefly directed against "all kinds of papistrie"; it is extremely curious, but our space does not permit of our giving an abstract of it. Every one of the Presbyterian Kirks, large and small, among which the mass of the Scottish people is now distributed, regards this assembly with the highest veneration.

Negation, however, is a poor basis for a theology; and one need feel no surprise that the clerical intellect of Scotland, during the three centuries that have followed, has been stricken with sterility. The ministers have certainly written many books, but their theological discussions interest few outside their own country.[1] Not one of the ecclesiastical sciences has been in any way advanced by Scotch Presbyterianism. The *lay* Scottish intellect, thanks to the natural endowments of the race and a good system of primary education, has achieved great things; it has perfected the steam-engine and the steamboat, invented political economy, composed the Waverley Novels, and borne more than its full share in the great governing and colonizing enterprises of the English people. But who can prove that all this might not have been done, Scotland remaining Catholic? The clerical intellect pays the penalty of having submitted itself to such a patriot as John Knox, with whom passion habitually took the place of reason, and frantic reviling was substituted for patient and equitable investigation.

[Knox, "Hist. of the Reformation," 1644; Calderwood, "Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland," 1843; John Lesley, "De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum," 1578; Cunningham, "Church History of Scotland," 2nd ed., 1882; Dean Stanley, "Lect. on the Church of Scotland," 1879; Burton, "Hist. of Scotland," vol. v., 1870; Bellesheim, "Hist. of the Cath. Church of Scotland," translated and edited by Hunter Blair.]

PRESBYTERY (πρεσβυτέριον, assembly of the elders; *senatus* has the same meaning). (1) The word is used twice in the N.T. for the Jewish Sanhedrin.[2] In the Christian Church it signified, perhaps from the first, the assembly of the entire clergy of the diocese, both presbyters (identified with bishops in 1 Peter v. 1) and deacons; it was such a body at Ephesus, the "celebrated presbytery"[3] of that Church, which consecrated Timothy

[1] *History*, p. 282.
[2] P. 583.
[3] In 1547 (*History*, p. 79).
[4] Calderwood, ii. 147.
[5] I. 223.
[6] Cunningham, p. 345.

[1] Even Chalmers is no exception; the man was admirable, but his works have no permanent value.
[2] Acts xxii. 5; Lk. xxii. 66.
[3] Ignat. *Ad Ephes.* 4.

to the episcopal office with the imposition of hands.[1] St. Cyprian convened a diocesan council of this kind continually, and did nothing important without its advice. That the Roman *presbyterium* in the fifth century meant such a synod—*i.e.* that it included the deacons and the clergy generally, as well as the presbyters—is plain from a letter of Pope Siricius (385) on the condemnation of Jovinian. It therefore seems reasonable to assign this same sense to the word when used by Pope Cornelius (251), who, writing to Cyprian, says "placuit contrahi presbyterium," to hear the recantation of Maximus. Finally, when St. Ignatius, about the beginning of the second century, exhorts the Ephesians to be "subject to the bishop and the presbytery" ("Ad Eph." c. 2; PG, v. 733), the word may well be understood to have the same meaning. (Ferraris, *Presbyterium.*)

(2) The portion of the church in which the clergy assist at the services; also called the choir (*q.v.*) and chancel (*q.v.*).

(3) "Presbytery" is often used among English Catholics to designate the priest's house. In this sense it is a translation of the French *presbytère*, so used (Littré) since the twelfth century; *presbyterium* appears never to have had this meaning. (Ducange; Taunton.)

PRESCRIPTION. The acquisition of an object or a right on the strength of a long undisturbed possession. It is of three kinds —ordinary, extraordinary, and immemorial. By ordinary prescription jurists understand one which rests on a possession of three, or of ten, or of twenty years—three years in the case of movable property; ten years in the case of a right, or of immovable property, *inter praesentes*; twenty years, in the same case, *inter absentes*. A just title must also be proved—*i.e.* the prescriptor must show that he obtained the property by purchase or gift, or some other mode in itself sufficient to constitute a title in the absence of an adverse claim. He must, moreover, have held the property during the time necessary to constitute prescription *in good faith*. One of whom it can be shown that he knew that he was detaining the property of another cannot plead prescription. The canon law is more strict on this head than the Roman, which only required that the prescriptor should have acted in good faith *at the commencement* of his enjoyment of the object. Extraordinary prescription, proof of which is required in many cases by the canon law, especially in regard to ecclesiastical or state property, is of thirty or forty years. Immemorial prescription is merely the presumption of a legitimate ownership, founded on the attestation of the fact of continuous and undisturbed enjoyment, made by old or elderly persons, during a period reaching back to the limits both of their own memory and that of aged persons with whom they had conversed in early life. (Ferraris, *Usucapio*; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. 376 *sqq.*; Taunton; Stephen, "Commentaries," book ii. ch. xxiii.)

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 11.

PRESENCE, REAL. [See EUCHARIST, p. 323.]

PRESENTATION BROTHERS. A religious institute founded in Ireland by Edmund Ignatius Rice in the early part of the nineteenth century. At first it was attached to the different dioceses in which it had houses, but in 1889 all of these were united under one superior-general. It is now established in Ireland, England, and Canada. The Brothers conduct colleges, primary schools, industrial schools, and orphanages. (Br. De Sales in "Cath. Enc.").

PRESENTATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. The story of Mary's presentation in the temple when three years old and her sojourn there till her marriage first appears in Apocryphal Gospels—viz. the Protevangelium (vii.), and that of the Birth of Mary. The belief was adopted by later Fathers—*e.g.* St. John of Damascus. Benedict XIV. ("De Fest." P. ii. § 178) considers the fact of the presentation certain, but the details of the story "altogether uncertain." The feast (*εἰσόδια τῆς θεοτόκου*) was kept by the Greeks as early at least as the time of the Emperor Emmanuel, who ascended the throne in 1143, and partially by the Latins on November 21 since 1374. Paul II. confirmed the feast, which was still not kept in all parts of the West, by "Apostolic authority." Pius V., on the contrary, abolished its celebration in the Roman Church itself, though this was permitted in other parts of the Latin world. Sixtus V. restored the feast in 1585 at the prayer of the Jesuit Turrianus. The present office was corrected under Clement VIII., who made the feast a greater double. (Benedict XIV. "De Fest."; Gavantus, "Thesaur." de Fest. mensis Novemb.; Kellner, "Heortology.")

PRESENTATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, ORDER OF THE. This order was founded in 1777 by Miss Nano (Honoria) Nagle, who belonged to a good Catholic family in the county Cork, and was born in 1728. She established an Ursuline convent at Cork in 1771. But her object being the instruction of the poor, whereas the Ursuline order has for its main business the instruction of the well-to-do, she was not yet satisfied. She built another convent near the first, and entered it, with three companions, towards the end of 1777. They were not enclosed, but were engaged in visiting and teaching the poor, and followed a rule drawn up for them by the curé of St. Sulpice. They took simple vows, renewed from year to year. Worn out by labour and austerities, Nano died in 1784. Her institute was confirmed by Pius VI. in 1791, with simple vows and no enclosure. In 1805,

at the request of Bishop Moylan, Pius VII. raised it to the rank of a religious order, with solemn vows and strict enclosure. A fourth vow was added, by which the nuns bind themselves to instruct young girls, especially the poor, in the precepts and rudiments of the Catholic faith. Their work, however, extends also to higher education. They have many houses in Ireland, England, America, and Australia. (See the "Life of Nano Nagle," by Dr. Hutch; "Cath. Enc.")

PRIESTS, CHRISTIAN. The priesthood is the second in rank among the holy orders. It is the office of a priest, according to the Pontifical, "to offer, bless, rule, preach, and baptize." First, he is empowered to offer that sacrifice of the Mass which is the centre of all the Church's worship, because in it Christ, the great high-priest, continually offers Himself in a bloodless manner, and applies that one sacrifice consummated for our redemption on the cross. Next, the priest, standing between God and his fellowmen, blesses the people in God's name. It is his duty, if a flock is entrusted to him, to rule and to instruct it, and to administer the sacraments of Baptism, Penance, Holy Communion, and Extreme Unction, besides solemnising marriages, &c. His duties are much wider than those of the Jewish priests. The latter were to teach the statutes of the Lord in Israel (Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxiii. 10; Ezech. xliv. 23, 24), and their lips were to keep knowledge (Mal. ii. 7); but these moral duties were only hinted at, and were not the subject of special regulation. On the contrary, though the offering of sacrifice is the chief, it is by no means the only duty of the Christian priest. He succeeds the Jewish "elder" as well as the Jewish priest. Hence he is called ἱερεύς and *sacerdos—i.e.* "sacrificing priest," but also *presbyter—i.e.* "elder." Our Saxon ancestors had both words, "priest" and "sacerd." We have retained only the former, but always use it in the sense of the latter.

The word "presbyter" was familiar to every Jew. The "elders" (זְקֵנִים, πρεσβύτεροι) were the chief men in the old civil communities of Palestine, and the word exactly answers in meaning to the Arabic "sheikh." In later times the number and authority of these "elders" was definitely fixed, and even among the Jews of the dispersion there was a council (יְשִׁיבָה = *consessus*) which met in the synagogue and administered the discipline of the Jewish community.[1] No record remains of the institution of such a body among Christians; but in Acts xi. 30, when the persecution in which St. James was slain drove the Apostles from Jerusalem, we find the Church there provided with a senate of "presbyters." It was apparently at a later date that such "presbyters" appeared among communities of Gentile Christians, for they are not once mentioned by St. Paul, except in the pastoral epistles. They were "rulers" of the Church, and though they might teach, if qualified to do so, this was no necessary part of their office (1 Tim. v. 17).[1] This ruling-office, as we have seen already, is still prominent in the Pontifical, which compares presbyters to the "seventy elders" who assisted Moses. In ancient times they formed the council of the bishop, who for many centuries could take no important step without consulting them. (See Second Council of Seville (619) can. 6: Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 257.) The presbyters of the diocese are now represented by the chapter, which the bishop is obliged to consult in enacting statutes &c. In one place the New Testament attributes the administration of a sacrament, viz. Extreme Unction, to presbyters (James v. 14).

The words "priest," "priesthood" (ἱερεύς, ἱεράτευμα), are never applied in the New Testament to the office of the Christian ministry. All Christians are said to be priests (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Apoc. v. 10). This recognition of the universal priesthood of Christians, however, involves no denial of the existence of a special priesthood, for the Israelites too were called a "kingdom of priests," though they had, of course, a special priesthood with prerogatives jealously guarded. Further, the Old Testament prophesies that priests would be taken from the Gentiles, and that the office of the priesthood was to last for ever (Isa. lxvi. 21; Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18); and St. Paul, so far, at least, brings the Christian ministry into connection with the Jewish priesthood that he justifies the claim of the former to support by a reference to the way in which the latter "lived by the altar" (1 Cor. ix. 13). Döllinger ("First Age of the Church," E.T. p. 222) also urges the liturgical character of St. Paul's language (Rom. xv. 16), where he describes himself as a "minister" (λειτουργόν, cf. Heb. viii. 2) and as an evangelical priest (ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, "ministering in sacrifice," R.V. marg.). The argument does not seem to be of much account, and Estius is probably right in considering the language merely metaphorical. The Apostle was a minister appointed by Christ, "administering the gospel" like a priest, that the Gentiles might offer up themselves an oblation to God.

The Apostolic Fathers also abstain from any mention of a Christian priesthood; at least the single reference in St. Ignatius (Phil. 9, PG, v. 704, καλοὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς) is very

[1] Vitringa (*De Synagog. Vet.* lib. ii. cap. 4 *seq.*) is at great pains to show that in the early synagogues these "elders" directed worship as well as discipline. We cannot see that he proves his point.

[1] So Cyprian, Ep. 29, ed. Hartel, 548, distinguishes the "presbyteri doctores" as a special class. The word "pastors" (ποιμένες, Ephes. iv. 11), which expresses the ruling office, is derived, like "presbyter" itself, from the language of the Synagogue, פַּרְנָסִים. (See Vitringa, ii. 10.)

doubtful.[1] Justin, in the middle of the second century (Dial. 116, 117; PG, vi. 744) simply alludes to the general priesthood of Christians. In a curious letter to Victor of Rome (190–200) Polycrates says of St. John the Evangelist that "he was a priest having worn the mitre" (*ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκὼς*, apud Euseb. "H.E." v. 24). The language can scarcely be anything but metaphorical (so Routh, "Rell. Sacr." tom. ii. p. 28). At the end of the second or beginning of the third century the term "priest" was in common use. We find it in Tertullian ("Praescr." 41, "sacerdotalia munera," PL, ii. 57), in the "Philosophumena" (Proem. *μετέχοντες ἀρχιερατείας*), Origen (Hom. v. in Lev. iv.). In Cyprian the word (*sacerdos*) constantly occurs—usually for bishops, but sometimes also for presbyters ("De Zelo et Livore," ed. Hartel, 423, 6).

We may distinguish three stages in the position of the priesthood.

(1) In the earliest times they ruled with and in subordination to the bishop. The bishop and priests said Mass conjointly, and the priests administered the sacraments independently only in the bishop's absence.

(2) The presbyters became more independent owing to the gradual establishment of parish as distinct from episcopal churches. Innocent's letter to Decentius exhibits the change in actual progress. In towns, he says, the Eucharist is to be consecrated by the bishop only and sent to the parish priests; in outlying churches the priests are to consecrate for themselves. Thus, separate replaced conjoint rule and administration of the sacraments.

(3) Gradually the rule became a separable accident of the priesthood. At first a priest, by the very fact of ordination, was attached to a particular church, and only in rare and exceptional instances a man of extraordinary merit was induced to submit to ordination on condition that he should not be bound to a particular church. In this way St. Jerome was ordained by Paulinus of Antioch. But from the eleventh century the custom began of ordaining priests who had no benefice, provided they had the means of honourable support (Juenin, "De Sacr." diss. viii. cap. 3). Further, the ordination of religious without cure of souls became the rule instead of the exception. And it is the capacity for rule, rather than the actual exercise of it, which we now associate with the priestly office. [PARISH; PARISH PRIEST; ORDER.]

PRIMATE (*primas*). In early times bishops were called primates who held any commanding position in the Church. Thus the Roman Pontiff was sometimes called the primate of the whole Church; and the Council of Chalcedon declared that the primacy, or first place before all (*πρὸ πάντων τὰ πρωτεῖα*), was to be accorded to "the Archbishop of Old Rome." (Sess. xvi. See, however, Hefele-Leclercq. ii. 834.) In Africa the metropolitans were called primates, or bishops of the first sees. Carthage, in the province of Africa strictly so called, was always the first see, though its bishop might be junior to others; in the other provinces the dignity of first see passed from city to city, as it depended on the priority of the date of consecration of the respective bishops.

In modern times those bishops only are properly called primates to whose see the dignity of vicar of the Holy See was formerly annexed. Such sees are—Armagh in Ireland, Arles and Lyons in France, Mayence in Germany, Toledo in Spain, Gran in Hungary, Pisa and Salerno in Italy, and some others. None of these retains any primatial jurisdiction except Gran, the archbishop of which has still the right of receiving appeals from all the other archbishops in Hungary. Changed circumstances—especially the great facility with which the most distant countries can now communicate with Rome—have made the jurisdiction of primates almost a thing of the past. [ARCHBISHOP; EXARCH; METROPOLITAN.] (Soglia, "Instit. Canon." lib. ii. § 48.)

PRIME. [See BREVIARY.]

PRIMER. [See PRYMER.]

PRIMICERIUS (*primus, cera*). The leading person, or foreman, on a list of the *employés* in a particular business or function; thus we read of the *p. notariorum*, the *p. palatii*, &c. "First on the waxed tablet" is the literal meaning of the word. In its modern use the term is only applied to the precentor of a cathedral or collegiate choir, who is responsible for the due instruction of every member of the choir in ecclesiastical chant and other things proper to his function. But the word is now seldom heard; the "primicer" of St. Denis is among the few instances where it is still retained. (Ferraris; Thomassin, I.)

PRIOR, PRIORESS. It is doubtful whether the word "prior" was used in either of the senses which it has borne for many centuries past—that is, as signifying either the ruler of an independent monastery, or the coadjutor and second-in-command of an abbot—before the pontificate of Celestine V. in the thirteenth century. The older term was *praepositus*, provost; thus Bede speaks of St. Cuthbert having been *praepositus* under the Abbot Eata, first at Melrose and afterwards at Lindisfarne.[1] Whenever the term "prior" occurs in relation to monks before the thirteenth century, it is said to be used in a loose sense, as signifying merely one who on account of greater age or other ground of superiority ranked above his fellows. The duties of a prior, or *praepositus*, are thus

[1] In the *Didache* (xiii. 3) the "prophets" (1 Cor. xii. 28) are called *ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν*.

[1] Bed. iv. 27.

described by Isidore: "To the *praepositus* belongs the charge of the monks, the carrying on of lawsuits, the management of the estates, the cropping of the fields, the planting and cultivation of vineyards, acquaintance with the law, the erection of buildings, the work of the carpenters and the smiths." [1] The *prior claustralis*, being next to the abbot in the monastery, and appointed by him, generally for life, had the inspection and control of the *decani*, or deans [DEAN], and was expected to maintain discipline firmly among the monks, for which purpose he might use the lesser excommunication. The *prior conventualis* was the master in his own house; under him there was generally a sub-prior. Yet there were several distinct positions, all of which might be described as priorates. For (1) in a place with a special history—*e.g.* Durham, where the mighty memory of the abbot-bishop St. Cuthbert coloured and modified all that was done for nine centuries—the bishop of the see might hold a quasi-abbatial position in the monastery out of which the see first arose; in which case the head of the monastery could only be a prior. But the Prior of Durham, modest as the name might sound, was a greater personage than most abbots. (2) a *cell*, or *obedience*, the offshoot of some larger monastery, was always governed by a prior. A conventual prior in this sense was often a person of little dignity or consequence, both from having a very small community to govern, and because the property with which the cell was endowed was small. (3) the superiors of the houses of regular canons (Augustinians, Arroasians, and — originally — Premonstratensians) were always called priors, never abbots. St. Dominic, who adopted the rule of St. Augustine for his friars, probably on this account put their houses under *priors*.

A prioress under an abbess held nearly the same position as a claustral prior, and prioresses governing their own houses were like conventual priors. (Thomassin: Smith and Cheetham.)

PRISCILLIANISTS. The followers of Priscillian, bishop of Avila in Spain (the birthplace of St. Theresa), in the fourth century. An Egyptian named Mark brought the Manichaean doctrines into Spain, and seduced by them the Bishops Instantius and Salvianus. besides other important or wealthy persons, of whom Priscillian was one. The sect was condemned by a synod held at Saragossa in 380; but even after this Instantius and Salvianus ventured to raise Priscillian to the see of Avila. The Emperor Gratian vacillated; but when the usurper Maximus came into power. he listened to the complaints of Idacius and Ithacius, the representatives of the majority of the Spanish bishops, and caused Priscillian and several of his adherents (384) to be tried before his own tribunal at Treves. St. Martin, who happened to be at Treves at the time, vainly endeavoured to dissuade Maximus from bringing a question of heresy before a secular court. Priscillian, the widow Euchrocia, and several others, were condemned and put to death. St. Martin was so grieved and shocked by this that for a long time he refused to communicate with Ithacius, and would not go near the Court. The heresy lingered on in Spain during the fifth century and was not entirely extinct at the date of the Council of Braga, 563. (Leclercq, "L'Espagne Chrétienne," iii. 150–203; St. Augustine, "De Haer. lxx.," PL, xlii. 44.)

[1] Thomassin, i. iii. 65.

PRIVATE MASSES. [See MASS, p. 568.]

PRIVATE REVELATION. The Christian religion is described as a revelation, on the ground that God through Christ has revealed truths to which the unaided reason could not have attained, or attained with the same certainty. This revelation was made to the whole world, just as the Mosaic religion, also a revelation, communicated God's will to a single people. But after the full revelation made to the whole human race through Christ, the New Testament speaks repeatedly of private revelations made to individuals for a particular end. Thus St. Paul (Gal. ii. 2) on a memorable occasion went up to Jerusalem "in accordance with a revelation" (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*); and he speaks elsewhere of such revelations as made repeatedly to himself (2 Cor. xii. 1), and as of frequent occurrence in the Church (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26), or at least that part of the Church to which he was writing. Justin ("Dial." 88 *ad fin.*, PG, vi. 688) and Irenaeus ("Adv. Haer." v. 6, 1, PG, vii. 1137) speak of prophetic gifts as enduring in the Church of their own day; and later Fathers, in their strife with the Montanists, did not attack those sectaries simply because they claimed to prophesy, but partly because of the contents of their revelations, partly because these supposed prophecies were made in an ecstatic state, which impeded the use of reason. Thus the Montanist Tertullian ("Adv. Marc." iv. 22, PL, ii. 413, cf. "De Anima," 45); whereas Miltiades, an early Catholic opponent of the sect, wrote a book to prove that "a prophet must not speak in ecstasy" (*περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν*, Euseb. "H.E." v. 17). This principle became an accepted one in the Church (so, *e.g.*, Chrysost. Hom. xxix. in Epist. 1 ad Corinth., PG, lxi. 239; Epiphan. "Adv. Haer. Montan." 2; Jerome, "Praef. Comm. in Nahum," PL, xxv. 1232; "Praef. Comm. in Habacuc"); but the possibility, and even the actual occurrence, of private revelations in the Church of all ages was, as we shall see presently, never denied.[1] The whole subject has been investi-

[1] See, however, Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* tom. ii. p. 217, and the extract there given from Didymus of Alexandria.

gated with patient learning by Eusebius Amort in his work entitled "De Revelationibus, Visionibus, et Apparitionibus Privatis Regulae tutae" (Augsburg, 1744). For the remainder of this article we are largely indebted to him; and in theological principles we have been content to follow him, though the historical facts have been drawn from various sources. We should add that Amort's book contains an analysis of all that has been said by the chief theologians and mystics who have treated of the question.

So far as we are aware, the first attempt to classify revelations from the subjective side was made by St. Augustine ("De Genesi ad lit." xii. 1 *seq.*, PL, xxxiv. 453). He divides them into such as are sensible, *i.e.* given through sensuous images; such as are spiritual, *i.e.* conveyed through the imagination, which presents to the mind the figures of bodily things not actually present; and such as are purely intellectual. The last he considers the most perfect, because least subject to demoniacal illusion, since devils, as was supposed, could influence the bodily powers, among which imagination is reckoned, but could not directly influence man's intellectual nature. Even intellectual visions are certainly from God only so far as the objects and the light by which they are manifested transcend nature. St. Augustine's principles are accepted as fundamental by the later mystics, *e.g.* by St. John of the Cross and St. Theresa, whose opinions are given by Amort at length.

St. Augustine evidently believed that these private revelations were made from time to time, though on each particular revelation he leaves others free to think as they please ("Ep. clix. ad Evod." PL, xxxiii. 700; "Doctrin. Christ." i. Prolog.), and he sharply contrasts their authority with that of the Bible ("De Catech. Rud." 6, PL, xl. 317).

In the Middle Ages a notable change was effected since mediaeval Popes have actually given their solemn approval to private revelations of saints. So Eugenius III. approved the revelations of St. Hildegarde (see Baronius, ad ann. 1148, n. 32), and Cardinal Turrecremata tells us that those of St. Bridget of Sweden were sanctioned by Urban VI. and Boniface IX. (see Turrecremata's Prologue prefixed to the folio edition of St. Bridget's works, Munich, 1680. and the extracts from the bull of Boniface IX., renewed and confirmed by Martin V.). Of St. Gertrude's revelations Blosius merely says that they were examined and approved by "most learned and enlightened men," and that no spiritual person will venture to impugn them (Blosius, Appendix to the "Monile Spirituale"). It is but another sign of the growing importance attached in the mediaeval Church to private revelations, and their closer connection with ecclesiastic authority, when we find Leo X., in his bull "Supernae," forbidding private revelations to be published —*e.g.* in sermons—unless already approved by the Holy See (see Castaldus, "De Potestate Angelica," Rome, 1650, apud Amort).

This prominence of private revelations in the later Church has given them a greater influence on devotion and pious beliefs. No doubt even in the early Church the "Shepherd" of Hermas had for a time quasi-canonical authority. The vision of St. Perpetua promoted the belief in purgatorial pain; the origin of the Trisagion was attributed to private revelation (St. John of Damasc. "De Fid. Orthodox." iii. 10, PG, xciv. 1021); the second Council of Tours appeals to a private revelation for the proper number of psalms at Sext (Mann's "Concil." ix. 797); and the Corpus Juris supposes (c. "Nosse," De Consecr. D. 3, Pius I.) that an early Pope was led to institute the celebration of Easter on Sunday by the revelations of Hermas. But till the Middle Ages it may be safely said that no private revelations exercised anything like the wide and enduring influence enjoyed by those of St. Gertrude, St. Bridget, St. Catharine of Siena, and many others who might be named. Still, no marked change was made in theological principle. For,

(1) Private revelations are only approved by the Pope in some general sense, as containing nothing contrary to faith or good morals, while the particular facts given in them are only approved as probable and calculated to promote piety. Amort points out that Suarez, although he believed in the truth of St. Bridget's revelations, does not scruple to contradict them on details in the history of Christ's passion.

(2) They cannot in any case avail to settle a controversy of faith still undecided by the Church. It is true that Amort quotes two theologians who judged otherwise, Corduba ("Question." lib. I. q. 44) and Orlandus ("In III. Sent." D. 3, q. 3, dub. 4), and even St. Augustine clearly thought, when in doubt about the validity of baptism given in joke, that the question might be decided by private revelation, "per alicujus revelationis oraculum concordi oratione implorandum" ("Contr. Donat." vii. 53, PL, xliii. 243). But the whole weight of theological opinion is, as Amort abundantly proves, on the other side. An attempt was made to influence the controversy on the Immaculate Conception in this way. The Dominicans were the great adversaries of the doctrine, the Franciscans its champions. St. Bridget, who was a Franciscan tertiary, asserts in her revelations (vi. 49) that she heard the Blessed Virgin say, in so many words, "The truth is that I was conceived without original sin." To this the Dominican theologian St. Antoninus of Florence replies

("Theol." P. I. tit. viii. cap. 2) that St. Catharine of Siena, who was a Dominican tertiary, and "other female saints, illustrious for miracles, had a revelation to the contrary effect" ("habuerunt revelationem de contrario"). (St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 174, a. 6; Benedict XIV. "De Canonizatione," lib. ii. c. 32, lib. iii. c. 53; Franzelin, "De Traditione," 279.)

PRIVATION. [See SUSPENSION.]

PRIVILEGE. "A private enactment, granting some special benefit or favour, against or outside the law."[1] It differs from a dispensation in that this last usually refers to a single act, such as a marriage, or the reception of orders, whereas a privilege presupposes and legalizes many acts done in pursuance of it. It differs from a grace or benefaction, because the latter is confined to the good which it operates once for all, whereas a privilege confers on its possessor immunity in regard to every act of the kind privileged, as much as if he had obtained the sanction of the law. A privilege may be granted by word of mouth as well as by deed. Privileges are either *against* the law (as when the duty of paying tithes, or that of submitting to the jurisdiction of the ordinary, is remitted to certain persons or communities), or it is beyond or outside the law—namely, when it authorizes acts which the law does not forbid, but which are only allowable to particular persons, such as the power of absolving in reserved cases, or of dispensing, and the like. Again, privileges are divided into real, personal, and mixed; the first being primarily annexed to some *thing* (a place, or a building, or a dignity), and indirectly extended to the persons by whom the thing is owned or enjoyed; the second being primarily granted to some *person*, regarded as an individual; the third being granted to *classes* of persons—*e.g.* the privileges of clerics, or students, or soldiers. Many other distinctions are noted by the canonists. It is obvious that only that authority can establish a privilege which is competent to frame and enforce a law. Concession made by such an authority is the usual source of a privilege; it may, however, also be acquired by prescription. A third way is that of communication, of which the mendicant orders furnish a brilliant example, since every such order enjoys by communication, not only every privilege ever granted to any other mendicant institute, but also those granted to any of the non-mendicant orders.

The chief privileges appertaining to clerical or monastic persons have been incidentally stated in the articles BISHOP, ABBOT, DEACON, PRIEST, MONK, NUN, &c.; but there are two important privileges belonging to the entire clerical body, which may here be noticed. These are the privileges of the tribunal and the canon (*privilegia fori et canonis*). The first is the exemption of the clergy from the secular tribunals in criminal and civil causes: an exemption of the highest value in barbarous times, but less desirable in those more civilised, and now in point of fact hardly anywhere enjoyed. The privilege of the canon consists in the excommunication (under the fifteenth canon of the Second Lateran Council), with reservation of absolution to the Pope, of anyone who has "laid violent hands on cleric or monk." (Ferraris, *Privilegium*; Taunton; Soglia, ii. § iii.)

[1] Ferraris.

PRIVILEGED ALTAR. (1) An altar, such as the seven privileged altars in St. Peter's, by visiting which certain indulgences may be gained.

(2) An altar at which Votive Masses may be said even on certain feasts which are doubles. There are often altars of this kind at places of pilgrimage.

(3) Altars with a plenary indulgence for one soul in purgatory attached to all Masses said at them for the dead. The privilege continues even if a new altar be erected, provided it be in the same place and under the same title. All altars are privileged on All Souls' Day. Sometimes the privilege is personal—*i.e.* a priest may have the privilege of gaining the plenary indulgence always, or on certain occasions, when he offers Mass for the dead, without respect to the altar at which he says it. The local privilege is only granted to fixed altars, the personal may be used even at portable altars. The Mass must be a Requiem Mass, if the rubrics permit it to be said on that day, but these limitations have been removed. This privilege is not withdrawn in the general suspension of indulgences during a jubilee. (Probst, art. *Altar*, "Kirchenlexikon.")

PROBABILISM. [See MORAL THEOLOGY, p. 603.]

PROCESSIONS. The word in its wider sense is used of the solemn entrance of the clergy to the altar for Mass, Vespers, &c, or of their return after service to the sacristy. The oldest Ordo Romanus, about the year 720, contains elaborate directions for a procession of this kind. At processions in a more restricted sense persons march together in public that they may express their gratitude to God, beseech His mercy, or do honour to the living or the dead. Processions with the first of these objects are called processions simply, those with the second are also known as "Litaniae," "Rogationes," "Stationes," "Supplicationes," "Exomologeses." Processions at the visitation &c. of a bishop and at funerals are instances of the third class. Processions are also classified, according as they are made with or without the Blessed Sacrament, relics, statues of the Blessed Virgin or the saints.

Lastly, there are extraordinary processions ordered by ecclesiastical authority for some special cause, and ordinary ones prescribed by the common ritual law of the Church. To the latter class the processions on Candlemas, Palm Sunday, St. Mark's Day, three Rogation Days, Corpus Christi, and at funerals belong. Each procession has a head, who walks last, those being nearest him who are highest in dignity and the juniors walking in front. The chief person, if a priest, wears biretta, stole, surplice, and sometimes also cope; if he bears the Blessed Sacrament, always a cope and humeral veil. A bishop wears his mitre and carries his pastoral staff; but in procession with the Blessed Sacrament and with a particle of the True Cross (S.C.R. Sept. 2, 1690) the head must not be covered, and then the bishop's staff is carried behind, his mitre before, him. The baldacchino always carried over the Blessed Sacrament may also be used, where it is the custom, with particles of the True Cross and other instruments of the Passion (S.C.R. 27 Maii, 1826). It is also used to honour the bishop—*e.g.* at his solemn entrance into a church. The colour of the vestments and the prayers said vary with the occasion of the procession. An out-door procession always starts from and ends by returning to the church, but sometimes several churches are visited in the course of the procession. The bishop may compel the attendance even of religious at processions under pain of censure, unless their rule obliges them to entire seclusion (S.C.R. 18 Martii, 1679).

Processions, at least in the case of funerals, were known in the Church during the time of heathen persecution. (See, *e.g.*, "Acta Martyr. S. Cypriani.") The litanies or penitential processions are thought by some to be mentioned by Basil (Ep. 207, "Ad Neoc.," PG, xxxii. 764; but see the Benedictine note). Festal processions are spoken of as an ancient custom by Ambrose (Ep. 40, § 16, ad Theodos., PL, xvi. 1107). They are often mentioned in the "Peregrinatio Etheriae." The procession on St. Mark's Day was old and established in the time of St. Gregory the Great, and was perhaps a survival in a purified form of the procession on the same day in honour of the goddess Robigo (Ovid, "Fasti," iv. 906); processions with relics were common in the fourth century. (See, *e.g.*, August. "Conf." ix. 7, PL, xxxii. 770; Socrates, "H.E." iii. 18.) Gregory of Tours ("Hist. Franc." v. 4) mentions the custom of carrying banners in processions. Processions are in fact a natural means common to all religions of publicly expressing the feelings of the heart, and are taken by an obvious symbolism as a figure of the Christian journey through this life to the next. (For further information see FUNERALS; CORPUS CHRISTI; ROGATION, &c.)

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON. The addition made to the Nicene Creed at Constantinople in 381 mentions only the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, and this for a plain reason. The definitions of the Council were directed against the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost and supposed that He was created, like all else which is not God, through the Son. The Council, on the contrary, denied that the Third Person was to be placed in the category of creatures at all. It affirmed His procession from the Father, and so in effect denied that He was created through the Son or owed His existence to Him, in the same sense that creatures do. Whether the Spirit did or did not eternally proceed from the Son was a question which did not come before the assembly. For a long time after there was no controversy on this point. Theodore of Mopsuestia (Mansi, "Concil." iv. 1348) says of the Holy Ghost: "Neither do we regard Him as the Son or as having received existence through the Son." And so Theodoret, criticising the ninth anathema of St. Cyril, declares he will admit the Spirit's procession from the Father, but by no means "that He has existence" (*τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον*) from the Son or through the Son.[1] Great authorities—Bellarmine, Petavius, and Garnier—have seen in Theodoret's criticism the first rise of the famous controversy on the double procession. This view is very far from certain. In all probability Theodoret simply meant to separate the existence of the Spirit from that of creatures. (So Kuhn, "Trinitätslehre," p. 484 *sqq.*)

However, the theology of the Church was forced to consider the eternal relations of the Second and Third Persons. If both alike proceeded from the Father, then how was the Spirit distinct from the Son? Why were there not two Sons? The difficulty met in West and East with two answers, different at least in form:—

1. The Latin formula is contained in the early Creed falsely ascribed to St. Athanasius—"The Holy Ghost is from the Father and the Son," a Patre et Filio. So Hilary, "De Trin." ii. 29, PL, x. 69; Augustine, "De Trin." iv. 20, PL, xlii. 908. These appear to be the oldest testimonies,[2] for Tertullian's "a Patre per Filium" ("Adv. Prax." 4, PL, ii. 159) can scarcely be regarded as a direct and certain reference to eternal procession. There is no need to quote later writers. Petavius ("Trin." vii. 8) says he only knew of one single Latin author—viz. Rusticus the Deacon—who ever doubted the correctness of the current Latin formula. St. Augustine

[1] The text will be found in the words of St. Cyril, PG, ix. 432.

[2] Ambrose (*De Spiritu S.* i. 11; PL, xvi. 732) says the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. But, in this place "procedere" means "to be sent."

("In Joann." Tract. xcix., PL, xxxv. 1885, and in many other places) proves the procession of the Spirit from the Son, from the fact that the former is called the "Spirit of the Son" (Gal. iv. 6), and again because the Son, while on earth, gave the Holy Ghost the temporal mission by, implying eternal procession from, the Son. St. Augustine clearly explains ("De Trin." v. cap. 14,[1] PL, xlii. 920) that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, not as from two principles, but as from one. St. Anselm, in his treatise on the procession of the Holy Ghost (cap. 18, al. 17), answers the objection of the schismatic Greeks, that the Latins asserted the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son as from two principles, by denying the alleged fact. The Spirit, he says, proceeds from the Father and Son, not in so far as they are distinct from, but in so far as they are one with, each other. St. Thomas argues (1^a, q. 36, a. 2) that if the Holy Ghost did not proceed from the Son there would be no real distinction between them, since in the Trinity the Persons are only distinguished from each other by mutual relation. This is no more than the development of a principle laid down by St. Augustine and other Fathers. It was, however, rejected by the Scotists.

2. The Greek Fathers commonly expressed their belief by another formula—viz. "from the Father through the Son" (*ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*), intending by this mode of expression to guard the doctrine that the Father is the principle or ultimate source of the Godhead. This form was not unknown in the West, for it occurs, *e.g.*, in St. Hilary ("De Trin." xii. "ex te," addressed to the Father, "per eum"), and implies, instead of excluding, the belief that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father. Moreover, some Greek Fathers actually use the Latin form. St. Epiphanius does so again and again (*τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα παρ' ἀμφοτέρων*, "Haer." 74, 7, PG, xlii. 488; *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ*, "Ancorat." 8; *ἄρα θεὸς ἐκ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα*, *ib.* 9). So does St. Cyril of Alexandria, who says the Spirit is "the Spirit of Christ and His mind," and no mere minister, since He "knows without teaching all that appertains to Him from whom and in whom He is" ("In Joann." xiv. 25–26, p. 837, ed. Aubert). Other great Fathers of the Greek Church clearly express their belief in the double procession. Thus, St. Athanasius asserts "it is not the Spirit which knits the Word to the Father, but rather the Spirit receives from the Word" (Orat. iii. "Contr. Arian." 24, p. 454 in the Benedictine edition); and again. "Such as we have found the proper relation (*ἰδιότητα*) of the Son to the Father, such we shall find is that of the Spirit to the Son, and as the Son says, 'All that the Father has is mine,' so we shall find all this through the Son and in the Spirit" ("Ad Serap." iii. 1, p. 552); and then he quotes the "Spirit of the Son" (Gal. iv. 6) and other places in which He is called both the Spirit of the Father and of the Son. Basil speaks of the Spirit as the "utterance" of the Son (*ῥῆμα δὲ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα*, "Contr. Eunom." v. p. 304, ed. Benedict.; see also *ib.* ii. 34, p. 271. In iii. 1, p. 272, the clause *παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχον καὶ ὅλως τῆς αἰτίας ἐκείνης ἐξημμένον* is spurious). A very late Father, St. John of Damascus, is the first to reject the Latin statement that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son (*ἐξ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν*, "De Fide Orthodox." i. 8); and although St. Thomas and Petavius consider this an error on his part, Le Quien gives strong reasons for supposing that he only meant to deny that the Son is the ultimate principle of the procession or a principle of it at all, so far as He is distinct from the Father.

Up to this point, then, we meet with nothing but a difference of words, like that which divided the West from most of the Orientals on the use of the term hypostasis; and for a long time each part of the Church was allowed to go its own way in peace. Pope Hormisdas, in a letter to Justin in 521, states the double procession in the Latin form ("proprium Sp. S. ut a Patre et Filio procederet sub una substantia deitatis." Mansi. viii. 521), and met apparently with no opposition. Maximus ("Ad Marin." ed. Combefis, p. 70 *seq.*) shows that some Greeks (as Le Quien thinks, Monothelites) raised a difficulty on the matter; but Maximus shows that both formulae expressed the same truth. So, on the other hand, Pope Hadrian, in a letter to Charlemagne, defends the Greek formula against the attack of some Latins (Mansi, xiii. 760 *seq.*). The Latin formula was violently denounced about the same time by John, a Greek monk, otherwise unknown, who charged the Latin monks on Mount Olivet with heresy, but no great result followed. (See the documents in Le Quien, "Diss. Damasc." i. § xiii. *seq.*)

Unfortunately, the difference of words was used by Photius after his condemnation at Rome, and again when the schism was renewed by Caerularius, as a means of exciting hatred against the Latins. And the strife became more bitter after the addition of the "Filioque" to the Creed even in the local Church of Rome. Enough has been said on these subjects in the articles on the Greek Church and on the Creeds. But something remains to be added here on the doctrine of the Schismatic Greeks.

Had they merely anathematized the Latin formula because they thought it implied two principles of spiration; had they merely denied the right of the Pope to permit the addition to the Creed, all this would have been proof of a schismatical spirit, but would not

[1] "Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus Sancti, non duo principia."

in itself have involved heresy on the doctrine of the Trinity. In fact, however, the Greeks, beginning with a factious opposition to the Latin terminology, ended in a denial of the Catholic doctrine. Although the Greek Fathers, says Le Quien, and St. John of Damascus, to whom the Greeks constantly appealed, taught the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father through the Son, the schismatics with one consent, from Caerularius to Beccus (*i.e.* till about 1274), denied any eternal procession of the Spirit through the Son, and simply admitted that the gifts or temporal manifestation of the Holy Ghost came through the Son. (Le Quien, *loc. cit.* § xlviii.) Here of course is an absolute opposition, not of terminology, but of doctrine.

A new opinion was devised in a council held against the Patriarch Beccus, who became a Catholic. Examination showed that the form in St. John Damascene, "from the Father through the Son," referred to eternal procession. Thereupon Gregory of Cyprus, the schismatical successor of Beccus, advanced the theory that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father through the Son, not in respect to existence, but to effulgence (εἰς ἀΐδιον ἔκφανσιν). There was, according to him, an eternal effulgence, improperly called the Spirit, produced by the Father through the Son, or rather by all three Persons (Le Quien, § xlix. 1). This was a prelude to the notion of the Palamites, the kernel of which consisted, as Combefis puts it, in this, that they considered the ἐνεργήματα and gifts of the Spirit to be eternal and uncreated (Combefis apud Mansi, xxvi. 211).

At Florence, Mark of Ephesus began by a simple objection to the insertion of the "Filioque" in the Creed; but later on he asserted that "through the Son" meant "with the Son," denying any other relation between the Second and Third Persons. Many more instances of Greek theologians who knowingly and of set purpose opposed the Catholic doctrine will be found in Petavius "De Trin." vii. 15. (A very full and accurate account of the whole history of the controversy is given in the first of the dissertations prefixed by Le Quien to his edition of St. John of Damascus. We have also derived much help from Petavius, "De Trinitate," and Kuhn, "Trinitätslehre." Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 294 *sqq.*)

PROCURATOR. The authorized agent or representative of another (Fr. *procureur*, proctor). Thus it answers to a "proxy," when the question is of a marriage which one of the parties contracts through a representative, and to a "sponsor," when the question is of a baptism where one or both of the god-parents are not able to be present. In either of the above senses, a procurator contracts spiritual affinity not to himself, but to his principal. A procurator is such either in respect of lawsuits entered upon, or in respect of business transactions; in the first case he is *judicialis*, in the other, *extra-judicialis*. The procurators or official agents of monasteries of nuns should not hold office more than three years. (Ferraris, *Procurator.*)

PROCURATOR CLERI. An official appointed as a representative of the clergy and acting at their mandate. He is appointed in synod. His duty is to make (if necessary) respectful remonstrances to the bishop regarding the synodal decrees (Taunton).

PROCURATOR FISCAL. An official attached to a bishop's court as promotor or prosecutor of cases affecting the public welfare or interest of the Church. He is appointed by the bishop or judge of the episcopal court. (Périès, "Le Procureur Fiscal ou Promoteur"; Taunton.)

PROFESSION OF FAITH. [See CREEDS.]

PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS. A religious or regular profession is "a promise freely made and lawfully accepted, whereby a person of the full age required, after the completion of a year of probation, binds him- (or her-) self to a particular religious institute approved by the Church."[1] The full age required is sixteen years, reckoned from the day of birth.[2] The year of novitiate or probation must have been continuous; so that if the novice had interrupted it even for so short a time as two hours, *e.g.* by leaving the monastery with the intention of entering some other order, the year would have to be begun *de novo*, from the date when he renewed his resolution of seeking admission to the order. Moreover, the year of probation must be spent in the religious habit, and in a monastery or other house designed for the purpose or approved by the Holy See.

By being "freely made" is meant, with entire personal liberty, with the free command over one's own property, and without prejudice to the rights of third parties. Thus neither a slave, nor a married person (without the consent of the other spouse), nor a bishop already consecrated (without a Papal dispensation) can be validly professed.

The matter of the promise is, the three essential vows of religion—poverty, obedience, and chastity—and any other vow or vows peculiar to the institute which the candidate is entering.

The following is an outline of the manner of profession of a nun, as prescribed in the "Pontificale Romanum":—

The Pontifical office is recited as far as the Gospel. The novices, habited as during their probationary year, each accompanied by two veiled religious, are led from the convent into the church, and go up two and two into the sanctuary; there they kneel; and the priest, officiating in the

[1] Ferraris.
[2] Conc. Trid. sess. xxv. c. 15, De Reg. et Mon.

character of archpriest, requests of the bishop, seated on his throne before the altar, that they may be consecrated. The bishop asks whether they are fit and worthy, and, being assured that they are, bids them come up. They obey, and range themselves in a semicircle round the bishop, who, after a short exhortation, says to them in a loud voice, "Are you willing to persevere in the observance of holy chastity?" Each of them declares her willingness aloud, and after placing her joined hands between those of the bishop, pronounces her perpetual vows. They return to their former place, and kneel down, with heads bowed to the ground; the bishop kneels in front of the altar, and the choir sings the Litanies. After the sentence, "Ut omnibus fidelibus defunctis," &c., and the response, the bishop rises, and, with his mitre on, and the crosier in his hand, solemnly blesses the newly-professed, saying "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to bless and consecrate these Thy servants." The response is made, "We beseech Thee, hear us."

After the Litanies the professed rise, "Veni, Creator," is sung, and they withdraw into a robing-room to change their dress. The bishop blesses the different articles of their future costume, and first of all the habit, which they immediately put on. They reappear, two and two, and again form a semicircle round the bishop, who, after the prayers, &c., set down in the ritual, puts the veil on the head of each, the ring on her finger, and the bridal wreath on her head. After several solemn benedictions the Mass continues. At the Offertory the professed come up to lay their offerings on the altar, and at the Communion the bishop imparts to them the sacred particles which he has consecrated for them.

With regard to the right of profession, as also the minimum of age and length of probation, there is considerable diversity in the various approved rules of different orders.

The effects of profession are, first, that nothing short of a Papal dispensation, which would only be given in extremely rare and altogether exceptional cases, can warrant the professed in returning to the world. A religious in any other order can pass into that of the Carthusians, on account of its great austerity. To pass from one order into another which has an easier rule is not permitted without a Papal dispensation. A valid profession secures to its subject the right of maintenance in the convent during life, and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of the ecclesiastical state. It annuls any simple vow previously contracted which could not be made compatible with the exact observance of the rule. It cancels a promise of marriage, and even a marriage itself, if not consummated. It releases its subject, so far as ordination is concerned, from the irregularity consequent on illegitimacy; finally, it invests the convent with the ownership of any property belonging to the professed at the date of profession, and also of any subsequently acquired.

The above article applies to what is termed "Solemn Profession," which is now made in comparatively few Religious Congregations of women. For it almost everywhere is now substituted "Simple Profession," which secures the privileges mentioned but is compatible with the retention of the ownership (though without the use or administration) of property. (Ferraris, *Regularis, Professio*; Esser; in "Kirchenlex." *Ordensprofess*; Taunton.)

PROMOTION PER SALTUM. [See ORDINATION, p. 630.]

PROMOTOR FIDEI: [See CANONIZATION, p. 114.]

PROMULGATION. That a law should bind, it is necessary that it should be adequately promulgated or published. From and after the date of such promulgation those whom the law concerns are presumed to be acquainted with it, and become liable to the penalties which disobedience entails in case of any infraction of it. Papal rescripts were promulgated by proclamation *in acie campi Florae*,[1] and by being affixed to the gates of the Vatican; whence came the expression "Publicatio urbi et orbi facta." By the Constitution "Promulgandi" of Pius X. (Sept. 29, 1908) the ordinary method of promulgating pontifical laws is by insertion in the "Acta Apostolicae Sedis," the official organ of the Holy See. A further regulation (Jan. 5, 1910) divides this publication into two parts; the first containing all documents requiring promulgation in order to have the force of law; the second, merely illustrations and explanations of the former. But the Pope expressly reserves to himself the right to determine in exceptional cases any other mode of promulgation. In fine a decree of Dec. 26, 1913, ratifies and declares authentic all legislation published up to that date in the "Acta." The diocesan ordinances and pastorals of bishops are, in general, transmitted by them to the rural deans, who forward copies to the parochial clergy under them; but where the number of the clergy is not very large, they receive such missives direct from the bishop. In either case, the parish priest (or missionary rector, as the case may be), completes the promulgation by reading from the pulpit those portions which concern the laity, and affixing the document to the doors of his church.

Among the pernicious doctrines of modern bureaucracy is that which, while denying validity to Papal or episcopal constitutions

[1] The Piazza of the Campo dei Fiori is not far from the Roman Chancery.

unless specially promulgated, makes such promulgation dependent on the consent of the civil government. The exercise by the Pope and the hierarchy of their divinely-conferred function of ruling the flock of Christ is thus circumscribed, and may at any time be rendered nugatory by a hostile government. [EXEQUATUR.] (Zaccaria, "De Varia Ecclesiae praesertim Latinae in Promulgandis Sacris Constitutionibus Disciplina"; Bouix, "De Principiis Juris Canonici," 196 *sqq.*; Van Hove in "Cath. Enc.")

PROPAGANDA. The sacred congregation of Cardinals *de propaganda fide*, commonly called the Congregation of Propaganda, which had been contemplated by Gregory XIII., was practically established by Gregory XV. (1622) to guard, direct, and promote the foreign missions. Among other countries subject to its control were the British Isles, North America (except Mexico), Australasia, and the East and West Indies. By the Constitution "Sapienti Consilio" (June 29, 1908) this jurisdiction has been considerably restricted. The British Isles, North America, and certain other non-Catholic countries are now under the Congregation of the Council; that is, they are now under the normal system of Church government.

Urban VIII. (1623–1644) instituted the "College of Propaganda" as part of the same design, where young men of every nation and language might be trained for the priesthood, and prepared for the evangelic warfare against heathenism or heresy. The management of this college the Pope entrusted to the Congregation. Urban caused the present building to be erected from the designs of Bernini. The College possesses a library of 30,000 volumes, among which are the translations of a great number of Chinese works, and a large collection of Oriental MSS. Attached to the library is the *Museo Borgia*, which contains several interesting MSS., service-books, and autographs, and a collection of objects sent home by the missionaries from the countries where they are stationed, including an extraordinary assortment of idols. [See CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN.]

PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith is an association for assisting in the spread of the Gospel by means of prayer and alms for the support of missionaries. From the very earliest ages of the Church the faithful have helped in these ways when they have not been able to render personal service. The special society for this object was founded at Lyons in 1822. [See MISSIONS, p. 587.]

PROPERTY. [See CHURCH PROPERTY.]

PROPHECY. (1) The biblical meaning of this word is wider than that which is now popularly attached to it. A prophet was not necessarily one who foretold what was to come; he was rather one who spoke, acted, or wrote under the extraordinary influence of God to make known to man the divine counsels and will. The Hebrew word (נָבִיא) clearly indicates this. In Exod. iv. 16, Aaron is appointed to be Moses' "prophet": "He shall speak in thy stead to the people and shall be thy mouth" (see Patrizi "In Evang." l. iii. diss. 13; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 171, a. 3). But as the predictive element became prominent the word has gradually been restricted to foretelling. We shall here state briefly the Catholic teaching on prophecy in this sense.

A prophecy is the certain prediction of future events which cannot be known by natural means. This definition discriminates prophecy from revelation of things past or present; from scientific forecasts and predictions; and from mere conjectures as to the future. God, in whose sight all things to come are ever present, is able to communicate to His creatures the knowledge which He possesses. He alone has this power, because foreknowledge of the contingent future is peculiar to Him. Prophecies are the words of His prescience, just as miracles are the works of His omnipotence. Hence a religion supported by prophecies must be divine. They belong to the supernatural order, because, directly or indirectly, they tend to a supernatural end—the salvation of mankind. Most of them directly make known supernatural facts, *e.g.* the coming of the Messiah, the conversion of the Gentiles, the Last Judgment. Those which directly refer to temporal events in no far off future serve to prove indirectly, by their fulfilment, the veracity of those of the former class which have not yet been fulfilled. It is clear that not all predictions are worthy of credit. If the foreteller does not claim to be God's mouthpiece, and if his life is ungodly, we are not bound to believe him. Although there have been exceptions (*e.g.* Caiaphas, Jn. xi. 49–52), we may assume that God does not, as a rule, communicate His knowledge to the impious. The credentials of a genuine prophecy are miracles wrought in confirmation and the fulfilment of other predictions made by the prophet. Miracles stamp the speaker as the minister of God, while the fulfilment of what he had previously foretold is the natural and obvious proof of his possessing predictive powers. Fulfilled prophecies serve to prove the divine origin of a religion when they possess the following qualifications: (1) that the prophecy was really such, that is, was made before the event; (2) that the fulfilment exactly answers to the prediction; (3) that the event could not have been foreseen by natural means; (4) that the harmony of prediction and event is not accidental. (See Vatican Council, sess. iii. ct. 3; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, qq. 171–176.)

(2) Twelve lessons from the Prophets are sung after the blessing of the Paschal candle and before the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday. Six of these are sung on Whitsun eve also. They were meant originally for the instruction of the catechumens. It is evident from the Sacramentaries and mediaeval writers on ritual that the number varied very considerably in different places and at different times (Merat. on Gavant. tom. i. p. iv. tit. 10).

(3) Lessons from the Prophets at Mass are mentioned by Justin, and were a regular feature in the Gallic, Ambrosian, and Spanish Liturgies. In Rome and Africa, as a rule, there was no lesson in the Mass from the Old Testament (Le Brun, tom. iii. diss. 1). Still, instances of such lessons occur, *e.g.* on the Ember Saturday in Whitsun week, and occasionally, *e.g.* on Friday in the same week, a lesson from the Prophets replaces the Epistle.

(4) "Prophetia" was the name in the Gallican Mass for the Benedictus. It was followed by a "Collectio post prophetiam." (Le Brun, tom. iii. diss. iv. a. 3.)

PROPOSITIONS, CONDEMNED. From the earliest times the Church has condemned heretical propositions. The First General Council, for example, anathematized certain propositions of Arius. But the Church also condemns propositions which are not indeed heretical, but are opposed in some lesser degree to soundness in the faith. Thus in 1418, Martin V. (bull "Inter Cunctas") proposed thirty-nine articles for the examination of persons suspected of agreement with Wyclif and Hus. Of these the eleventh puts the question whether they hold that of the forty-five propositions of Wyclif and Hus, condemned at the Council of Constance, all are uncatholic, and of these, some heretical, "some erroneous, others rash and seditious, others offensive to pious ears." Such condemnations have been very common in the modern Church. Sometimes, as in the bull "Unigenitus," the propositions have been condemned *in globo*—*i.e.* a number of propositions have been condemned as respectively heretical, false, scandalous, &c. Sometimes, as in the "Auctorem fidei" against the Jansenist synod of Pistoia, each proposition has a particular censure attached to it.

We may thus explain the meaning of the terms of censure. A proposition is "heretical" when it is directly opposed to a truth revealed by God and proposed by the Church; "erroneous," when it is contradictory to a truth deduced from two premises, one an article of faith, the other naturally certain; "proximate to error," when opposed to a proposition deduced with great probability from principles of faith; "haeresim sapiens," when it is capable of a good sense, but seems in the circumstances to have an heretical meaning; "evil sounding" or "offensive to pious ears," when opposed to piety and the reverence due to divine things according to the common mode of speaking; "scandalous," when it gives occasion to think or act amiss; "rash," when opposed to the common sense of the Church in matters of faith and morals. This account is taken from Viva, "De Fide"; but Melchior Canus ("De Loc. Theol." lib. xii. cap. 10) shows that opinions have varied much on the precise import of the minor censures. There is a well-known work "Propositiones Damnatae" by the Jesuit Viva.

PROSE. [See SEQUENCE.]

PROTESTANT. The origin of the name was as follows. At the first Diet of Spires (1526) a decree was agreed to, to the effect that, pending the convocation of a general council, every prince of the German Empire should be free to execute the imperial edict of Worms (1521, by which Luther and his doctrine had been condemned) in such a manner as was consistent with his being prepared to answer for his conduct to God and the Emperor. The adoption of this decree led in practice to much discord and confusion, the princes of the different states being emboldened by it to make and enforce within their own territories any arrangements about religion that might be agreeable to them. Thus, in states and cities where the Lutheran opinions prevailed, the Catholic worship was often forbidden. At the Second Diet of Spires (1529) the majority adopted a new decree to this effect: that those states which had hitherto observed the edict of Worms should continue to observe it; that the other states, in which the new opinions had been introduced, should not, pending the meeting of the council, make any fresh changes in regard to religion; and that, in these last-named states, no preaching against the Sacrament of the altar should be permitted, the Mass should not be abolished, and, if Lutheranism had gained the upper hand, the Catholics were not to be prevented from hearing Mass. Against this decree the Lutheran minority in the Diet (chiefly Duke Frederic of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, and Albert of Brandenburg) *protested*; the meaning of the protest being that the dissentient princes did not intend to tolerate Catholicism within their borders. The followers of Luther objected to being called Lutherans; the name of "Evangelical," which Luther approved, the Catholics would not concede. Hence the name "Protestant," which implied nothing positive, and might be used indifferently by all who rejected the authority of the Church, came easily into use by common consent. [See REFORMATION.]

It has lately become the fashion among a certain party in the Anglican Church to reject the word "Protestant." But this

is the title given to their Church in the coronation oath, in the Bill of Rights, and in the Act of Settlement. "Will you," asks the officiating prelate of the King, "to the utmost of your power maintain . . . the *protestant reformed religion* established by law?" (Möhler, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. iii.)

PROTONOTARY (*πρῶτος, notarius*). In early times this title, which seems to have been first used at Constantinople in the eighth century, meant "the chief of the notaries," and corresponded to *primicerius notariorum*, the term then in use at Rome. After 800, the title of protonotary was introduced in the West, and for a long time past it has designated, not the chief, but any member of the important and dignified College of Protonotaries Apostolic in the Roman Curia. Their great and varied privileges are described by Ferraris. Tradition assigns to St. Clement in the first century the institution of the notaries, seven in number; Sixtus V. raised the number to twelve.

But their importance gradually diminished until by the end of the eighteenth century they had practically disappeared. Gregory XVI. revived the office by creating seven protonotaries called "protonotarii de numero participantium," because they had a share in the revenues.

Besides the above, the popes were wont to appoint honorary protonotaries. By the Motu Proprio "Inter Multiplices" (Feb. 21, 1905) Protonotaries are divided into four classes: (1) "Protonotarii Apostolici de numero Participantium," who exercise their office in connection with the acts of consistories and congregations; (2) "Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii"; (3) "Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar (sc. Participantium)"; (4) "Protonotarii Titulares seu Honorarii." The privileges, &c., of the various classes are defined in the Motu Proprio. (The last part of the art. from Kirsch in "Cath. Enc."; see also Ferraris; Smith and Cheetham.)

PROTOPRESBYTER. The *protopapas*, or chief of the clergy of the second order, was anciently so called in the Eastern Church. In the acts of the Synod of the Oak (401), Arsacius, the protopresbyter of the Church of Constantinople, figures as a witness against his own archbishop, St. John Chrysostom. Apparently the term was equivalent to "archpriest." (Smith and Cheetham.)

PROVIDENCE, SISTERS OF. There are several religious congregations of this name. The chief are: (1) Daughters of Providence founded by Mme. Polaillon at Paris in 1647, for the protection of young girls. In the course of time their activities embraced elementary schools, orphanages, asylums, and the care of the sick in hospitals and in their homes. (Hélyot; Heimbucher, "Orden und Kongregationen.")

(2) Sisters of Providence of the Institute of Charity (Rosminian Sisters). The objects are the teaching of poor girls and the care of the sick. Their constitutions were drawn up by Antonio Rosmini, of whose Institute of Charity they form a branch. [See ROSMINIANS.]

PROVINCE. The territory, comprising usually several dioceses, within which an archbishop or metropolitan exercises jurisdiction. In rare cases—*e.g.* Glasgow and Olmütz—there is an archbishop without suffragans.

A modern theory derives the provincial councils and metropolitans of the primitive Church by direct imitation from those assemblies and their presidents by which civil affairs were conducted in the various provinces of the Roman Empire.[1] The president of such an assembly (*κοινόν, concilium*) was, it is said, called the *sacerdos provinciae*; the members were called *σύνεδροι* or *legati*; here we have the original type of a metropolitan and bishops sitting in council. But till it can be shown that these *σύνεδροι* were, as Christian bishops were from the first, invested with *permanent* powers of government and administration within certain local limits, the resemblance of the two institutions cannot be said to be very close. Of course there can be no doubt that the boundaries of many ecclesiastical provinces merely conformed themselves to those of the civil provinces; the convenience of such an arrangement would be obvious. [See ARCHBISHOP; METROPOLITAN; DIOCESE.]

PROVINCIAL. The religious who, being appointed either by the general of the order or by the chapter, has the general superintendence of the affairs of the order within the limits of a certain province. These provinces have a greater or less geographical extension according to the number of monasteries established within them; when the monasteries are numerous, *caeteris paribus*, the provinces will be smaller. In 1580 the residences and colleges of the Society of Jesus [JESUITS] were distributed among twenty-one provinces; this implies the existence of the same number of provincials.

PROVISION, CANONICAL. By this is meant the regular conferring of, and induction into, ecclesiastical functions. It has three principal parts or stages—designation, collation or institution, and installation. [See BISHOP, IV.; NOMINATION; COLLATION TO A BENEFICE; and INSTALLATION.]

PROVISORS, STATUTE OF. [See PREMUNIRE.]

PROVOST (*praepositus*). Professor Cheetham has collected six different senses in which the word *praepositus* was used in the first eight centuries: (1) as the president or chairman of any meeting; (2) as the chief of

[1] Art. "Bishop," by Hatch, in Smith and Cheetham.

a body of canons; (3) as the second in authority under an abbot, or the head of a subordinate house [see PRIOR]; (4) as that member of a chapter who manages the estates; besides two senses of minor importance. Referring to (2), the provost of a cathedral chapter was anciently the archdeacon; the provost of a collegiate chapter was the first dignitary among the canons. At the present day, in Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, and England, the cathedral chapters are presided over by provosts; in France and other parts of Germany by deans. In Austria the provost of a cathedral has the title and privileges of a prelate; the provost of Munich has the right of wearing the mitre in processions. Provosts in Austria are nominated by the Emperor; in England, and the other countries named, by the Pope. (Smith and Cheetham; Taunton; "Kirchenlex.")

PRUDENCE. [See CARDINAL VIRTUES.]

PRYMER (PRIMER). The Prymer was a name given in England to a popular manual containing the Hours of the Blessed Virgin, the dirge, penitential, and gradual psalms, Pater, Ave, Creed, Commandments, Litany, commendations, and other occasional prayers. It is only when different parts of the offices, prayers, &c., are translated into English that the word Prymer is used. Thus the title runs, "The Prymer of Salysbury Use," "The Prymer in Englysshe," "The Prymer in Englysshe and Latin," &c. Prymers were published by the authority of King Henry VIII. after he had asserted the royal supremacy, and again by the Reformers, who published Prymers to suit their own way of thinking. We owe to Maskell a most learned and interesting edition of the English Prymer from a MS. now in the British Museum, not later than 1410. The MS. has no title, but the contents answer to those of the Prymer, and Maskell traces the word back to the fourteenth century. (From Maskell's Dissertation on the Prymer, "Monument. Rit." vol. iii.)

PSALTER (*Psalterium*). The book of Psalms as used for liturgical purposes. The Western Church has used (and still uses) two different Latin versions: the Roman and the Gallican. Both are due to St. Jerome, the former being his first revision, the latter his second revision. This latter from being circulated in Gaul received the name "Gallican," and ultimately supplanted the other, which is now used only at St. Peter's at Rome, at St. Mark's, Venice, and at Milan.

The practice of reciting the whole Psalter once in every week does not appear to have prevailed in the early Church, nor did it ever obtain in the synagogue worship. Its introduction is probably due to the solitaries of the fourth and fifth centuries. St. Benedict (after the year 500) imposed it on his monks, reminding them that their predecessors in the religious life made it a point of going through it *daily* from beginning to end. Both in the East and West the continuous recitation of the 150 psalms took firm hold on popular devotion, though in some places (as in the Ambrosian rite) the finishing it within a fortnight was deemed sufficient. Previously, in the Roman Church, matins in summer had three psalms only; in winter, four; and on Sundays and Feast days, nine, as now ("Liber Diurnus," tom. iii. p. 7). The Psalmody of Lauds appears to have been identical with that disused only in our own time. Especially has to be noted the Saturday sequence psalm, "Bonum est confiteri," the canticle, "Audite coeli," of Moses, and Psalms cxlviii., cxlix., terminating with the general Doxology "Laudate Dominum in sanctis ejus." This perpetuates the pre-Christian usage of Jerusalem. The daily recital of the "Beati immaculati" began probably after the peace of the Church, but two centuries later was still sufficiently novel to justify St. Benedict in modifying it for his monks. Vespers had proper psalms (at least in part), prominent among them being Psalm cxl., "Domine clamavi," whence our versicle "Dirigatur," so constantly repeated at that hour, and giving origin to the incensing of the altar that follows. Compline in those ages was barely struggling into life. There was thus no provision for a weekly recitation of the Psalter.

Festival days had their proper psalms. St. Benedict assumes that his monks were acquainted with their varying order and gives no particulars about them. They were probably the very same as those of the Breviary of our own day. The inclusion of the "Venite, exultemus" in the Nocturns of the Epiphany points to an age in which the Invitatory psalm was not known in Rome. And all tradition evinces the chant of the "Dixit Dominus," with the four psalms immediately following, to have been looked upon as specially appropriate to Sunday and Festival vespers, and the first psalms of the Psalter to have been similarly judged the right ones with which to begin the matins of such days. Indeed, so much was this the case that, up to our own time, Roman devotion to SS. Agnes and Agatha has refused to forsake the primitive practice on the festival days of these holy virgins.

When the weekly recitation of the whole Psalter was established, Feasts, whether occurring on Sundays or on week days, were, however, allowed to retain their proper psalms. Thus, St. Benedict laid down that the matins on Saints' days should have the same psalms as the Sunday office. At the outset this rule only slightly interrupted the order of the Psalter, and led to the omission of but few of the psalms during the week. However, in the course of time, the multiplication of Saints' offices made

the weekly recitation of the Psalter a rare exception. To remedy this abuse Pius X., by his Constitution "Divino Afflatu" (Nov. 1, 1911), restored the weekly recitation of the Psalter. Further, he equalized the daily office by breaking up the longer psalms into portions and making these portions equivalent to single psalms. Thus the Sunday matins no longer has eighteen Psalms, but only nine, or rather six, the ninth Psalm (*Confitebor*) being split up into four portions. In making these changes, the Holy Father had doubtless before him, as a guide and a warning, the drastic reform drawn up by Cardinal Quiñonez in the sixteenth century and approved for private recitation for more than thirty years, until its abolition by St. Pius V. in 1568. This was a revolution rather than a reform. Antiphons, responsaries, little chapters, versicles, and responses were struck out, and all the hours had only three psalms each. But the weekly recitation of the Psalter and the equalization of the daily offices were sound principles of this reform, and were adopted by Pius X. It was Quiñonez' breviary which Cranmer took as a model when framing the matins and evensong of his prayer book. Indeed he copied word for word in his preface a portion of Quiñonez' preface. He was, of course, still more revolutionary than Quiñonez, reducing the hours to two, and arranging for the recital of the Psalter only once a month. (See Burton and Myers, "The New Psalter and its Use"; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Baudot, "The Roman Breviary," tr., p. 41 *sqq.*; Bäumer-Biron, "Hist. du Bréviaire," i. 242 *sqq.*; for the story of Quiñonez' reform, ii. 126 *sqq.*)

PSALTER, THE JESUS. An old English pre-Reformation devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus. It consists of 150 invocations of the Holy Name, divided into fifteen decades, each followed by a number of verses in imitation of the verses of the Psalms. The author is believed to have been Richard Whytford, a Brigittine monk of Syon House, Middlesex, in the fifteenth century. The original edition, printed (probably) in 1520, was much longer than the form given in Challoner's "Garden of the Soul," which is now commonly found in our prayer-books. Challoner also modernized the language. (Thurston, *Prayer Books*, in "Cath. Enc.")

PSEUDO-ISIDORE. [See FALSE DECRETALS.]

PUBLIC HONESTY: [See IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE.]

PULPIT. The old custom was to preach from the altar or episcopal chair. But apparently even in St. Augustine's time the ambo, originally meant for readers and singers, and large enough to hold several persons easily, was used for preaching, and so was raised and narrowed into the form of the pulpit. It should be placed on the Gospel side (S.C.R., February 20, 1862), unless that side is already occupied by the bishop's throne. The bishop, according to the "Caer. Episc." should preach, if possible, from the throne or from a faldstool at the altar. If this is inconvenient, he should be accompanied to the pulpit by the two canons who assist at the throne. (Montault, "Traité de la Construct. et des Églises.")

PURGATORY. A place in which souls who depart this life in the grace of God suffer for a time because they still need to be cleansed from venial sins, or have still to pay the temporal punishment due to mortal sins, the guilt and the eternal punishment of which have been remitted. Purgatory is not a place of probation; for the time of trial, the period during which the soul is free to choose eternal life or eternal death, ends with the separation of soul and body. All the souls in Purgatory have died in the love of God, and are certain to enter heaven. But as yet they are not pure and holy enough to see God, and God's mercy allots them a place and a time for cleansing and preparation. At last, Christ will come to judge the world, and then there will be only two places left, heaven and hell.

The Councils of Florence ("Decret. Unionis") and Trent ("Decret. de Purgat." sess. xxv.; cf. sess. vi. can. 30, sess xxii. "De Sacrific. Miss." c. 2 et can. 3), define "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful and, above all, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar." Further the definitions of the Church do not go, but the general teaching of theologians explains the doctrine of the councils, and embodies the general sentiment of the faithful. Theologians, then, tell us that souls after death are cleansed from the stain of their venial sins by turning with fervent love to God and by detestation of those offences which marred, though they did not entirely destroy, their union with Him. St. Thomas and Suarez hold that this act of fervent love and perfect sorrow is made in the first instant of the soul's separation from the body, and suffices of itself to remove all the stain of sin. (See the quotations in Jungmann, "De Novissimis," p. 103.) Be this as it may, it is certain that the time of merit expires with this life, and that the debt of temporal punishment must still be paid. The souls in Purgatory suffer the pain of loss—*i.e.* are in anguish, because their past sins exclude them for a season from the sight of God, and they understand in a degree previously impossible the infinite bliss from which they are excluded and the foulness of the least offence against the God Who has created and redeemed them. They also undergo "the punishment of sense"—*i.e.* positive pains which afflict the soul. It is the common belief of the Western Church

that they are tormented by material fire, and it is quite conceivable that God should give matter the power of constraining and afflicting even separated souls. But the Greeks have never accepted this belief, nor was it imposed upon them when they returned to Catholic unity at Florence. The saints and doctors of the Church describe these pains as very terrible. They last, no doubt, for very different lengths of time, and vary in intensity according to the need of individual cases. It is supposed that the just who are alive when Christ comes again, and who stand in need of cleansing, will be purified in some extraordinary way—*e.g.* by the troubles of the last days, by vehement contrition, &c., but all this is mere conjecture. In conclusion, it must be remembered that there is a bright as well as a dark side to Purgatory. The souls there are certain of their salvation, they are willing sufferers, and no words, according to St. Catherine of Genoa, can express the joy with which they are filled, as they increase in union with God. She says their joy can be compared to nothing except the greater joy of Paradise itself. (See for numerous citations, Jungmann, "De Noviss." cap. 1, a. 6.)

This may suffice as an account of theological teaching on the subject. It must not be supposed that any such weight belongs to legends and speculations which abound in mediaeval chronicles (see Maskell, "Monument. Rit." vol. ii. p. lxxi.), and which often appear in modern books. The Council of Trent (sess. xxv. Decret. de Purgat.), while it enjoins bishops to teach "the sound doctrine of Purgatory, handed down by the holy Fathers and councils," bids them refrain "in popular discourses" from those "more difficult and subtle questions which do not tend to edification," and "to prohibit the publication and discussion of things which are doubtful or even appear false."

Scripture, it may be justly said, points to the existence of Purgatory. There is no fellowship between the darkness of sin and selfishness and God, "in whom there is no darkness at all," so that the degree of our purity is the measure of our union with God here on earth. Perfect purity is needed that we may see God face to face. When God appears "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." "Every man who hath this hope in him purifieth himself, as he is pure" (1 Jn. iii. 2, 3). Without holiness "no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14). This work of inner cleansing may be effected by our correspondence with grace. We sow as we reap: deeds of humility increase humility; works of love deepen the love of God and man in the soul. Often, too, God's mercy in this life weans the soul from the love of the world, and affliction may be a special mark of His compassion. "Whom the Lord loves He disciplines, and He scourges every son whom He receives" (Heb. x. 6). He disciplines us "for our good, that we may participate in His sanctity" (*ib.* 10). Now, it is plain that in the case of many good people this discipline has not done its work when death overtakes them. Many faults, *e.g.* of bad temper, vanity, and the like, and infirmity consequent on more serious sins of which they have repented, cleave to them still. Surely, then, the natural inference is that their preparation for heaven is completed after death. By painful discipline in this world or the next, God finishes the work in them which He has begun, and perfects it "unto the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 6).

We would appeal to those general principles of Scripture rather than to particular texts often alleged in proof of Purgatory. We doubt if they contain an explicit and direct reference to it. St. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 10) speaks of some who will be saved "yet as through fire," but he seems to mean the fire in which Christ is to appear at the last. He himself, he says, has established the Corinthian Church on the only possible foundation—viz. Jesus Christ. Others have built it up from this foundation, or in other words, have developed the Christian faith and life of its members. These teachers, however, must take care how they build, even on the one foundation. "Each man's work will be made manifest, for the day will show it, because it [the day of judgment] is revealed in fire, and the fire will test each man's work of what kind it is: if any man's work which he has built up [on the foundation] remains, he will receive a reward; if any man's work is burnt down he will suffer loss—[*i.e.* he will forfeit the special reward and glory of good teachers], but he himself will be saved, but so as through fire." The man who has built up with faulty material is depicted as still working at the building when the fire of Christ's coming seizes it and he himself escapes, but only as a man does from a house on fire, leaving the work which is consumed behind him. St. Paul, if we have caught his meaning, speaks of the end of the world, not of the time between death and judgment, and so, we think, does our Lord in Mt. xii. 32. The sin against the Holy Ghost, he tells us, will not be forgiven, either "in this age" (ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι)—*i.e.* in the world which now is—or in the future age (ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι)—*i.e.* in the new world, or rather new period which is to be ushered in by the coming of the Messiah in glory. There is no hope of forgiveness here or hereafter for the sin against the Holy Ghost, but it does not follow, and, granting our interpretation, it would be inconsistent with Catholic doctrine to believe, that other sins may be forgiven in the age to come. Thus, "the age to come" would have precisely the same sense as the corresponding Hebrew words (הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא—see, *e.g.*, "Pirke Avoth," cap. 4,

and for many other instances Buxtorf, "Lex. Rabbin. et Chald." *sub voc.* עוֹלָם), which is in itself a strong argument, and the meaning we have given is fully supported by New Testament usage (see particularly *τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν*, Lk. xx. 35, and *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Mt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20—decisive passages, as we venture to think). Maldonatus decidedly rejects the supposed allusion to Purgatory in Mt. v. 25, 26. "Be well-disposed to thine adversary [*i.e.* the offended brother] quickly, even till thou art on the way with him [*i.e.* it is never too soon and never, till life is over, too late to be reconciled], lest the adversary hand thee over to the judge, and the judge hand thee over to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say unto thee thou shalt not go out thence till thou shalt pay the last farthing." Maldonatus follows St. Augustine in the opinion that the "last farthing" will never and can never be paid, and that the punishment is eternal. Just in the same way it is said of the unmerciful slave (Lk. xviii. 34) that he was to be handed over to the tormentors "till he should pay all the debt." Yet a slave could never pay so enormous a sum as 10,000 talents. "Semper solvet, sed nunquam persolvet," "He will always pay, but never pay off," is the happy comment of Remigius (and so Chrysostom and Augustine; see Trench, "Parables," p. 164). The reader will find the various interpretations of these texts fairly discussed in Estius and Maldonatus or in Meyer. Döllinger, however ("First Age of the Church," p. 249), sees an "unmistakable reference" to Purgatory in Mt. xii. 32, v. 26.

In two special ways, writers of the early Church, as Cardinal Newman points out ("Development," p. 385 *sq.*), were led to formulate the belief in Purgatory. In the articles on the sacrament of Penance, we have shown the strength of primitive belief in the need of satisfaction for sin by painful works, and in the article on Penance the rigour with which satisfaction was exacted. Indeed, the belief in Purgatory lay dormant in the primitive Church to a certain extent, just because the fervour of the first Christians was so vehement, just because the severity of penance here might well be thought to exclude the need of purifying discipline after death. But what was to be thought of those who were reconciled on their death-bed, before their penance was ended or even begun, or in whom outward penance for some cause or other had failed to do the whole of its work? Clement of Alexandria supplies a clear answer to this question: "Even if a man passes out of the flesh, he must put off his passions, ere he is able to enter the eternal dwelling, . . . through much discipline, therefore, stripping off his passions, our faithful man will go to the mansion which is better than the former, bearing in the special penance which appertains to him (*ἰδίωμα τῆς μετανοίας*) a very great punishment for the sins he has committed after baptism" ("Strom." vi. 14, p. 794, ed. Potter). He speaks of the angels "who preside over the ascent" of souls as detaining those who have preserved any worldly attachment (iv. 18, p. 616), and with at least a possible reference to Purgatory, of fire as purifying sinful souls (vii. 6. p. 851). The genuine and contemporary Acts of St. Perpetua, who suffered under Septimius Severus at the very beginning of the third century, plainly imply the belief in Purgatory. The saint, according to a part of the Acts written by herself, saw in a vision her brother who was dead, and for whom she had prayed. He was suffering, and she went on praying. Then she beheld him in another and more cheerful vision, and "knew that he was translated from his place of punishment" (*de poena*; Ruinart, "Act. Mart. S. Perpet." &c., vii. viii.). Cyprian (Ep. lv. 20; ed. Hartel, 638), in answer to the objection that the relaxation of penitential discipline in the case of the lapsed would weaken the courage and stability which made martyrs, insists that after all the position of one who had fallen away and then been admitted to martyrdom would always be much less desirable than that of a martyr. "It is one thing for a man to be cast into prison and not to leave it till he pay the last farthing, another thing to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be tormented long with sorrow for sins, to be purified and cleansed for a long time by the fire, another to purge away all sins by martyrdom." Cardinal Newman urges that these words, especially "missum in carcerem," "purgari diu igne," "seem to go beyond" a mere reference to penitential discipline in this life, and the Benedictine editor is of the same mind.

Next we can prove the early date of belief in Purgatory from the habit of praying for the dead, a habit which the Church inherited from the Synagogue. The words in 2 Macc. xii. 42 *seq.* are familiar to everybody. Judas found *ἱερώματα*, or things consecrated to idols, under the garments of those who had been slain in battle against Gorgias. Whereupon he made a collection of money and sent to Jerusalem, "to offer sacrifice for sin, doing very well and excellently, reasoning about the dead. For unless he had expected those who had fallen before [the others] to rise again, it would have been superfluous and absurd to pray for the dead. Therefore, seeing well [*ἐμβλέπων*] that a most fair reward is reserved for those who sleep in piety, his design was holy and pious, whence he made the propitiation for the dead that they might be loosed from

sin."[1] This passage implies a belief both in Purgatory and the efficacy of prayers for the departed, and takes for granted that this belief would be held by all who believed in the resurrection. This is not the place to discuss the canonical or even the historical character of the book. It represents a school of Jewish belief at the time, and we know from xv. 37 that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Second Maccabees was composed in Greek, but we have the fullest evidence from Hebrew and Chaldee sources that the later Jews prayed for the dead and recognized the need of purification after death. Weber ("Altsynag. Paläst. Theol." p. 326 *seq.*) thus sums up the Rabbinical doctrine: "Only a few are sure of [immediate] entrance into heaven; the majority are at their death still not ripe for heaven, and yet will not be absolutely excluded from it. Accordingly, we are referred to a middle state, a stage between death and eternal life, which serves for the final perfecting." Those who were not perfectly just here suffer "the pain of fire, and the fire is their penance." The "Pesikta," a very ancient commentary on sections of the Law and Prophets, composed at the beginning of the third century after Christ, describes the penance as lasting usually twelve months, of which six are spent in extreme heat, six in extreme cold. The common Rabbinical doctrine that Israelites, except those guilty of some special sin, do at last enter heaven, and the fantastical shapes which the Jewish doctrine of Purgatory has assumed, do not concern us here. But it is well to observe that the Jews have never ceased to pray for their dead. The following is from the prayer said at the house of mourners, as given in a modern Jewish prayer-book, issued with authority:—"May our reading of the law and our prayer be acceptable before Thee for the soul of N. Deal with it according to thy great mercy, opening to it the gates of compassion and mercy and the gates of the garden of Eden, and receive it in love and favour; send thy holy angels to it to conduct it, and give it rest beneath the Tree of Life." (שִׂיחַ יִצְחָק "Meditation of Isaac," a Jewish prayer-book according to the German and Polish rite, pp. 336–7.[2])

Against the Jewish custom and doctrine Christ and His Apostles made no protest, though both custom and doctrine existed in their time. Nay, "St. Paul himself [cf. 2 Tim. i. 16–18 with iv. 19] gives an example of such a prayer. The Ephesian Onesiphorus, mentioned in the Second Epistle to St. Timothy, was clearly no longer among the living. St. Paul praises this man for his constant service to him, but does not, as elsewhere, send salutations to him, but only to his family; for him he desires a blessing from the Lord, and prays for him that the Lord will grant he may find mercy with Christ at the day of judgment." The words put in inverted commas are from Döllinger's "First Age of the Church," p. 251; but many Protestant commentators, among whom we may mention De Wette and Huther, who is eminent among recent commentators on the Pastoral Epistles, lean to the same interpretation.

All this considered, it cannot seem strange that every ancient liturgy contains prayers for the dead. To understand the strength of this argument we must remember that these liturgies are written in many different languages, and represent the practice in every part of the ancient world. The very first Christian who has left Latin writings speaks of "oblations for the dead" as a thing of course (Tertull. "De Coron." 3, PL, ii. 79). It is often said that prayers for the dead do not necessarily imply belief in Purgatory, and this is true. The words, *e.g.*, in the Clementine liturgy, "We offer to Thee for all Thy saints who have pleased Thee from ancient days, patriarchs, prophets, just men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose name Thou knowest," do not imply that those for whom the sacrifice is offered are in a state of suffering. But Tertullian ("Monog." 10, PL, ii. 912) connects prayer for the dead with Purgatory when he says of a woman who has lost her husband that "she prays for his soul, and supplicates for him refreshment [*refrigerium*], and a part in the first resurrection, and offers on the anniversaries of his death [*dormitionis*]." So, too, St. Cyril of Jerusalem ("Mystagog." 5, PG, xxxii. 1116): "If when a king had banished certain who had given him offence, their connections should weave a crown and offer it to him on behalf of those under his vengeance, would he not grant a respite to their punishments? In the same manner we, when we offer to Him our supplications for those who have fallen asleep, though they be sinners, weave no crown, but offer up Christ sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful God, both for them and for ourselves." Still the doctrine was not fully established in the West till the time of Gregory the Great. Some of the Greeks conceived that all, however perfect, must pass through fire in the next world. So, *e.g.*, Origen, "In Num." Hom. xxv. 6, "In Ps. xxvi." Hom. iii. 1, PG, xii. 769. St. Augustine had, indeed, the present doctrine of Purgatory clearly before his mind, but had no fixed conviction

[1] This sentence is, of course, ungrammatical; but so is the Greek. A part of 2 Macc. is more like rough notes than a finished composition.

[2] The קַדִּישׁ is recited at morning and evening prayer for deceased parents during eleven months of the year of mourning. Formerly it was said for the whole year. It is one of the few prayers in the Ritual which are in Chaldee instead of Hebrew, but there are internal signs that it comes from a lost Hebrew original.

on the point. In his work "De VIII Dulcitii Quaestionibus" (§ 13; PL, xl. 156), written about 420, he says it is "not incredible" that imperfect souls will be "saved by some purgatorial fire," to which they will be subjected for varying lengths of time according to their needs. A little later, in the "De Civitate," he expresses his belief in Purgatory as if he were certain (xxi. 13, PL, xli. 731), or nearly so (xx. 25), but again speaks doubtfully (xxi. 26, "forsitan verum est") and in the "Enchiridion" (69, PL, xl. 265). Very different is Gregory's tone: "Ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est." ("Dial." iv. 39, PL, lxxvii. 396.) (Billot, "De Novissimis," p. 85; Scheeben-Atzberger, "Dogmatik," iv. 843 *sqq.*, good bibliography; Anderdon, "Purgatory Surveyed"; Coleridge, "The Prisoners of the King.")

PURIFICATION, as distinct from ablution, is the pouring of wine into the chalice after the priest's communion, the wine being drunk by the priest. This purification is not of ancient date. "Liturgical writers," says Le Brun ("Explication de la Messe," P. v. a. 9, § 3), "down to the treatise on the mysteries by Cardinal Lothair, afterwards Pope under the name of Innocent III., at the end of the twelfth century, simply note that the priest washes his hands, that the water was thrown into a clean and decent place, called the piscina, and that [the water] used to wash the chalice was thrown into the same place." But Innocent III., fifteen or sixteen years after writing his treatise "De Mysteriis," laid it down that the priest should always use wine to purify the chalice, and drink it, unless he was going to say another Mass.

PURIFICATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. The Levitical law (Lev. xii. 2 *seq.*) declared women unclean for seven days after the birth of a male child; it excluded them from the sanctuary for thirty-three days more; on the fortieth they had to appear in the temple and to offer a lamb one year old for a holocaust and a young pigeon or turtle-dove as a sin-offering. In the case of the poor it was enough to offer two turtle-doves or young pigeons, one as a holocaust and the other as a sin-offering. The Blessed Virgin was not bound by this law, since the child born of her was conceived by the Holy Ghost (see Lev. xii. 2 and St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 37, a. 4). But her divine Son subjected Himself to the burdens of the law that He might set His seal to its divine origin, remove occasion of cavil, and leave us an example of humility; and similar motives no doubt induced the Virgin herself to undergo the rite of purification. It is this event which the Church celebrates in the feast which bears that name, and is kept for a reason virtually given already on the fortieth day after Christmas, *i.e* February 2. If, however, we turn to the Mass for the day, we find no less prominence given to two other events which were simultaneous with the purification. Candles are blessed and carried in procession to remind us how the holy old man Simeon met our Lord, took Him in his arms, and declared Him the light of the Gentiles and the glory of Israel. Next, in the collect, epistle, and the gospel there are marked references to the fact that our Lord was at the same time presented in the temple before God and redeemed with five holy shekels (Lk. ii. 22, cf. Exod. xiii. 2; Num. viii. 16, xviii. 15). Indeed, these two latter incidents are more prominent in the Mass and office than that of the Blessed Virgin's purification, and it is noteworthy that the Preface in the Mass is the same as that of Christmas, not the one which is proper to the feasts of the Blessed Virgin. The Greeks number the festival amongst those of our Lord, and call it ὑπαντή, ὑπαπαντή, *i.e.* the meeting of Christ with Simeon and Anna. The old Latin title "occursus," "obviatio," points in the same direction. So Bede calls it "Oblatio Christi ad templum," and in the Ambrosian rite it is still reckoned among the solemnities of our Lord's life. On the other hand, the name in the Roman Missal and Breviary, viz. "Purificatio B.V.M.," stamps it as a feast of the Blessed Virgin. The English name Candlemas refers of course to the candles blessed and carried in procession before Mass.

We have the first certain traces of the observance in the East. The "Peregrinatio Etheriae" speaks of the feast as "Quadragesima de Epiphania," that is, the fortieth day after the Epiphany. No Father of the first five centuries mentions it, for the homily of Methodius on the feast is probably due to Methodius of Constantinople in the ninth century, and in any case is certainly not by Methodius of Tyre, who lived at the end of the third. Similar homilies attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, Amphilochius and Gregory Nyssen are admitted on all hands to be spurious. In the year 543, says Fleury ("H.E." livr. xxxiii. 7), "they began to celebrate at Constantinople the feast of the Purification, named by the Greeks Hypapante," and he refers to the notes of Baronius on the martyrology for February 2. Fleury's statement is undoubtedly accurate. But there is nothing incredible in that of Cedrenus that there was a local celebration at Antioch begun under the Emperor Justin in 526, while Tillemont ("Mém." tom. 1, note 7 on the life of Christ) infers from a passage in the life of the abbot Theodosius that the day was kept in the Church of Jerusalem as early as the middle of the fifth century. We cannot say for certain when it was introduced in the West, and the conjecture of Baronius that Pope Gelasius, who abolished the heathen festival

of the Lupercalia in the month of February, persuaded the people to accept the feast of the Purification instead, is only a conjecture and not a very probable one. Be that as it may, we have evidence that the feast was known to Bede ("De Rat. Temp." cap. 12, PL, xc. 351), who died in 735. It is, moreover, mentioned in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory and in the Capitularies of Charlemagne (in the latter under the modern title, Purificatio S. Mariae; see Thomassin, "Traité des Festes," livr. ii. ch. 11), and after that time it is clearly recognized everywhere. The candles borne in procession and held in the hand at Mass are spoken of by Bede, *loc. cit.*, and by St. Eligius ("Hom. ii. in die Purificationis S. Mariae"), who was bishop of Noyon from 640–648. On the other hand, it does not seem possible to trace the rite for the blessing of the candles beyond the eleventh century. (See Kellner, "Heortology"; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," 271, 479; Holweck, "Fasti Mariani," 18.)

PURIFICATOR. [See MUNDATORY.]

PURIFIER. [See MUNDATORY.]

PYX. A vase in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. The word occurs in this sense in a decree of Pope Leo IV., who reigned from 847–885 (Mansi, "Concil." xiv. 891). The pyx should be of silver, gilt inside, and covered with a silk veil. It is not consecrated, but the Missal gives a form for the blessing of a pyx by the bishop or priest with episcopal faculties ("Manuale Decret." p. 76 *note*). [See also RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.]

Q

QUADRAGESIMA. [See LENT, p. 519.]

QUADRIVIUM. [See UNIVERSITY, p. 835.]

QUAESTORES. Persons appointed by the Popes and bishops who announced the indulgences for those who joined or supported the Crusades, contributed to the building of churches, to monasteries, &c., and collected the alms given for these objects. The Fourth General Council of the Lateran (in 1215) enjoined the Quaestors to be modest and discreet. They were not to be received unless they could produce letters of authorisation, and were only to propose to the people what these letters contained. Similar regulations were made by the Council of Vienne in 1311. The Council of Trent (sess. xxi. De Ref. cap. 9) declared that these Quaestors had occasioned intolerable scandal, that the proposed remedies had been inefficacious, and abolished the office altogether.

QUARANT' ORE (*Forty Hours*). [See EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.]

QUARANTINE. A period of forty days. Indulgences of seven years and seven *quarantines* are often granted for certain devotions. [See INDULGENCES.]

QUARTODECIMANS. [See EASTER, p. 292.]

QUATER TENSES (*Quatre temps*). An old English name for the Ember Days (*q.v.*)

QUIETISM is a name given to a dangerous tendency rather than to any definite system, for persons called by the common name of Quietists have differed seriously from each other, and have advanced to different degrees of delusion. The common tendency consists in making perfection here on earth consist in a state of uninterrupted contemplation (see Bossuet, "États d'Oraison," livr. 1) during which the soul remains quiet or passive under the influence of God's Spirit, without forming the ordinary acts of faith, hope, love, &c., without desiring heaven or fearing hell. [See HESYCHIASTS.]

Molinos, a Spanish priest, born at Saragossa in 1627,[1] was the first Quietist of modern times. He spent a great part of his life at Rome, and, while there, published in Spanish his "Spiritual Guide" which was translated into Italian, Latin, French, German, English (1688, 1775), and other languages. He maintained not only the merits of passive contemplation without hope or desire, but also that the soul in this state neither gained by the practice of good works nor suffered by gross sins, which last only affected the lower part of the nature and could not tarnish the purity of a contemplative soul. In 1685 the Inquisition censured 68 propositions of Molinos and condemned the author to perpetual imprisonment, in which he died, having recanted his errors, in 1696.[2]

Quietism crossed the Alps, stripped, however, of its gross and directly immoral part. It was propagated by Malaval at Marseilles in his "Pratique facile pour élever l'Ame à la Contemplation." This book also was condemned at Rome, and Malaval submitted. But Quietism found a much more talented and engaging defender in Madame Guyon. This lady, originally Jeanne Bouvier de la Motte, had contracted an unhappy marriage at 16 and was left a widow at 28. She went to the diocese of Geneva at the bishop's request to help in the instruction of converts, and at a convent in Gex met the Barnabite Fr. Lacombe, with whom she travelled from town to town. At Grenoble she published her "Moyen court et très facile pour faire l'Oraison." Some time before,

[1] So the new edition of Bossuet, vol. xix. Pref.

[2] The chief contemporary documents relating to the condemnation of Molinos and his followers were published in 1875, by Loemmer, *Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa*, p. 407 *seq.*

P. Lacombe had issued his "Analyse de l'Oraison Mentale." Lacombe was imprisoned at Lourdes and Paris, where he died in 1699, and for eight months Madame Guyon herself was confined to a convent. After regaining her freedom, she published a book on the "Mystical Sense of Canticles" [1] (Lyons, 1688), and she contrived to win over Fénelon, then tutor to the grandson of Louis XIV., and she sent her works, printed and MS., to Bossuet. But with Bossuet she could make no way. His profound learning, his common sense, his manly and simple piety, made him proof against the charms of delusion, and he could see nothing in Madame Guyon's works except "a mass of extravagances, illusions, and puerilities." He has fully justified this verdict in his "Relation sur le Quiétisme." A commission in which Bossuet was the leading member met in 1694 and 1695, and issued thirty-four articles in which the condemnation of Quietism was implied.

Fénelon was made archbishop of Cambray in 1695, and soon after (Feb. 1697) published his "Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie intérieure." He defended the Quietist idea of "holy indifference," in which the soul loses all deliberate desire of its own bliss or fear of its own woe. Fénelon, who was censured by sixty doctors of the Sorbonne and refuted by Bossuet, appealed to Rome, and there twenty-three propositions of his book were condemned as rash, scandalous, &c., in a brief of Innocent XII. dated 1699. Fénelon made a most edifying submission, publicly burning his own book. "It is not I who have conquered," Bossuet said in reply to the congratulations offered to him; "it is the truth." (Chiefly from the new edition of Bossuet; see also Bausset, "Hist. de Fénelon.")

[1] Her other works are: her autobiography, 3 vols.; *Discours Chrétiens*, 2 vols.; *L'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, avec des Explications et des Réflexions*, 20 vols.; *Cantiques Spirituels*; *Vers Mystiques*.

QUINISEXTA. [See TRULLO, COUNCIL IN, p. 831.]

QUINQUAGESIMA, Sexagesima, Septuagesima, the first, second, third Sundays before Lent. The words are ancient (Septuagesima occurs in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries); but it is hard to divine their meaning. Alcuin proposed two solutions to Charlemagne (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes," p. 308 *seq.*)—one that there are seventy days from Septuagesima to "Pascha clausum"—*i.e.* the Octave of Easter. This leaves the names Sexagesima and Quinquagesima unexplained. His other solution is adopted by Thomassin ("Traité des Jeûnes," p. 231). Quoting a passage from the "Regula Magistri," Thomassin says: "It clearly shows that the names Quinquagesima and Sexagesima are not intended to denote the numbers fifty or sixty. They have been formed on the [false] analogy of Quadragesima—*i.e.* Lent—being one and two weeks before the first Sunday in Lent. In the same rule the second week of Lent is called Tricesima, the third Vicesima." The custom of beginning the fast on Septuagesima, &c., and the reasons for it, are given in the article on LENT.

R

RANSOM, OUR LADY OF. Sometimes called also Our Lady of Mercy (Sancta Maria de Mercede). Under this title a religious order for the redemption of Christian captives among the Moors was founded by St. Peter Nolasco in 1218. Some of the members were priests, some lay brothers or knights. There are also nuns of the order. They were generally known as Mercedarians. The objects of the order were much the same as those of the Trinitarian order (*q.v.*) but the two remained distinct. (See Hélyot; Besse in "Cath. Enc.")

In recent years the title of Our Lady of Ransom has been adopted by a confraternity founded by Father Philip Fletcher for the conversion of England. The feast of Our Lady of Ransom is kept on September 24.

REAL PRESENCE. [See EUCHARIST, p. 323.]

REASON AND FAITH. [See FAITH.]

RECEPTION OF CONVERTS INTO THE CHURCH. We speak here only of converts who are supposed to have received baptism: For adults who have never been baptized a longer form of baptism is provided. But in England, at least, leave is usually given by the bishop to use the shorter form.

A baptized person who has previously belonged to an heretical sect has incurred the censures of the Church, and cannot therefore be restored to the sacraments or receive sacramental absolution till he has been absolved from censures. It may be that his error was no fault of his, and, if so, he was not a formal heretic. Still, he is treated as such in the external court of the Church, and the Pope reserves to himself the power of removing the bar of excommunication. In many countries, however, bishops receive power as delegates of the Holy See in their extraordinary or quinquennial faculties to absolve from the censure in question, and in England they communicate this power to all their priests who have faculties for hearing confessions.

In England, after a priest has carefully tested the sincerity and steadfastness of the person who wishes to be a Catholic, and is satisfied that the person really knows and

understands sufficiently the tenets of the Catholic religion, he may admit him into the Church. First the "Veni, Creator" is said, and the convert reads the creed of Pope Pius IV. or some shorter form. Then the "Miserere" or "De Profundis" is recited. For fear his former baptism should have been invalid because the proper matter, form, or intention was wanting, he receives baptism from the priest under condition, unless there is evidence that this sacrament has already been validly given. This rule was made by the vicars-apostolic at the beginning of the nineteenth century for all born after 1773, and was renewed by the first provincial synod of Westminster. He is then absolved from excommunication, and the "Te Deum" is said in thanksgiving. Finally, the convert goes to confession and receives sacramental absolution *sub conditione* and the plenary indulgence granted on this occasion by the Pope. The ceremonies, as contained in the English Rituale, are not always observed, nor are the absolutions and sacraments always conferred in the same order. Some priests, relying on the authority of Bishop Grant (Synod. Suthwarc. p. 76 *seq*), begin by hearing the convert's confession, and give absolution after the baptism; but, according to a Roman decree subsequent to Dr. Grant's instruction (December 17, 1868), the confession should be made *after* the baptism, and this order is prescribed in the new "Ordo administrandi Sacramenta," 1915. (See Decreta Conc. Prov. Westmon., pp. 334–337.)

RECLUSE. The life of a recluse is still more solitary and austere than that of a hermit; it implies that the persons practising it "live for ever shut up in their cells, never speaking to anyone but to the superior when he visits them, and to the brother who brings them necessaries. Their prayers and austerities are doubled, and their fasts more severe and more frequent." [1] St. Romuald allowed reclusion to such of his hermits [CAMALDOLI] as desired and seemed to be fitted for it, as the highest and most difficult stage of monastic discipline. Female recluses were usually called *inclusae*. [See INCLUSI.]

RECOLLECTS. A branch of the Franciscan order bore this name (derived from the detachment from creatures and recollection in God which the founders aimed at) for nearly three centuries. From the time of the Minister-General Elias, who succeeded St. Francis, the Franciscans have been divided into two branches, Conventuals and Observantines, or of the Observance. The Observantines in France were commonly called Cordeliers. Several distinctions appeared in course of time among those of the Observance, which Leo X. endeavoured to check by fusing all the subdivisions into one, under the name of the Reformed Franciscans. Before this a saintly Spanish friar, B. John de Puebla, had founded (1489) a house of "Strict Observance" on the Sierra Morena, in Spain. The friars of the Strict Observance soon became a separate congregation; they passed into Italy (where they received the name of "the Reformed") in 1525, and established themselves at Nevers, in France, in 1597. The French filiation increased rapidly; the friars were called "Recollects"; Henry IV., Louis XIII., and Louis XIV. loved and favoured them; and it was arranged that in every French province of the Observance a certain number of houses should be given up to the Strict Observance. The Recollects were uninfected by Jansenism, and when the commission on the regular orders (1768) put it in their power to relax the austerities of the rule they did not do so. They were suppressed in France at the Revolution, but reappeared some years ago, at Amiens and other places. The various "families" of Observantines have been reunited under the single title of Friars Minor by Leo XIII. (October 4, 1897), and are subject to one Minister General. [See FRANCISCANS.]

RECONCILIATION OF PENITENTS. [See PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE OF CHURCH; CEMETERY, &c. See also DESECRATION.]

RECTOR. 1. The ecclesiastic who has charge of the government of a congregation or a college is often called the Rector.

2. In England there is a certain number of missions in each diocese, important either on account of their having been long established or because of the size of the congregation, the priests in charge of which are styled "Missionary Rectors." [See PARISH PRIEST.]

3. In Germany, when a parish has no Pfarrer in the strict sense, the priest in charge is called the Rector. (Taunton.)

RED FRIARS. So called from the red cross on their habits. They are properly Trinitarians [*q.v.*].

REDEMPTION OF MANKIND THROUGH CHRIST. The idea connected with redemption is that of being brought out of a state of bondage or slavery and restored to one's former estate. Christian usage applies the term to the acts by which Christ delivered mankind from the bondage of sin and the devil, and restored it to its original estate of friendship with God. Such restoration is beyond the power of man, who may, indeed, satisfy the Divine justice by undergoing eternal punishment, but whose weakened and despoiled will is unable to embrace a God-pleasing life as commanded by the divine holiness. If the first gift of grace was a free gift, much more so was the second, when the first had been forfeited by man's wilful transgression. God's decree of redeeming man was as free as the decree of his creation, and as eternal; its freedom excludes all

[1] Alban Butler, Feb. 7

rightful claim of man to it; but its eternity includes man's destination to redemption. The Divine message of salvation was revealed at divers times—each revelation being more distinct than the preceding—from the proto-evangelium (Gen. iii. 15) to the testimony of the Baptist (Jn. i. 29). In the fulness of time, that is, when the Law and the Prophets had prepared Israel, and to a certain degree the heathen world, for the coming of the Redeemer, "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." The Incarnation, in which the Son of God took unto Himself a human nature, so as to be one Person in two natures [see CHRIST], was necessary if God demanded for our redemption a full, though vicarious, satisfaction of His offended justice and sanctity.

God, then, decreed at the same time the redemption through vicarious satisfaction and the Incarnation. The decree comprises the offer of God the Son to act, in a human nature, as representative of mankind and to satisfy for all its sins (Heb. x. 5 *sqq.*), and on the other hand the acceptance of this offer by God (Gal. iv. 4; Jn. iii. 16, 17). Man is bound to satisfy the claims on him of God's holiness and justice. God's holiness claims that man should honour Him by leading a holy life, a life of obedience to and love of his Creator. The satisfaction of this claim is the foundation of merit; it gives man a title to grace and other rewards promised by the Divine goodness and justice. The refusal to satisfy this claim, by committing sin, is an infringement of the Divine right—an injury—and is the foundation of guilt (*reatus culpae*). Guilt puts man in contradiction with God and with himself; guilty man is not what he ought to be according to the Divine ideal. Here the claim of Divine justice intervenes. God must oppose the perverted will of the sinner, and this opposition constitutes the sinner's punishment, for it inflicts "pain" on him. The just pain of the sinner is temporal and eternal death. Temporal death, because sin has frustrated the object of his state here below; eternal death, that is, endless striving after an unattainable happiness, because the possession of God, the Sovereign Good, is incompatible with rebellion against Him. The claim of the Divine justice can only be satisfied by the sinner undergoing the punishment. However, a compromise is possible between Divine holiness and justice on the one hand, and Divine mercy and love on the other. It lies in the acceptance by God of a vicarious satisfaction. This kind of satisfaction takes place when some person substitutes himself for another and acts or suffers in his place and on his behalf. If the claim merely refers to a lifeless object, anyone who possesses such object and is willing to part with it on behalf of another, can act as substitute and perform vicarious satisfaction. But not so if the claim be a personal one. Where a personal act is required, *e.g.* a reparation of honour, vicarious satisfaction can only be accepted by the claimant when the substitute has something in common with the offender that enables or entitles him to act in his place. Hence, to meet the claims of Divine holiness and justice by vicarious satisfaction, a "man" must come forth qualified to honour God by a holy life as much as mankind has dishonoured Him by sin, and to endow his sufferings with an amount of atoning merit equivalent to the demerit of all mankind. No mere man is equal to such task. Even granting that his impaired will were turned entirely to the service of God, this finite and purely natural homage could in no wise counterbalance the gravity of his offence against the infinitely Holy and Just. The greatness of the offended God at the same time magnifies the offence and diminishes the value of attempted satisfaction. Again: satisfaction for sin embraces the whole existence of the sinner and all his powers, so that no one can atone by suffering but for his own self. And, besides, satispassion is the reverse of redemption. No angel can atone for man, because angels have no natural communion with man. Only a Man-God was able to enter the world with a sinless human nature and to stand before God as the representative of His kin, without guilt, without the necessity of atoning for Himself. Only a God-Man had sufficient personal dignity to invest His action and passion with that infinite value which they draw from the personal dignity of their author.

The Divine decree of Redemption was realised in the Incarnation of God the Son, Jesus Christ, the Messiah. Christ's redeeming work comprises atonement for sin and acquisition or merit of grace, according as we consider it in relation to God's justice or holiness. He atoned by His passion, He merited by His holy actions, yet so that His actions were also satisfactory and His passion meritorious. Merit and satisfaction are not more distinct than justice and holiness in God, upon which the distinction rests. Christ's atonement began when He assumed humanity, continued throughout the trials and troubles of His life, and ended on the cross. In all these sufferings He bore the sins of the world "that through death He might destroy him who has the empire of death" (Heb. ii. 14, 15). He could not, on account of His Divinity, suffer the pains of separation from God, *i.e.* hell; but the pains He really did suffer acquired, through His Divinity, an intensity and an atoning value more than equivalent to the pains of hell. The atoning effect of His sacrifice is the remission of sin and its punishment, or in the language of Scripture, the appeasement of God's anger, the reconciliation of man with God. The merit of Christ is the satisfaction of the Divine

claim of holiness on the part of man. Christ's holiness of life far outweighs the guilt of Adam (Rom. v. 15); the honour He gives to God more than compensates for the dishonour arising from man's sin. Like His satispassion, so His satisfaction embraces the whole earthly career of the Saviour, from the moment He entered the world (Heb. x. 5–7) to His last word on the cross. His voluntary death on the cross is the crowning act of both His satisfactory and meritorious work, because it is at the same time the crowning act of a life of suffering and of a life of holy obedience to the will of God. Through His obedience "even unto the death of the cross" (Phil. ii. 8) He merited the fulness of grace, for Himself and for us "who all have received of His fulness" (Jn. i. 16). For Himself, that is, for His human nature, He merited His glorious resurrection and ascension, and a place at the right hand of the Father; for us, sanctifying grace from its beginnings to its completion in the beatific vision.

The doctrine of vicarious satisfaction is universally taught in the Church, although no council has ever defined it. Such definition was never called for. The older heresies directly impugned the Person of the Redeemer; the more recent ones have erred concerning the manner in which His merits are applied to individuals. Erroneous consequences as to the work of Christ were indeed drawn from these heresies, but the Church contented herself with the condemnation of the fundamental errors. The Socinians first directly denied the work of atonement through Christ. The Council of Trent does not *ex professo* treat of this matter, but supposes the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction as a foundation for its teaching on justification and sanctification. *E.g.*, in sess. v. c. 3, it says that original sin is taken away from us "by the merit of the one Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who reconciled us to God in His blood," and in sess. vi. c. 7, on the causes of justification, the meriting cause is said to be "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who by His most holy passion on the cross merited for us justification and satisfied for us God the Father."

The earliest Fathers do not carry us much beyond the very words of Scripture. In Clement of Rome Christ is said to be "the high-priest of our oblations" (1 Ep. 36, PG, i. 280), to have given His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our soul (*ib.* 49); in the Epistle falsely ascribed to Barnabas, to have ransomed us from death (Barnab. 19); in Ignatius (ad Ephes. v. 1, PG, ii. 778), to have presented Himself as a sacrifice and oblation to God. The notion of satisfaction is more prominent in Justin, who says (Dial. 95, PG, vi. 701) that Christ "took on Himself the curses of all," while Clement of Alexandria ("Quis Dives," 37, p. 956) says that our Lord "laid down His soul as an equivalent for all" (*ἀνταξίαν τῶν ὅλων*).

In the great work of St. Irenaeus, who wrote a little earlier, we meet for the first time with a full and dogmatic exposition of the doctrine of the Incarnation—an exposition wrung from him in his controversy with the Gnostics. According to him, it was not enough for God to vindicate Himself: He had to vindicate His workmanship ("Adv. Haer." iii. 23, 1, PG, vii. 960); it was necessary that man should return to the sanctity and obedience for which God had destined him, and overcome the devil as God meant him to be overcome. For this task fallen man was utterly unfit. But what mere man could not do, the Word of God, being made flesh, did (iii. 18, 2, iii. 18, 7; PG, vii. 932). Christ "passed through every age, restoring communion to God with each" (*ib.*). The new Adam died on that day on which Adam died (spiritually) by disobedience to God (v. 23, 2, PG, vii. 1185). His atonement had a retrospective efficacy. He was the "man who strove for the fathers, and by obedience paid for disobedience" (iii. 18, 6). For the rest, he contents himself with the words of Scripture, and lays down the principle that the Word ransomed us by His death, without inquiring to whom the ransom was paid (v. 1, 1).[1] Very similar is the doctrine of Tertullian ("Adv. Marc." iii. 9, PL, ii. 334), that Christ reformed our birth by His, and destroyed our death by His own.

But soon the speculative mind of Origen applied itself to Christ's satisfaction, and struck out a theory which was to exercise a great and lasting influence in the Church. The Gnostics maintained (see Baur, "Christl. Gnosis," p. 272 *seq.*) that Christ deceived and overcame the demiurge or lower god who created the world. In the place of the demiurge Origen put the devil. He asks (in Matt. tom. xvi. 8; PG, xiii. 1398) to whom it was that Christ gave His soul as a ransom. He distinguishes the soul from the spirit, which He commended to the Father, and suggests that Christ's soul was paid as a ransom to Satan that he might let us go free. Satan thought he could hold Christ bound in death. But it was not so. Christ was "free among the dead," nay, so much stronger than Satan that He wrested from the power of death all who believe in Him. In the East this strange fancy of Origen had only a partial success. It was adopted by Gregory Nyssen ("Orat. Cat." 22 *sq.*, PG, xlv. 60), who explains the deception of the devil on the ground that, although he knew Christ's miraculous birth and power, he saw Him clothed in flesh, and believed he could secure Him as his own. But at an earlier date Athanasius tacitly rejects it. His view is ("De Incarn." 8, PG, xxv. 109) that Christ "delivering His body to death instead of all, offered it (*προσήγε*) to the

[1] Baur's statement (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 131, that Irenaeus held the devil's rule over us to be just, is refuted by the saint's own words (v. 1, 1) "injuste nobis dominabatur apostasia."

Father."[1] Gregory Nazianzen, although ("Orat." xxxix. 13, PG, xxxvi. 348) he accounts for the deception of the devil much as Gregory Nyssen had done, yet in another place ("Orat." xlv. 22, PG, xxxvi. 653) distinctly repudiates the supposition that Christ paid a price to the devil. The Father received it, "not asking for it, or needing it, but because of the dispensation (*διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν*), and because man had to be sanctified by the human nature of God" (*τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*). St. John of Damascus sums up all results of theological speculation in the East, and he utterly sets aside Origen's theory. It was the Father who had been offended, and He, not "the tyrant," must "receive the ransom" ("De Fid. Orthodox." iii. 27, PG, xciv. 1096).

In the Latin Church Origen's tenet struck deeper root. St. Augustine ("De Lib. Arbitr." iii. 10, PL, xxxii. 1286) holds that after the fall Satan claimed men as his own "by most just right." But he slew Jesus, who was not only sinless, but born without concupiscence, and so most justly was obliged to loose those who believe in Jesus. Augustine is followed by St. Leo (Serm. xxiii. 3 et 4), "Per injustitiam plus petendi totius debiti summa vacuatur"); by St. Bernard ("De Error. Abaelard." cap. 5 et 6); and by the Master of the Sentences ("Sentent." lib. iii. distinct. 19).

St. Anselm's famous treatise, "Cur Deus Homo," marks a new epoch in the treatment of the doctrine, and the discussion of it within the Church has continued ever since within the lines which he has laid down. He lived before Bernard and Peter Lombard, but we have not placed him in strict chronological order, because the new position which he occupied did not become immediately the accepted one in the Church. His view did, however, finally prevail in substance, and became dominant in the Scholastic period, just as that of Origen had been among the Western Fathers. He fixed attention on sin mainly as an offence done to God's honour, to whom and not to the devil reparation must be made, for he utterly denies the devil's rights over man (i. 7). God was constrained by a moral necessity to punish sin or else to provide an atonement. "Necesse est ergo ut aut ablatus honor solvatur aut poena sequatur" (i. 13). Christ's human nature enabled Him to incur, His Divine nature to satisfy, the debt (ii. 6 et 7). As He made this payment or satisfaction freely, He merited a reward which He did not need for Himself, and therefore transmitted to us.

The theory of St. Anselm was amended and developed by St. Thomas. He denies, in opposition to Anselm, the necessity of Christ's passion. God is subject to no restraint, and might have liberated us from sin and its consequences without the death of Christ (3ª, q. 46, a. 2). So, again, Christ's death was not a penalty inflicted upon Him by God. He, as man, willingly offered Himself for us, and God permitted wicked men to work their will upon Him, and accepted His death as a sacrifice and satisfaction for our sins (*ib.* q. 47 a. 3); nor did the merit and satisfaction of Christ consist in His mere death and sufferings considered by themselves. The passion was meritorious because willingly undergone (*ib.* q. 47, a. 1). Christ's death was a perfect satisfaction. For full satisfaction is made when the offended person receives that which he loves as much as or more than he hates the offence done to him. Now Christ's satisfaction was superabundant, first, because of the exceeding love which led Him to suffer, then because he offered the life of a God-man for our ransom, thirdly because of the greatness of His sufferings (*ib.* q. 48, a. 2). It was also a sacrifice, inasmuch as it was offered "for the honour properly due to God," and in order to propitiate Him; and here too it was the free will and love of Christ which made His oblation acceptable (*ib.* a. 3), and the merit of Christ's sacrifice and satisfaction is infinite because of the dignity of His person (this is implied in 3ª, q. 46, a. 6, compared with the answer). As sin partakes of the nature of infinity because committed against God who is infinitely great and good, so with the worth of Christ's atonement, because offered by a person of infinite dignity. This, however, by no means excludes the necessity of acceptation on God's part. It was necessary that He should freely give up His Son for the life of the world, just as it was necessary that Christ should freely suffer.

Like St. Thomas, Duns Scotus rejected the notion that Christ's death was the only means by which we could have been freed from sin and death, but he brought another point in the discussion prominently forward. He regarded Christ's merit as finite, not infinite, because it proceeded from a created human will: "Meritum Christi fuit finitum quia a principio finito essentialiter dependens" (3 dist. 19, n. 7, quoted by Werner, "Johannes Duns Scotus," p. 457 *sqq.*), although the dignity of Christ's person made it "congruous" that God should accept His satisfaction for us all (*ib.*). Here we reach the last stage in the history of the controversy among Catholics. Clement VI. (in Extravag. "Unigenitus," lib. v. tit. 9, *De Poenit. et Remiss.*) speaks of Christ's "infinite merits,"[2] and asserts that one drop of His blood would, because of its "union with the Word," have sufficed for the redemption of mankind. The Scotists rightly refused to take this as a dogmatic decision on the matter, and although the Thomist opinion has been widely adopted, even by those who do not belong to

[1] We deliberately reject Baur's interpretation of St. Athanasius, viz. that Christ paid the ransom to Death conceived of as a person.

the Thomist school (see, *e.g.*, Billuart, "De Incarnat." Diss. xix. a. 5; and for an invaluable catena of Patristic passages, Petavius "De Incarnat." xii. 9), the question is still open. The Council of Trent (*e.g.* sess. vi. "De Justific." cap. 11) contented itself with general statements, *e.g.* that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world "through faith in His blood."

The belief in Christ's atonement, or vicarious satisfaction, exactly reflects the doctrine of Holy Scripture on the work of redemption. Scripture calls the work of redemption a sacrifice, a sacrifice of propitiation, and generally applies to it the sacrificial terminology of the Old Testament: Christ is the High Priest of the New Testament, who offers Himself as victim, and His action is termed oblation. But the bloody sacrifices of the Old Law were certainly offered as vicarious satisfaction for sin. The sinner acknowledged that his life had been forfeited to God, and begged Him to accept as a substitution for his own the blood (in which is the life) of the victim (Lev. xvii. 11). The idea of substitution is especially clear in the imposition of hands on the head of the victim, by which rite the victim was made the bearer of the sin of the offerer (Lev. xvi. 21). This atoning idea, of which the old sacrifices were but symbols, was truly realized in the sacrifice of Christ (Heb. x. 1 *sqq.*), the only true priest, who not only symbolized but effected our reconciliation with God. Christ's priesthood is often insisted upon (Heb. v. 10; vi. 20; vii.; ix. 11–15 and 24–28; x. 1–22). The victim is Himself (Heb. ix. 14, 26), His Body and Blood (x. 10; ix. 14), which He offered on the cross, where the real sacrificial act was completed (ix. 25 *sqq.*). St. Paul says: "Christ hath loved us, and hath delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice (*προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*), to God for an odour of sweetness" (Eph. v. 2 cf. 1 Cor. v. 7, Rom. iii. 25). "Jesus Christ; is the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world" (1 Jn. ii. 2; iv. 10). Besides these direct testimonies, we have numerous passages in which to the Blood of Christ (shed in His death) are ascribed all the effects of the blood shed in the ancient sacrifices. The Blood of Christ is our ransom *λύτρον*, *ἀντίλυτρον* (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19; Apoc. v. 9); our reconciliation with the Father (Col. i. 20; cf. Eph. ii. 13–15); our justification (Rom. v. 9); the remission of our sins (Mt. xxvi. 28); the cleansing of sin (1 Jn. i. 7; Apoc. i. 5; vii. 14; xxii. 14); the blood of a new testament or covenant with God (1 Cor. xi. 25; 1 Pet. i. 2). In the same manner the death of Christ is given as ground of our reconciliation (Rom. v. 10) and of our redemption from sin (Heb. ix. 15). The doctrine so clearly set forth in these texts leaves no doubt as to the sense of the passages in which Christ is said to have shed His Blood, or died for many, for all, for sinners, for us (Mt. xxvi. 28; xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Rom. v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 14 *sqq.*; 1 Thess. v. 10). In most of these places, it is true, the word *ὑπὲρ* (for) is used; *ἀντὶ*, however, is used Mt. xx. 28 (*δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*) and 1 Tim. ii. 6 (*ἀντίλυτρον*); and this, in connection with the above distinct doctrine, shows that *ὑπὲρ* has the sense of *ἀντὶ* and refers to vicarious sacrifice. Besides, it is not easy to conceive how Christ died "on our behalf" if He did not die "instead of us." The idea of vicarious sacrifice is also apparent in the testimony of the Baptist calling Christ the Lamb that beareth or taketh away the sins of the world (with reference to Isaias liii.); in 2 Cor. v. 21, "Christ who knew no sin, He [God] hath made sin for us," viz. treated Him as bearing our sins, and in Gal. iii. 13, "Christ being made a curse for us," viz. the object of the Divine anger which we deserved. The term redemption itself carries with it a sacrificial notion (Lev. xxvii. 27–33; Num. xviii. 15–17). The prophet Isaiah most distinctly shows the vicarious character of the Redeemer's work: "He hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows . . . He was wounded for our iniquities, He was bruised for our sins: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and by His bruises we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was offered because it was His own will . . the Lord was pleased to bruise Him in infirmity: He shall lay down His life for sin [Hebrew: as an offering for sin] . . . He shall divide the spoils of the strong because He hath delivered His soul unto death and was reputed with the wicked; and He has borne the sins of many and He has paid for the transgressors" (Isa. liii.).

The satisfaction offered by Christ is perfect; it meets the claims of Divine justice and holiness to their fullest extent, and even superabundantly; moreover, it gives him a real claim on God's justice to all grace. No good work of man can have a claim for reward on God's justice, because man and all his acts belong to God more than a slave to his owner. When man merits by the aid of Divine grace, strictly speaking, God rewards His own gift rather than the work of man (see MERIT). Christ, on the contrary, merited of His own power (*ex propriis*). His Divinity gave to all He did or suffered Divine excellence and infinite value. His whole work was a work of mercy indeed, yet not of mercy to Him, who needed none for Himself and who undertook to meet the justice of God in full on behalf of His brethren. The superabundance of Christ's merits follows from the "infinite excellence" of each of His actions and passions, each of which was sufficient to redeem the world. St. Paul testifies to it, Rom. v. 12–21,

The redemption wrought by Christ is universal, that is, sufficient and intended for all men. It is sufficient because infinite, and because its vicariousness makes it applicable to all who have the nature of man in common with the Redeemer. It is intended for all, as appears from Scripture. The decree of redemption is an effect of God's love for the world (Jn. iii. 16) or for mankind (Tit. iii. 4); "God will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). Hence Christ is "the Saviour of the world" (Jn. iv. 42); "the Light of the world" (Jn. ix. 5); He sends His apostles to the whole world to preach the Gospel to all creatures (Mk. xvi. 15); He gives His flesh for the life of the world (Jn. vi. 52). He is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 Jn. ii. 2); as Adam brought condemnation Christ brought salvation on all men (Rom. v. 18); lastly "Christ died for all" (2 Cor. v. 15).

If redemption is undoubtedly universal as to its sufficiency and intention, it is yet not universal in its efficacy; the lot of many for whom the Saviour gave His blood is eternal damnation. From this, however, we must not conclude with Calvin and Jansenius, that God's saving will either does not exist or is not in earnest. Otherwise, we ought also to infer that God's will concerning the observance of His commandments is not in earnest because, as a matter of fact, His commandments are often set at naught by man. God's will is infallibly fulfilled only when the execution depends solely and entirely on the Divine omnipotence; when the execution is made dependent on the free co-operation of the creatures, it may be frustrated. That all men should be saved is like a Divine commandment, for the fulfilment of which God has given ample means through the work of redemption; the use, however, of these means to some extent depends on the co-operation of each individual: this much must be conceded to save the freedom of human will. They who refuse the required measure of co-operation remain unsaved, not on account of a deficiency in God's saving will or power, but of their own free will. Still, even human resistance to the Divine offer of salvation cannot entirely deprive redemption of its fruits. Even though the final grace of heavenly bliss be not granted, many actual graces, sufficient in themselves to secure salvation, are granted to each and all. To secure these latter, it is sufficient to be a member of Christ as the "Head of all men"; to secure the former, it is necessary to be a member of Christ as the "Head of the Church." (See GRACE, MERIT, &c. All the dogmatic theologians deal with the subject in their treatises "De Verbo Incarnato," *e.g.* Petavius, lib. xii.–xiii. "De Incarnatione"; Franzelin, sect. iv. p. 477 *sqq.*; Scheeben, "Dogmatik," lib. v. sect. 206 *sqq.*; Oxenham, "The Atonement.")

REDEMPTORISTS. The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, the members of which are commonly known as Redemptorists, and in some countries as Ligorians, was founded by St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori in the year 1732. Born of a noble Neapolitan family in 1696, Alphonsus, after giving promise of a brilliant career at the bar, abandoned its honours at the age of twenty-seven to embrace the ecclesiastical state. His first desire was to join the Congregation of the Oratory; being unable to do this on account of the opposition of his father, he devoted himself to evangelizing the poor in the city of Naples, and to the duties of preacher and confessor, residing first in his father's house, afterwards in the College of the Chinese, founded by Father Matthew Ripa, the famous Chinese missionary. He also joined a secular congregation of missionaries called the Propaganda, and with them gave several missions in the provinces. By this means he came to know the spiritual destitution of the poor peasants and shepherds, and felt a strong desire to devote his life to the succour of the rural populations. He was confirmed in these thoughts especially by the advice of Monsignor Falcoia, bishop of Castellamare. This prelate had long desired the establishment of an institute of apostolic men, who should strive in all things to copy the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, and after His example to evangelize the poor. He had founded at Scala a community of ladies, called Nuns of the Most Holy Saviour, who prayed continually for the same intention. It was while giving the spiritual exercises to these nuns that St. Alphonsus at last resolved, under the direction of Bishop Falcoia, to gather some companions, who should on the one hand seek their own perfection by the obligations and rules of a religious life, and on the other devote themselves to apostolic work among most neglected and forsaken souls. The work was solemnly begun at Scala on November 9, 1732, St. Alphonsus being then thirty-six years old.

In carrying out this design the saint encountered innumerable obstacles, first on the part of good men who looked on him as misled by enthusiasm or spiritual ambition, and afterwards from the civil authorities. The times were indeed most unfavourable to such a project, and it is one of the miracles of the saint's life to have founded and maintained a new religious congregation at the time when the Marquis Tanucci was all-powerful in Naples. In spite, however, of these obstacles, St. Alphonsus succeeded in establishing several houses in different parts of Naples and Sicily, and before his death saw his institute spreading in the Papal States, and already transported beyond the Alps.

On February 25, 1749, Pope Benedict XIV. approved the rules and confirmed the new institute by a solemn approbation.

St. Alphonsus had called his Congregation by the name of the Most Holy Saviour; but to prevent confusion with the canons regular of that name in Venice, the Pope himself changed the title to that of the Most Holy Redeemer. The members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, besides the three simple but perpetual vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, bind themselves by a vow of perseverance until death in the Institute, which they confirm in a promissory oath. They are bound by their vow of poverty to refuse all benefices, offices, or dignities outside their Congregation. Whenever a Redemptorist has been raised to a bishopric it has been by command of the Sovereign Pontiff, and by his dispensation. It was in this way that St. Alphonsus himself was obliged to accept the bishopric of St. Agatha of the Goths. In order also more effectually to pursue the principal end of the Institute, which is to succour the most ignorant and neglected souls, St. Alphonsus forbade his Fathers to undertake such works as the instruction of youth, the government of seminaries, the direction of nuns. Their main occupation is the apostolic ministry in the preaching of missions and retreats to all classes of persons, but with a preference for such as are most neglected, especially those who live in remote villages and hamlets. As, however, in many countries the most neglected souls are to be found in the great cities, the intention of the founder is carried out in labouring for them. It is on record that St. Alphonsus, about the time of the establishment of his congregation, seriously debated the question of going himself to the savage heathen in South Africa, and that he welcomed an invitation that had been made to him to send out missionaries for the conversion of the Nestorian heretics in Asia. It was also his wish that the members of his Congregation, who should have reached the age of thirty, should bind themselves by vow to give missions to the heathen, as soon as they should receive the command of the Sovereign Pontiff or of the Superior-General. This vow was, however, considered superfluous by the cardinals who examined the rules for approbation. It need scarcely be said that a founder, whose pre-eminent science has gained him a place among the doctors of the Church, could not be indifferent to learning among his disciples. He insists, therefore, in his rule on the duty of continual study, so that his priests "may be of use and profit to the Church on all occasions."

St. Alphonsus died on August 1, 1787, in his ninety-first year. Before his death he foretold the spread of his Congregation beyond the Alps, and rejoiced when he heard that two Germans had asked admission from the superior of the Roman house. One of these, the Blessed Clement Maria Hofbauer, established the order in Poland, Austria, and Switzerland, and since his death, in 1820, it has spread through Europe, in North and South America, the West Indies, and Australia. It was introduced into England by Dr. Baines, vicar-apostolic of the Western District, in 1843. Ireland became a separate province in 1898. In the revolutions of the past century the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer has experienced more than the usual share of persecution, having been expelled in turn from Poland, Austria, Bavaria, France, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Italy, and Germany. Into several of these countries the missionaries have returned a second time and renewed their labours. From some they have been again driven out when revolution or impiety has become predominant.

The Congregation is under the Government of a superior-general, called the Rector Major, who is elected for life by a general chapter, and is assisted by six consultors. His residence is in Rome. The superiors of the various provinces (Provincials) and of the houses (Rectors), with their consultors, are appointed for a term of three years by the Rector Major. Their term of office may be renewed at his discretion.

The nuns already mentioned, commonly called Redemptoristines, form the *Order* of the Most Holy Redeemer, as distinguished from the Congregation of missionaries. They are under the jurisdiction of the bishops in whose dioceses they reside. They are strictly enclosed and contemplative, assisting the missionaries by their prayers. They have monasteries in several parts of Europe. (Capecelatro, "La Vita di Sant' Alfonso Maria de' Liguori"; Berthe, "Life of St. Alphonsus," tr.; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongregationen"; Wuest, in "Cath. Enc.")

REDUCTIONS OF PARAGUAY. [See MISSIONS, p. 587.]

REED, EUCHARISTIC. [See FISTULA.]

REFECTORY (*refectorium*, place of refreshment). [See CONVENT.]

REFORMATION, THE. Since the conversion of the Barbarians, who broke up and divided amongst them the Western Empire, wealth in every form had been lavishly poured upon the Church; and a relaxation of discipline—against which great pontiffs, saintly bishops, and the founders or reformers or religious orders unceasingly strove—had been too frequently the result. Through the operation of this and other causes—such as the Great Schism, the Renaissance, wars of ambition, national rivalries, the growth of commercial and other purely secular interests, &c.—the sense of the essential unity of the Church, which was so strong throughout Christendom in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was considerably weakened at the beginning of the sixteenth. On the rise and progress in

Germany of the series of conflicts and changes which go by the name of "the Reformation," see the article LUTHER AND LUTHERANISM. The subversive doctrines of the German reformer found a willing disciple in Gustavus Vasa who, on the dissolution (1523) of the Union of Calmar, became king of Sweden. Aided by the brothers Peterson and by Lawrence Anderson, archdeacon of Strengness, whom he made Chancellor, Gustavus (1527) induced the estates of the realm, in the Diet of Westerås, to sanction the confiscation of the property of the monasteries. The work of change then went rapidly on. Lawrence Peterson was appointed by the king (1531) archbishop of Upsala, and married. The king declared himself supreme in matters ecclesiastical, and setting aside entirely the authority of the Holy See, deposed or appointed bishops at his will. The last remains of Catholic usages were abolished at a second Diet of Westerås in 1544. Under the reign of King John (1569) there seemed to be some hope of a Catholic reaction; an envoy was sent to the court of Gregory XIII., and the Jesuit Possevin was received at Stockholm, but a sudden change in the sentiments of the king restored things to their former state. The system adopted in Sweden, in organizing which Lawrence Peterson was mainly instrumental, was Lutheranism; but, as in England, bishops were nominally retained. The episcopal authority of Lawrence Peterson, the head and fountain of the new hierarchy, appears to have been derived solely from the king; according to Rohrbacher ("Hist. de l'Egl." xxiii. 303), there was a true Archbishop of Upsala, Olaus Magnus, alive at the time, though in exile; he did not die till 1544.

In Denmark the tyrant Christian II., before his deposition in 1523, had brought to Copenhagen a Wittenberg preacher, a follower of Luther, favoured the marriage of the clergy, and in various ways sought to tamper with the faith and laws of the Church. His successor, Frederick I., instigated by his son Christian, who had studied in Germany and become a zealous Lutheran, established by degrees his own supremacy in religious matters, and, by favouring heretical preachers and discouraging and punishing all who stood up for the ancient faith, prepared the way for its ruin. At a diet held in 1536, at which no representative of the clergy was admitted, he induced the assembly to decree the abolition of the Catholic worship in all the Danish dominions; the bishops were required to cease from opposing Lutheranism and the beneficed clergy to embrace it. The nobles and people acquiesced with a singular apathy in all these changes. The king then invited Bugenhagen, a friend of Luther, into Denmark, appointed him court preacher, and commissioned him to reorganize the Danish church. Bugenhagen crowned the king afresh, as if to show that his previous coronation with Catholic rites had been invalid; he also consecrated superintendents in the place of the deposed Catholic bishops. As these last successively died out, the superintendents assumed the title of bishop; and this is the origin of the present Danish episcopate.

On the Reformation movement in England, Scotland, and Ireland, see the articles ENGLISH CHURCH; PRESBYTERIANS; SCOTTISH CHURCH; and IRISH CHURCH.

In France the Protestants, there called Huguenots, became very numerous; civil war broke out in 1562, and was renewed at frequent intervals during more than thirty years, till the abjuration of Protestantism by Henry IV. in 1593. By the edict of Nantes (1598) liberty of worship was granted to the Huguenots, and certain cities, of which the chief was Rochelle, made over to them. In the eighteen flourishing provinces of Holland and Belgium the reforming party, owing to the neighbourhood of France, adhered to the system of Calvin. Under the rule of Charles V., and afterwards of his son, Philip II., the designs of the innovators were severely repressed. The seizure of Brille by the Gueux, in 1572, was the commencement of the long civil war which ended in the disruption of the seven northern provinces from the eleven provinces of Belgium, and the consolidation of the former into a Republic. The necessity of providing a rallying point and symbol of union caused the adoption by the Dutch, in the Synod of Dordrecht (1574), of the "Belgic Confession," drawn up by Gui de Brès, a Walloon, a few years before. This confession is Calvinistic. In 1582 the provinces of Holland and Zeeland proscribed the Catholic worship, and the wholesale plunder and desecration of churches followed. The final success of the revolt was the signal for a series of penal enactments which had for their object the extirpation of Catholicism from the Republic. This, however—since the Belgian provinces, conterminous in their whole breadth with those of Holland, had remained Catholic—was found a task impossible of achievement.

"In Switzerland the Reformation arose, independently of Luther, by the exertions of Zwingli, in Zurich (who fell October 11, 1531, at Cappel, in a battle with the Catholics). It spread rapidly; in 1528 it had been adopted, altogether or partially, by the cantons of Zurich, Bern, Basle, Appenzel, Glarus, and Schaffhausen. A separation from those [the Lutherans] who followed the Confession of Augsburg grew in 1525 out of the . . . difference of opinion respecting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and thus originated the Reformed party, which was first fully developed in Geneva, through

Calvin, 1536–1564. . . . . The forms and discipline of the Reformed Church were here fully developed. By means of the university founded in 1539, under the direction of Calvin, and supported by his exertions and those of Beza, Geneva became the principal school of theology for the professors of these opinions, and in those days the only one where the French language prevailed." (Heeren, "Political System of Europe," i. 76.) By the "Consensus Tigurinus," arranged in 1549 between Calvin and Bullinger, of Zurich, a concord, at least external, was brought about between the Calvinist and Zwinglian factions.

The true and Catholic reformation, long desired but delayed by many difficulties, was taken up and successfully accomplished by the Council of Trent (1545–1563); see that article. (Besides the ordinary Church histories numberless works have been written on the subject. We can only mention Döllinger, "Die Reformation"; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," tr.; Janssen, "Hist. of the German People," tr.; Grisar, "Life of Martin Luther," tr.; Baudrillart, "L'Église Catholique, la Renaissance, le Protestantisme.")

REFRESHMENT SUNDAY: [See LAETARE SUNDAY.]

REGALIA. The right claimed by kings of receiving the revenues of a bishopric during a vacancy, and of appointing, pending the election of a successor, to all benefices in the bishop's patronage, not involving the cure of souls, which might fall vacant in the interval.

In England, as is well known, the Norman and Angevin kings exercised this right, and were accustomed to keep the sees vacant for years in order that they might enjoy the revenues. After the martyrdom of St. Thomas, Henry II. (1176) promised the Pope that he would in future not keep any vacant bishopric or abbey in his hands for more than a year, unless it were required by the evident necessity of the case.[1]

In France the regalia was introduced about the end of the eleventh century,[2] at first with reference to certain provinces only; but there was a tendency to extend it further and further. The Council of Lyons (1274) in its fifth session sanctioned the right in cases where ancient custom could be pleaded for it, but forbade on pain of excommunication its extension to churches hitherto free.[3] In spite of this, the kings of France, supported by the lawyers, went on developing and extending the regalia, until by three edicts of Louis XIV. (1673, 1674) it was declared to be applicable to all the provinces of the French monarchy. The patronage which it conferred was now declared to be inherent in the crown until such time as the new bishop should sue out his temporalities in the Parliament of Paris and pay certain fees; and to this clause a retrospective effect was given, so that any beneficiary appointed by a bishop who had not complied with these formalities might be dispossessed in favour of a royal nominee.

Most of the French bishops, seeing the overwhelming power of the crown, submitted to these innovations; but the bishops of Aleth and Pamiers (Pavillon and Caulet) resisted them; and when royal nominees were inducted by the secular arm into canonries to which these bishops had already made appointments, they excommunicated the intruders. The struggle began in 1675 and lasted several years. The excommunicated ecclesiastics appealed to the metropolitans (Archbishops of Toulouse and Narbonne) of the two bishops, and obtained from them decisions nullifying the episcopal censures. The bishops then appealed to Rome; Innocent XI., regarding the question as one in which the liberties of the Church were involved, espoused their cause, and annulled the decrees of the metropolitans. Great confusion and excitement followed.

The king's interpretation of the regalia was supported against the Holy See, not only by the Parliament and the Archbishop of Paris (Harlay), but also by the Jesuits. The explanation of this remarkable fact is found in a complication of the question connected with the spread of Jansenism [JANSENISM]. The Bishops of Aleth and Pamiers were known to be favourable to Arnauld and his party, and they had appointed to canonries in their gift persons more or less imbued with these opinions. If the regalia were maintained, and in the extent now claimed for it, these men might be ejected, and ecclesiastics nominated by the King's confessor, the Père la Chaise, S.J., might be put in their place.

This united opposition neutralised the efforts of the Pontiff; and when, in 1682, the assembly of the French clergy issued its celebrated Four Articles [see GALLICANISM], the question of the regalia, in view of this fresh subject of solicitude, fell into the background. (Ferraris, *Regalia*; Döllinger, in "Kirchenlex.")

REGENERATION. [See BAPTISM.]

REGINA COELI. An anthem in honour of the Blessed Virgin which begins with these words, and after each of whose four clauses the Alleluia is repeated; it is said at the end of the offices of the Breviary during the Easter season. Pope Benedict XIV., confirming on April 20, 1742, the indulgences granted to the recitation of the "Angelus," ordered that the "Regina Coeli," with its verses and prayers, should be said standing, instead, during the Paschal season. An ancient tradition relates that in the days of St. Gregory the Great a plague broke out in Rome. The Pope ordered all the people to

[1] Lingard, ii. 192. [2] Ferraris. [3] Fleury, livr. lxxxvi.

march in procession, carrying the picture of the Blessed Virgin said to have been painted by St. Luke. As the crowds went towards St. Peter's and reached the bridge across the Tiber, a multitude of angels were seen above the picture singing the first three lines of the anthem. The Pontiff cried out "Ora pro nobis Deum, Alleluia," completing the anthem, and the angel of the plague was seen sheathing his sword above Adrian's mausoleum, which henceforth was known as the castle of Sant' Angelo. (Guéranger, "Liturgical Year," Paschal Time, tr., Part I., p. 111.)

REGIONARIUS. Pope Fabian, it is said, divided Rome into seven regions, founded no doubt on the fourteen known since the Augustan age, and he assigned each to the charge of a deacon, who was responsible for the distribution of alms, care of hospitals, &c. These regionary deacons were the seven chief deacons of the Roman Church; they were subject to the archdeacon, while the "titular" deacons—*i.e.* deacons of the parochial churches—were placed under the archpriest of each church. From the time of Honorius II. Rome had twelve regionary deacons, and six with the name of Palatinales.[1] The regionarii sang the Gospel when the Pope officiated at the stations, the Palatinales when he did so at the Lateran. There was a similar division of subdeacons and acolytes. Sixtus V. fixed the number of cardinal deacons at fourteen. (Mabillon, "Museum Italicum," vol. ii. p. xi. *seq.* and p. 567 *seq.*)

REGIUM PLACET. [See CANON LAW, p. 104; EXEQUATUR.]

REGULARS. Persons of either sex observing a common rule of life, bound by the three vows of religion, and obeying, with regard to dress, food, and the employment of their time, the statutes of the particular order or congregation to which they belong. [See the articles ORDERS, RELIGIOUS; CLERK REGULAR; PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS; EXEMPTION.]

RELICS. The word includes the bodies of departed saints, fragments of their bodies, articles or portions of articles which they have used, such as clothes, vestments, rosaries, and the like. The Church also venerates relics of Christ and His Blessed Mother. Such are the holy nails, lance, spear, or fragments of the True Cross, the girdle, veil, &c., of the Blessed Virgin. The devotion to relics, solemnly approved by the Council of Trent (sess. xxv. De Invoc. Sanct.), rests on two great principles of Catholic belief.

First, the Church honours the bodies of the dead who sleep in Christ. Our Lord has opened the kingdom of heaven, and given us the pledge and assurance of the resurrection of the body. Hence, Christians have lost that horror of dead bodies which was characteristic of the heathen, and even of Jews. But the Church specially venerates the bodies of the martyrs and other saints; because, while they were on earth, their bodies were the temples of the Holy Ghost and they themselves living members of Christ. Their souls are already in heaven, their glorious resurrection is a matter of certainty, and therefore the Church joyfully anticipates the glory which God will give to these remains at the last day. She testifies at once the firmness of her belief in the resurrection and her love of the virtues which shone forth in the saints. For these were not virtues of the soul only: they were proper to the whole man, body and soul, which toiled and suffered together. The same reasons which make the resurrection of the body credible also tell in favour of the veneration due to relics. And so Christians have felt from the very infancy of the Church. They gathered the bones of St. Ignatius of Antioch (anno 107) and placed them in linen, "as a priceless treasure, being left to the Holy Church by the grace which was in the martyr" ("Act. Mart." 6). When Polycarp's body was burned in 167 the Christians exhumed the bones they could find "as more precious than costly stones and more valuable than gold." The Jews suggested that the Christians would leave Christ and worship Polycarp, ignorant that Christians could "never leave Christ or worship another" ("Act. Mart." 17, 18). When in 258 Cyprian was about to be beheaded, the Christians cast towels and napkins before him, clearly that they might be soaked in his blood ("Act. Procons." 5). So baseless is the statement that devotion to relics came into the Church from Pagan influences after Constantine's conversion.

Next, Catholics believe that God is sometimes pleased to honour the relics of the saints by making them instruments of healing and other miracles, and also by bestowing spiritual graces on those who, with pure hearts, keep and honour them. For this principle the Fathers (*e.g.* Cyril of Jerusalem, "Catech." xviii., PG, xxxiii. 1036) appeal to the Old Testament which relates the resurrection of a dead body which touched the bones of Eliseus (4 Kings xiii. 21), and to the New, which tells us that the sick were healed by towels which had touched the living body of St. Paul (Acts xix. 12; cf. v. 15). "There is a power," says Cyril (*loc. cit.*), "latent [ἔγκειται] even in the bodies of the just." No proof is needed that, after the heathen persecution was over, the Christians sought and believed that they obtained graces through the relics of the saints. St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and, indeed, the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries generally, are witnesses to the belief. A catena of passages will be found

[1] "Cui duae aliae demum additae diaconiae numerum XX constituerunt" (Mabill. p. xviii.).

in Petavius, "De Incarnat." lib. xiv. cap. 11. (See also Newman's "Development," ch. x. § 1, *Resurrection and Relics.*)

Abuses no doubt have occurred in all ages with regard to relics. In 1215, canon 62 of the Fourth Lateran Council, inserted in the "Corpus Juris," forbade relics to be sold or to be exposed outside of their cases or shrines, and prohibited the public veneration of new relics till their authenticity had been approved by the Pope (Mansi, "Concil." tom. xxii. 1049–50; see also Fleury, "H.E." livr. lxxvii. 54). The Council of Trent (sess. xxv. De Invoc. Sanct.) renews these prohibitions and requires bishops to decide on the authenticity of new relics after careful consultation with theologians, or, if necessary, with the metropolitan and other bishops of the province assembled in council.

Relics are usually venerated in public by being exposed in their cases, with burning lights, upon the altar. They are often placed there at High Mass and incensed. They are carried in procession and the people are blessed with them. A special Mass and Office are permitted to churches which have an "insignis reliquia" of a saint named in the Roman Martyrology. (See the decrees at the beginning of the Breviary and Missal; Bened. XIV. "De Servorum Dei Beatif. &c." iv., Pt. II.; Thurston, in "Cath. Enc.")

RELIGION, RELIGIOUS (*religio*, prob. from *relego*; *relegens*, attentive, studious, would be the opposite of *neglegens*, careless [1]). The word "religion" is often used in a technical sense by Catholic writers to denote the virtue which deals with giving to God the honour which is His due. St. Thomas looks upon it as a part of the virtue of justice. God is the supreme Lord of all; all other beings are entirely dependent upon Him. Man by his reason can know this dignity of God and his own dependence upon God. He is therefore bound to acknowledge this dignity and dependence; to adore, praise, and thank his Creator, and to ask Him for all that he stands in need of. These acts of homage are paid chiefly by prayer and sacrifice (see these articles).

As religion is a moral virtue, it lies midway between two extremes. The defect of religion is called irreligion. To this belongs all want of reverence for God, or for persons or things dedicated to Him. Thus, tempting God, perjury, and sacrilege are instances of this vice. The opposite extreme is superstition. We cannot, of course, give God too much honour, but it is possible to honour Him in an unbecoming way, or to give to creatures the honour due to Him alone. To offer Mosaic sacrifices now that the new law has been established would be an instance of the former kind of superstition; idolatry, divination, and vain observance are instances of the latter.

[1] Skeat, *Etymol. Dict.*

Religion is sometimes used in a still narrower sense to designate the state of those who have entirely devoted themselves to God by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience [see ORDERS, RELIGIOUS; MONK, NUN, &c.]. Hence the various religious orders are styled "religions." Trench ("Study of Words," p. 9) infers from this use of the word that monks and nuns are the only "religious" people among Catholics. St. Thomas long ago met this objection in a way that should commend itself to a writer on language. "A name common to many things is sometimes appropriated to that one to which it eminently belongs; as, for example, Rome is often called 'the city.' Now, religion is the virtue by which a man does something for the service and worship of God. And, therefore, they are said, by antonomasia, to be religious who have devoted themselves entirely to the service of God, offering, as it were, a holocaust to Him" ($2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 186 a. 1). St. Thomas has treated of religion at some length, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, qq. 81–100; and of the religious state, qq. 184–190.

REORDINATION. [See ORDER, HOLY, p. 624.]

REPROBATION. [See PREDESTINATION.]

REQUIEM. [See MASS, p. 564.]

RESCRIPTS, PAPAL. Under the old Roman empire the emperor was the fountain of justice. He was the supreme judge, and he exercised his powers in two ways principally. He either sat as judge on appeals, or he gave opinions (*rescripta*, replies) at the instance of a subordinate judge or party to a cause. Thus the famous "rescriptum Trajani" (Pliny, "Epist. ad Trajanum," 96, 97) is a reply to the request made by Pliny for guidance as to his conduct towards Christians. In like manner, the custom arose of writing to the Popes or Papal Congregations and receiving replies. Such rescripts have the force of law *inter partes*, that is, for those in whose favour they have been granted; and they serve as precedents applicable to similar cases. If they are inserted in the Corpus Juris they have the force of common law. They are of various kinds: they may explain or extend or abrogate the law; or they may bestow benefices or favours. They presuppose the truth of the allegations mentioned in the petition. (Taunton.)

RESERVATION OF BENEFICES. Mandates and favours in expectation (*mandata*, *gratiae expectativae*), by which Popes had been accustomed to require that bishops and others, having the right of conferring benefices should, as soon as they fell vacant, confer them upon particular persons—and mental reservations, by which a Pontiff announced, but without mentioning their names, that he had reserved certain benefices, when they should fall vacant, in favour of particular persons—were all abolished by the Council of

Trent.[1] With other Papal reservations the Council did not interfere.

The reservation of benefices is desirable for many reasons: it is a practical means of giving effect in widely separated countries to the supreme pastorate of the Roman Pontiffs; it links the different national Churches more closely, by personal ties of gratitude and affection, to the Apostolic See, and through it to each other; and it provides the Pope with the means of rewarding those who have laboured meritoriously in his cause and that of the Church.

Considered with reference to the legal foundation on which they rest, reservations are divided into four classes—(1) those which are contained in the "Corpus Juris"; (2) those which are found in the "Extravagants," outside the "Corpus"; (3) those specified in the constitutions of later Popes; (4) those specified by the rules of the Chancery. Another classification, founded on differences in the *quality* of reservations, is suggested by Cardinal Soglia. According to this arrangement, reservations are fivefold:—

(1) Benefices are reserved on the ground of their own quality; thus the second rule of the Chancery reserves to the Pope all vacant bishoprics, and the abbacy or headship in any monastery of men, the revenues of which exceed a certain amount. The fourth rule reserves the greater dignities in cathedral churches, and the principal dignities in collegiate churches possessing a certain revenue. One such dignity only in each church is understood to be affected by the rule. With regard to all the reservations under this head, it should be remembered that they do not take effect in countries where there is any pact or concordat regulating the course of patronage, for it is a maxim that *pactum praestat juri*.

(2) Benefices are reserved on the ground of their being held by particular *persons*—*e.g.* by cardinals, members of the Curia, and officials of the Holy See.

(3) The third ground of reservation is connected with the *manner* in which a benefice has become vacant. Thus a benefice may be vacated on account of *heresy*, in collusive *simony* (*simonia confidentialis*), or *informality* (as in the case of parishes, or appointing to which the *concursus* ordered by the Council of Trent has been neglected), or *deposition* proceeding from a particular cause; in all these cases, under constitutions emanating from St. Pius V and other Pontiffs, reservation takes effect.

(4) The fourth ground is connected with the *place* where the vacancy has occurred. The benefice of any ecclesiastic dying at the court of Rome is a familiar instance; this is mentioned in the "Corpus Juris," and is the most ancient of all reservations.

(5) The fifth ground depends on the *time* at which the vacancy has occurred. The ninth rule of the Chancery reserves all benefices strictly so called (not being in lay patronage), whether with or without cure of souls, which fall vacant in eight months of the year—viz. in January, February, April, May, July, August, October, and November. In the case of bishops, however, who reside continuously in their dioceses, and who apply for the privilege, the above rule is modified to this extent, that the Papal reservation only takes effect in alternate months, the patronage being thus equally divided between the Pope and the ordinary.

It should be observed that the rules of the Chancery have no legal force during a vacancy of the Holy See; each Pope renews them immediately after his election. Reservations, therefore, which depend *only* on a rule of the Chancery, and not also on a Papal constitution, do not take effect in the case of benefices vacated in the interval between the death of one Pope and the election of another. (Soglia, "Instit. Canon." III. 2, § 20.)

RESERVATION, MENTAL. [See MENTAL RESERVATION.]

RESERVATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. The doctrine of the Church on this subject has been explained under the word EUCHARIST. In this article we propose to give a brief history of the reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Church.

a. Causes of Reservation.—In all ages, of course, the Blessed Sacrament has been reserved for the sick; and the first Christians, in the times of persecution, kept the Eucharist at home and gave communion to themselves. But, besides this, (1) the Eucharist was sent from bishop to bishop as a sign of charity. Irenaeus (apud Euseb. "H.E." v. 24) testifies that the bishops of Rome sent the Eucharist to other bishops, and although the Council of Laodicea (canon 14) forbade the sending of the Eucharist at Easter into strange dioceses, and this prohibition found general acceptance, still a decretal of Pope Innocent to Decentius proves that the Bishop of Rome sent the *fermentum* or consecrated Host "per titulos"—*i.e.* to the chief churches of the city. (2) In Rome, as we know from the earliest Ordo, a Host consecrated at one Mass was placed on the altar at the Mass of the next day, to signify the unity of the sacrifice. A similar custom prevailed in Gaul under the first dynasty. (3) The Eucharist was carried by lay persons, or even catechumens (see Ambros. "De Excessu Sat." i. 43, PL, xvi. 1304), as a protection against danger. This custom must have lasted, at least in the case of clerics, till late in the Middle Ages, for St. Thomas à Becket carried the Eucharist with him when he went to meet Henry II.; St. Louis of France carried the Eucharist with him beyond the sea, but by permission of the Papal legate;

[1] Sess. xxiv. c. 19, De Ref.

and, from about this time, the privilege seems to have been reserved to the Pope, though one or two instances of priests carrying it for their own protection occur in later times—*e.g.* in the life of Savonarola. Among the Greek monks it was still maintained when Arcudius wrote his work "De Concordia Eccl. Occid. et Orientalis in VII Sacramentorum administratione"—*i.e.* in the seventeenth century. (4) In Rome and France, as appears from the Ordo Romanus and Alcuin, a bishop at his consecration kept a part of the Host presented to him by the consecrator and consumed it during the next forty days. The same usage obtained in some parts of France at the ordination of priests. (5) Many councils reprove the custom, which must have been widely spread, of giving communion to the dead (Concil. Hippo. c. 4; Auxerre, c. 12; Statut. Bonifac. 20). (6) The Host was buried with the dead. This was done on one occasion, according to St. Gregory the Great, by St. Benedict ("Dial." ii. 24), and, according to an ancient author, in the case of St. Basil, at the saint's own desire. (7) The pen was sometimes dipped in the Communion under the species of wine in subscribing decrees of councils, &c. Pope Theodore, for example, signed the condemnation of Pyrrhus in this way. (8) In dedicating churches three portions of the Host were put in the altar and sealed up with cement. This rite was followed by Pope Urban II. in dedicating the abbey church of Marmoutier (Martène, "De Rit." tom. i. c. 5, a. 4; quoted by Chardon).[1]

b. The Case or Tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament was Reserved.—The oldest tabernacles had the form of a tower. According to Anastasius, Constantine presented St. Peter's Church at Rome with a tower of pure gold adorned with jewels and with a dove upon it, while Innocent I. and Hilarius I. gave towers of the same kind to the churches of SS. Gervase and Protase and of St. John Lateran. Such a tower existed in Chardon's time (the middle of the eighteenth century) at Marmoutier. There is one still in Nuremberg in the Church of St. Laurence. Their turrical form was succeeded in many churches by tabernacles in the shape of a covered cup; in others by small boxes suspended over the altar. The custom, so common in France, of suspending the Blessed Sacrament in a tabernacle made like a dove has been described elsewhere [art. DOVE]. Tabernacles were of very various material, of precious metal, of precious stone such as onyx, of glass, or even wood.

c. The Place of Reservation.—The most ancient use was to reserve the Holy Eucharist in *παστοφόρια* or *thalami*—*i.e.* in chambers at the side of the church. Jerome, in cap. 40 Ezech. (quoted by Chardon), alludes to this custom. Reserving the Eucharist in the sacristy was not extinct in France even during the eighteenth century. In the Middle Ages the Eucharist was often reserved in an ambry [AMBRY], or press, in the corner of the building or in a pillar—such a press as we now use for the holy oils. The modern Greeks reserve the Eucharist for the Mass of the Presanctified in the sacristy, whence it is carried in procession to the altar. For the sick they keep it in a place called *ἀρτοφόριον* behind the altar, with a lamp burning before it. Such, no doubt, is their rule, but M. Nointel, ambassador from the King of France to the Sultan, gives an interesting account (printed in the "Perpétuité de la Foi") of the different ways in which he saw the Eucharist reserved among the Greeks. Sometimes the box which held it was on the altar; very often it was put in a silk bag and hung on a nail.

Gavantus approves the custom which exists in many Catholic churches, of placing the tabernacle on the altar in a side chapel; but in most English churches the tabernacle with the Blessed Sacrament is placed over the chief altar, and the Sacred Congregation of Rites approved of this practice, except in the case of cathedrals. (From Chardon, 295 *sqq.*; see also Bridgett-Thurston, "Hist. of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain," especially 186; Thurston, "Month" 1907, and "Cath. Enc."; Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," 421.)

RESERVED CASES. Certain sins, power to absolve from which is reserved by the superior to himself and not imparted to inferiors, who have ordinary or delegated jurisdiction over other sins. Papal cases are reserved to the Pope, episcopal cases to the bishop, the reserved cases of regulars to the prelates of the order. Jurisdiction given by a superior is, as has been shown in the article on PENANCE, necessary for the validity of absolution. But a superior may either confer the whole of the jurisdiction which he himself holds, or only a part of it, just as in England the Crown empowers magistrates to try petty cases, but not the more serious crimes. Hence, the Council of Trent (sess. xix. De Poenit. can. 11) defines that bishops have the power of reserving cases, and that absolution from them cannot be validly given by an ordinary confessor. The object of the reservation is to increase the shame of the penitent, to impress the serious nature of the offence upon him, and to give the superior, who is likely to have more experience than the ordinary confessor, the opportunity of prescribing a fitting remedy. This power of reservation, however, is given for edification, not destruction. Clement

[1] In modern times the Holy Eucharist is also reserved for exposition and benediction, and in order that the faithful may be able throughout the day to adore Christ present on the altar. [See BENEDICTION; EXPOSITION; VISITS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.]

VIII. warns prelates [1] only to reserve "the more atrocious and grievous crimes," and it is generally assumed that the reservation falls only on sins which are grievous, external, certain, and complete in their kind. The reserved sin may also have a censure attached to it, and this is almost always the case in Papal reserves. Absolution from a reserved sin may be given by the superior who reserves it, by his successors, by those whom he delegates, by his own superiors. For full information we refer to the common treatises on moral theology; only adding that in the dioceses of England very few sins, and those of most rare occurrence, are reserved either to the Pope or ordinary.

The practice of the modern is consonant with that of the ancient and mediaeval Church, which usually "reserved to the bishops the absolution of public penitents" (Chardon, 664 *sqq.*). Some of the cases quoted by Chardon scarcely seem to the point—*e.g.* the direction of ancient Rituals that priests are to hear the confessions of those who present themselves, and take them, if they seem well disposed, to the bishop for absolution; or the statement of Peter the Cantor in his "Sum of the Sacraments," that formerly monks used to hear confessions and the abbot alone to absolve. But he quotes from the Acts of a Benedictine, St. Redon, who lived in the tenth century, and from Constitutions of Richard, bishop of Salisbury, clear cases of Papal reserve. In 1171, Pope Alexander III. wrote to the Archbishop of Upsala, that women guilty of child-murder and other abominations were to be sent to Rome for absolution. "This," says Fleury ("H.E." lxxii. 35), "is the beginning of Papal reserves for more atrocious crimes"; but the instances just given show that this is scarcely correct. Maskell ("Monum. Rit." vol. i. p. 97) gives some account of reserved sins in the old English Church. Thus, a Council of Durham in 1250 lays down the principle that greater sins are to be reserved to those higher in office. The penitent is to go to the bishop or the penitentiary with a letter from his confessor stating the nature and circumstances of his sin, or else the confessor is to accompany him. In 1367, Thoresby, archbishop of York, reserved thirty-seven sins to himself or his penitentiary. (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. vi. 578 *sqq.*; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." v. 348 *sqq.*; Ferraris; Taunton; Slater, "Mor. Theol." ii. 192.)

RESIDENCE. Before the Council of Trent the non-residence of ecclesiastics, even of bishops, had long been a crying evil. In the sixth session, the Fathers adopted a decree of reformation, which provided that any patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop, who should remain without legitimate cause for six months together absent from his church should forfeit a fourth part of the revenues. A still more protracted and contumacious absence was eventually to be reported to the Pope, who would meet it by appropriate measures. Finding that this decree had been by some perversely understood, as if a bishop might, without incurring censure, be absent five months in the year from his diocese, the Council, in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions, returned to the subject, and declared that "all the rulers of patriarchal, metropolitan, and cathedral churches, under whatsoever name or title, even if they be cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, are bound to personal residence in their own church or diocese, where it is their duty to discharge the functions of their office, and cannot be absent, except for the causes and under the circumstances hereunder specified." There are many legitimate causes of absence, but these must be approved in writing either by the Pope or the metropolitan; except in the case of some urgent political exigency, the occurrence of which, being usually sudden, and at the same time notorious, dispenses the bishop from the necessity of notifying his absence. As a rule, the period of absence in the course of a year, apart from the urgent causes above noticed, "ought on no account to exceed two or at most three months; and care should be taken that there be a sufficient cause, and that the bishop's flock suffer no harm; judgment on which point [the Council] leaves to the conscience of those absenting themselves, hoping that it [their conscience] will be scrupulous and full of fear, since hearts are open before God, whose work they are bound at their peril not to do deceitfully." [1]

Canons in cathedral and collegiate churches are ordinarily bound to residence during nine months in the year.[2] But where a foundation possesses a privilege, confirmed by the Pope, in virtue of which the canons are permitted to be absent for a longer time, it is held that the conciliar decree does not derogate from that privilege.[3] In the case both of bishops and canons, the period of absence ought not to comprise the times at which the great festivals (Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Corpus Christi) are celebrated, nor the days of Lent or Advent. The obligation on individual canons to reside does not bind when they have a lawful excuse for not doing so. Such excuses are—illness, permitted sojourn in a foreign country for the purpose of study or teaching, and employment in the immediate service of the bishop.

Parish priests and other beneficiaries having cure of souls cannot be absent from their cure for more than a week without the bishop's permission. Two months in the year is the period beyond which the bishop's

[1] He actually limited the power of reservation on the part of religious superiors.

[1] Jer. xlviii. 10. [2] Sess. xxiv. 12, "De Ref."
[3] Ferraris, "Canonicatus," art. 5.

permission of non-residence to his clergy is not ordinarily extended.

Diocesan statutes, concordats, and the civil law in certain countries, contain a great variety of particular regulations respecting the residence of ecclesiastics. (Taunton; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." iv. 221 *sqq.*; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. v. 120 *sqq.*)

RESIGNATION. The resignation or renunciation of a benefice is "the spontaneous relinquishment of an ecclesiastical benefice, made before the lawful superior, and accepted by him."[1] It is either tacit or express. A resignation is tacitly or *ipso facto* made of any church preferment held by the resigner in the following cases: by one who, already having one benefice, is nominated to another incompatible with the first; by a clerk in minor orders who enters into a contract of marriage; by a clerk becoming professed in a religious order [PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS]; and by a clerk becoming a soldier or a strolling player. An express resignation is made either in words or in writing, and is either pure or conditional. A pure resignation is an unqualified absolute surrender of the preferment; a conditional resignation is made *sub conditione*, and is of five kinds, according as it is made—(1) in favour of a third person; or (2) with the reservation of a pension out of the revenues; or (3) with the right of resumption, if the resignatary should die before the resigner; or (4) with the right of resumption at some given date in the future; or (5) in pursuance of an arrangement for an exchange of benefices. But these conditional resignations, the status of the clergy relatively to the civil power being so different from what it formerly was, are now of rare occurrence.

Publicity is necessary to the validity of a resignation, and the mode of publication under varying circumstances is minutely regulated by canon law.

Reserved benefices, the collation of which belongs to the Pope alone, cannot be resigned into the hands of any ordinary lower than the Pope.

According to a decretal of Innocent III.,[2] a bishop can only resign his see for one of six causes, which are summed up in the memorial lines:—

> Debilis, ignarus, male conscius, irregularis,
> Quem mala plebs odit, dans scandala, cedere possit.

The lawful causes, therefore, are physical infirmity; ignorance, or a want of the knowledge necessary for the discharge of his office; the consciousness of some crime, such as heresy, which, even after penance done, would impede him in the performance of his duties; irregularity (see that article); great personal unpopularity, and some grave scandal, which nothing short of his resignation could remove. (Ferraris, *Resignatio*; Taunton.)

[1] Ferraris. [2] Ferraris, "Resignatio," § 29.

RESPONSORY. Verses said after the Lessons, so called according to Isidore because part of it is said by one reader or singer to whom the choir answer with the rest of the responsory. "Historia" is the name given in the Micrologia, because they mostly refer to the history in the Lesson or commemorated on the day. (Probst, "Brevier und Breviergebet," p. 107 *seq.*; Batiffol, "Hist. du Brév." p. 93 *sqq.*; Baümer-Biron, i. 172.)

RESTITUTION. The principle, "Do wrong to no man," implies that if we have done another any injury we are bound to make good the loss. Thus, if we have converted another's property to our own use, we must give it back to him; if we have destroyed anything that is his, even without benefiting by the action, we must hand over to him an equivalent at our own cost. We are also bound to indemnify him for any inconvenience that he may have suffered by being deprived of his property. Restitution applies, as far as the case admits, to any injury to another's life or limb, wife, goods, or good name (V., VI., VII., and VIII. commandments), and is binding under pain of mortal sin where the matter is serious. Absolution may be given before restitution is actually made, provided that the penitent has the intention of restoring as soon as possible. If the intention is not carried out, the penitent grievously sins. It should be noted that they who co-operate in causing injury are bound to make restitution. The exact details of this branch of the subject cannot here be entered into. Restitution is not necessary where the injurer cannot make good the loss, or where he may prudently judge that the injured party does not require him to do so, or where an equivalent compensation has been made. Thus, Crolly holds that a bankrupt who has passed his examination, at least in England, is not afterwards bound to pay his liabilities. Lehmkuhl accepts this opinion only with hesitation and with some qualification. (See the last named writer's "Theol. Moralis," i. 579 *sqq.*) But Slater, "Moral Theol." i. p. 438, 451, quite confidently maintains that the bankrupt is not bound.

RESURRECTION OF THE BODY. The doctrine of a general resurrection of the dead, both good and bad, is nowhere taught in the Hebrew Bible. The Book of Isaias, xxvi. 19, certainly expresses faith in a resurrection. The prophet expresses the disappointment of the Jewish nation when their land was restored to them and they were not numerous enough to people it. But they must not lose heart. "Thy dead shall live: thy dead bodies shall arise. Awake and shout, ye who lie in the dust, for thy dew is a dew of lights, and the earth shall bring forth the the shades"—*i.e.* the power of God shall descend like dew, instinct with the light of

life; the corpses shall arise, and the departed spirits from the nether world will quicken them into their old life. We have in Osee (Hosea) vi. 2 ("He will quicken us after two days: on the third day He will raise us up and we shall live in His sight"), and in Ezech. xxxvii. 11–14 allusions to a resurrection, but only in an allegorical sense. In Daniel xii. 2, as in Isa. xxvi. 19, it is a literal and not a metaphorical resurrection which is intended, and the writer, who has the verse of Isaias in his mind, goes further, and teaches a resurrection to shame as well as to joy. "Many of them that sleep in the dusty earth shall awake, some to eternal life and some to eternal reproach and horror." The character of the book makes it likely that the "many" who are to rise are all Israelites, some of whom have been faithful to the law, others apostates; but in any case it is a resurrection of many, not of all, which is predicted. We have still to consider the famous passage in Job xix. 27. We venture to give the following as an exact translation of the Hebrew:—"I know that my avenger liveth, and at the last [lit. as the last one—*i.e.* to speak the last decisive word] he shall rise up on the dust. And after my skin has been thus destroyed [lit. which they have thus destroyed] and [away] from my flesh I shall see God, whom I shall behold for myself, and mine eyes shall have seen [a preterite of confidence] and not another: my reins waste [with longing] in my breast." There are very strong grounds for believing that Job here asserts his expectation of immortality, and this interpretation is held by critics, such as Ewald and Dillmann, who cannot be suspected of dogmatic prejudice. The confident hope of immortality shines forth clearly, just when Job's desolation, when the absence of all human comfort is most complete. The poem leads us up naturally to this expression of confidence. There is a gradual advance from the doubts of ch. xiv. to the sublime prayer and trust of xvi. 18 *ad fin.* All this culminates in the passage before us; nor does Job fall back again to the depth of his former despair. But, on the other hand, "from my flesh" may quite well, according to Hebrew usage, mean "away from my flesh." This use of the particle is very common in Hebrew (see, *e.g.*, Gen. xxvii. 29, Jer. xlviii. 45), and a striking instance of the double sense of "from" in English will be found in "Richard III." act iv. scene 4.[1] In Second Maccabees we find the doctrine of the resurrection strongly asserted, but even there nothing is said about a resurrection of all men. And although the resurrection of the dead (תְּחִיַּת הַמֵּתִים) is the thirteenth article of the Jewish creed, the doctrine of a resurrection of both good and bad, says Weber ("Altsynag. Theol." p. 372), cannot be proved from the Talmud or Midrashim; and he quotes the dictum of Maimonides, "The resurrection of the dead is a fundamental article of Moses our teacher . . . but it only belongs to the just." Heathen, or Jews who are to be reckoned as heathen, have no part in it. We may add that David Kimchi on Ps. i. 5 ("the wicked shall not rise in judgment") denies the resurrection of the wicked, and on Ps. civ. 30 he says "it is disputed among our sages" whether the resurrection will be general; but adds that the "ways" or style of the Talmud favours the belief that it is the just only who will rise. This doctrine of the most orthodox Jewish doctors is by no means to be confounded with the Sadducee denial that the bodies of just or unjust rose again.

The New Testament, however, clearly teaches that the wicked also will rise again (*e.g.* Mt. v. 29, x. 28). In it the resurrection of the just assumes a new prominence, and the "resurrection of the flesh" became an article of the Apostles' Creed, and one of the most characteristic[1] doctrines of Christianity. St. Paul insists that as death came by sin (Rom. v. 15), so Christ completes His redeeming work by raising to new life the bodies of those who sleep in Him (1 Cor. xv. 54 *seq.*). From the very first the doctrine was an object of Pagan ridicule (Acts xvii. 32), and the Fathers down to the end of the fourth century were constantly employed in answering Pagan and heretical objections. (See, *e.g.*, Athenag. "De Resurrect." c. 4; Iren. "Adv. Haer." v. 3, PG, vii. 1129; Tertull. "Apol." 48; PL, i. 520; "De Carne Christi," 15, PL, ii. 779; "De Resurrect." 3, PL, ii. 798; Minuc. Felix, 11; Cyril Hieros. "Cat." xviii., PG, xxxiii. 1017; August. "Enchirid." 84, PL, xl. 272.) We cannot wonder at the objections which Pagans and heretics such as the Gnostics felt. Plato, the noblest of heathen philosophers, had regarded the body as the prison-house of the soul, and death as an escape from the bonds of matter. It was long before the world could accept the deeper view of the Christian Church—viz. that the body is a constituent part of human nature; that man, body and soul, is the work of God, and that both are precious in his sight. The Christians, on the other hand, during times of persecution comforted themselves with the thought of the resurrection. The symbols of it—*e.g.* the tree, the eagle, the egg, the peacock—occur on the oldest monuments;

[1] *K. Rich.* Then know that from my soul I love thy daughter.

What do you think?

Q. *Eliz.* That thou dost love my daughter from thy soul:

So from thy soul's love didst thou love her brothers;
And from my heart's love I do thank thee for it.

K. Rich. Be not so hasty to confound my meaning.

[1] The Babylonians, however, and the Persians had believed in a resurrection. The former ascribed it to the god Marduk, who himself died and rose again.

and so also the types of the resurrection—the three youths in the furnace, Job, Ezechiel, Daniel in the lions' den, the ascent of Elias, &c. (See Kraus, "Real-Encyclop." art. *Auferstehung.*)

All the Creeds confess the resurrection of the body, but the fullest definition is that of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 (cap. i. "Adv. Albig."): "All will rise with their own proper bodies which they now bear." St. Thomas ("Supp." q. 79 a. 2) says it is heretical to deny the numerical identity of the body which dies and rises again; and the opinion attributed to Durandus (see Jungmann, "De Noviss." cap. iii. a. 2), viz. that the body will be the same in this sense only, that it will be informed by the same soul, does not seem to satisfy the terms of the Lateran definition. But this identity must not be pressed too strictly. Our bodies remain the same, though the atoms of which they are composed are in constant change. Jungmann (*loc. cit.*) lays it down as the common teaching of all Catholic theologians that we may suppose part of the elements of the risen body to be supplied by the power of God without in any way denying the truth of the resurrection. He admits that modern writers "of the best reputation" mention (and apparently hold) opinions which go much further than this.

We learn from St. Paul that the bodies of the just will rise incorruptible, glorious, and spiritual—*i.e.* subject no longer to animal wants, but entirely dominated by the spirit (so Estius, ad 1 Cor. xv. 44). The Schoolmen have expanded this Pauline doctrine into the theory that the risen body will have four gifts or endowments: impassibility; *claritas* or splendour, the glory of the soul shining forth in the body; subtlety, *i.e.* the power of penetrating other bodies, as Christ passed through the closed doors; agility, *i.e.* the power of moving and acting swiftly at the will of the spirit. (The subject is dealt with by the dogmatic theologians in their treatise "De Novissimis," *e.g.* Billot, Jungmann, Atzberger "Die Christliche Eschatologie"; Oxenham, "Catholic Eschatology"; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." ii. 535 *sqq.*).

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. This greatest of Christ's miracles and strongest proof of His Divinity is the object of persistent attacks on the part of unbelievers. Against them we show:

I. The historical truth of Christ's resurrection; viz. (1) His real death, and (2) His coming to life again.

(1) His death is attested unanimously by the four Evangelists: "He gave up the ghost" (Mt. xxvii. 50; Mk. xv. 37; Lk. xxiii. 46; Jn. xix. 30). Pilate asked the Roman centurion in command at the crucifixion if Christ was already dead, and only when he had understood it from the centurion he gave the body to Joseph of Arimathea (Mk. xv. 43–45). Other witnesses are the soldiers who broke the legs of the two thieves crucified with Jesus, but did not break His legs because they "saw that he was already dead" (Jn. xix. 32, 33). All doubt as to His death is removed through the opening of His side by a spear, which would have killed Him had He not been dead already. According to Roman law, the relatives of the condemned were entitled to take possession of His body and to bury it, yet not before death had been made certain by a thrust of the spear. The thrust left behind a large open wound into which Thomas was able to introduce his hand. Again, the water and blood that flowed from the side are a sure sign of death. The observations of older doctors testify that water gathers in the pericardium of those who die after a long and painful agony. The thrust of the spear was given soon after death and before the blood had coagulated, as appears from the great number of things which took place between that moment and the evening of the same day, before the Sabbath commenced. If death had only been apparent, the handling of the body in removing it from the cross would certainly have restored life; not to mention that His Mother, Mary Magdalen, and Joseph of Arimathea would not have performed the rites of the burial if they had not been convinced of His death. Nay, these very ceremonies, especially the wrapping up in linen, would have been sufficient to extinguish the last gleam of life if any remained. Again, the hatred of the Pharisees and Scribes is a guarantee that they did not leave the place of execution before being sure of the death of their victim. They never contended that His death was only apparent in order to disprove His resurrection. Modern rationalists were the first to put forward the theory of Christ's merely apparent death. They founded it on Pilate's astonishment at the Saviour's early death, and on the fact that men have been known to live two or more days on the cross. In the case of Christ, however, death was accelerated by His previous sufferings, spiritual and corporal; although it may be permitted to attribute death to an act of His free will.

(2) Not less certain than Christ's death is His coming to life again. The Evangelists with one voice declare that Christ rose from the dead, and that an angel announced His resurrection to the women who had gone to the sepulchre (Mt. xxviii. 1–7; Mk. xvi. 1–8; Lk. xxiv. 1–8; Jn. xx. 1 *seq.*). After His resurrection Christ appeared to many and gave them tangible proofs of His being alive. He appeared to Mary Magdalen and to the women who came to the sepulchre (Mt. xxviii. 9–10; Mk. xvi. 9; Jn. xx. 14–17); to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, who recognized Him by the breaking of

the bread (Lk. xxiv. 13 *seq.*); to Simon Peter (Lk. xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5); to the Apostles gathered together in the absence of Thomas, to whom He showed His hands and His feet, whom He allowed to touch Him and to whom He gave the power of forgiving sins (Lk. xxiv. 36–43; Jn. xx. 19–24; Mk. xvi. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 5); eight days later to the Apostles when Thomas was with them (Jn. xx 26–29); repeatedly in Galilee, especially to seven disciples fishing on the Sea of Tiberias (Jn. xxi. 1 *seq.*), and to more than five hundred brethren on a mountain in Galilee, many of whom were still alive when St. Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 6; Mt. xxviii. 16–20; Mk. xvi. 15–18; Lk. xxiv. 44–49); to James (1 Cor. xv. 7); lastly, to the Apostles before His ascension into heaven (Mk. xvi. 19; Lk. xxiv. 50; Acts i. 6–10; 1 Cor. xv. 7). Strauss and Renan treat these many witnesses as visionaries. "The Apostles," they say, "were at first bewildered and confused by the death of Christ. Yet they were unable to shake off their belief in Jesus as the expected Messiah. Hence, in Galilee, where everything reminded them of the Master, they sought to conciliate their belief 'that Christ abideth for ever' (Jn. xii. 34) and the prophecies of the Old Testament (*e.g.* Isaias lxiii. and Psalm xv.) with the events they had witnessed, and thus gradually they evolved the idea of His resurrection from the dead. Their enthusiasm, and the excited imagination of women, created imaginary visions of the departed, which tradition transformed into real apparitions." But such an hypothesis is incredible on the face of it. The Apostles and other disciples, who during Christ's lifetime were often rebuked for their incredulity, were not the men to persuade themselves that Christ had risen from the grave, had appeared to and been touched by them, had taken meals with them, and communicated to them things of the utmost importance which they faithfully relate. The Gospel narrative, on the other hand, bears upon it the stamp of consistency and truth. After, as before, the resurrection, the Apostles remained slow in believing. The words of the women seemed to them as an idle tale, and they did not believe them (Lk. xxiv. 11; Mk. xvi. 11, 13); they were rebuked for their incredulity by the risen Christ Himself (Mk. xvi. 14; Lk. xxiv. 25); even when Christ stood in their presence and said to them "Peace be to you; it is I, fear not," they were troubled and affrighted and supposed they saw a spirit. To convince them, He showed them His hands and His feet; they saw and felt, yet they believed not until He had eaten before them a piece of broiled fish and a honeycomb (Lk. xxiv. 36–43). Still more unbelieving than the rest was Thomas, who was not with the Apostles when Jesus appeared to them. When they said to him "We have seen the Lord," he answered "Unless I shall see in His hands the prints of the nails, and put my finger in the place of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe" (Jn. xx. 25 *seq.*). After eight days, the Lord again appeared and invited Thomas to put his hands in the wounds, and only then the Apostle exclaimed: "My Lord and my God!" The slowness of belief in Thomas, as St. Gregory observes, has been more useful to us than the faith of the other Apostles, for by putting his hands into the wounds of the Lord the doubting disciple has cured the wounds of our incredulity. The above facts entirely upset all rationalistic theories attributing the Apostles' preaching on the resurrection of Christ to preconceived ideas or to an over-excited imagination. The multiplicity and incontrovertible evidence of the proofs of the resurrection are evidenced by the enthusiasm and unflinching constancy with which the Apostles published it everywhere and appealed to it as the best proof of the divinity of their teaching. St. Peter commences his public preaching by proclaiming the fact of the resurrection to the Jews who had crucified Christ (Acts ii. 22 *seq.*); he insists upon it in presence of the authorities and of the people, and no threat deters him (Acts iii. 15, 26; iv. 10, 33; v. 30; x. 40 *seq.*). In his first epistle he again appeals to the resurrection (1 Pet. i. 3, 21). St. Paul likewise bears frequent witness to the resurrection of Christ; in Antioch of Pisidia and at Thessalonica (Acts xiii. 30 *seq.*; xvii. 3); at Athens in the midst of the Areopagus (Acts xvii. 31), and very often in his epistles (*e.g.* Rom. iv. 25; viii. 34; xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 13, &c.). He lays special stress on it in his first epistle to the Corinthians, where he makes the certitude of our faith entirely dependent on the certitude of the resurrection. "With great power did the Apostles give testimony of the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord" (Acts iv. 33); they liked to call themselves witnesses of His resurrection, and they confirmed their testimony by dying to maintain its truth. God corroborated the testimony of the Apostles through miracles wrought in the name of the risen Lord (Acts iii. 15 *seq.*; iv. 10). Nobody contradicted the Apostles when they preached the resurrection to the people of Jerusalem who had seen the crucifixion. On the contrary, 3000 conversions were made by the first sermon of St. Peter, and more on other occasions (Acts ii. 41; iv. 4). Many priests were among the converts (Acts vi. 7). The conduct of Christ's enemies affords another confirmation of His resurrection. They had sealed the tomb and placed guards round it. When the guards told them that an angel had removed the stone and that the

grave was empty, "They gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying 'Say you that His disciples came by night and stole Him away when we were asleep'" (Mt. xxviii. 12, 13). Only perfect helplessness could suggest such an explanation. Why did they not punish the soldiers who failed to do their duty? How could they appeal to sleeping witnesses? Why not exact a judicial inquiry? Why not accuse the Apostles of breaking the seal attached by lawful authority? They did nothing of all this, although the Apostles publicly reproached them with the murder of Jesus, and found credence among the people. All they did was to forbid the Apostles to teach in the name of Jesus (Acts iv. 18; v. 40). Thus the conduct of the Jews shows that they did not believe in their own assertion, which, moreover, is intrinsically impossible. The Gospels characterize the Apostles as simple and honest men, quite unable to perform the feat of stealing Christ's body. Then, what could have induced them to act thus dishonestly? If Christ did not rise, His whole undertaking was at an end; they had nothing more to expect from the man who had so utterly deceived them. God also would punish them for giving testimony against Him (1 Cor. xv. 15). The world offered no other reward to their dishonest schemes than the hatred, scorn, and persecution which it had bestowed on their Master. With such prospects nobody practises deceit. Moreover, any scheme of stealing the body was doomed to fail. The Roman soldiers who guarded the sepulchre were not likely to be all sleeping; and granted that they were, the removal of a heavy stone and the carrying off of the corpse would have disturbed their sleep. Among the many whom it was necessary to let into the secret, how is it that none betrayed them? Remorse, fear, hope of reward, unguardedness of speech, would certainly have led one or more of the conspirators into divulging the conspiracy. The modern opponents of Christianity have abandoned the Jewish theory as indefensible; they substitute for it the theories of visions and fancies dealt with above. The common ground of all objections to the resurrection of Christ is disbelief in miracles generally, and rejection *à priori* of the historical value of all books that admit miracles. Certain contradictions in the Gospel narratives are also adduced as objections against the resurrection. But these contradictions are only apparent, and rather confirm than weaken the authority of the narratives. The writers constantly keep in view the main point, on which they all agree; the fact that they differ on minor and unimportant details merely proves that they wrote independently of one another. A very ancient objection—Celsus raised it long ago—is the question why Christ did not appear to His enemies. To this we may reply that Christ's enemies were among the first to receive certain news of His resurrection through the guards who had witnessed it. Such testimony would have been sufficient if their hearts had not been hardened. But as, formerly, they had attributed Christ's miracles to the influence of the devil (Mt. xii. 24); as they had been prepared to kill Lazarus, raised from the dead (Jn. xii. 10), rather than acknowledge the miracle, so now they remained unmoved by the miracles which accompanied the death of Christ, or which were wrought by the Apostles. An apparition of Christ to them would have increased their guiltiness rather than have brought about their conversion (cf. Lk. xvi. 31).

II. *The resurrection as proof of the divinity of Christ's teaching.*—Christ often foretold His resurrection, and declared that He would rise by His own power. "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again" (Jn. x. 18). "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn. ii. 19). When the Pharisees would see a sign of Him, He answered: "A sign shall not be given, but the sign of Jonas the prophet," &c. (Mt. xii. 39, 40), thus holding out His resurrection as a proof in itself sufficient of His Divine mission. And often, when foretelling His passion and death, He added, "and the third day He [the Son of Man] shall rise again" (Mt. xvi. 21; xx. 19; cf. xvii. 9). Hence the resurrection of Christ is at the same time a miracle and a prophecy, and affords a double proof of the divinity of His mission and of His whole teaching. It is a miracle wrought by His own power, and therefore the strongest proof of His oft-asserted Divinity. It is the greatest of all miracles ever wrought, because, more than any other, it transcends the power of created causes. Hence it is a fit crowning and sealing of Christ's other miracles, and for this reason St. Paul has no hesitation in making all Christian truth dependent on the truth of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 14–20). Hence, also, the other Apostles always bring to the front the fact of the resurrection to make their doctrines acceptable to Jews and Gentiles, although with cultured Gentiles they might have succeeded better by simply holding out to them the beauty and reasonableness of Christian teaching. The world accepted the testimony of the Apostles; the foundation, progress, continuance of the Church are a great fact which in its turn bears out the truth of the resurrection. For the world to believe the Apostles without any miracles would be in itself a greater miracle than any attributed to them.

It may be well to point out that the Modernist views on the Resurrection were condemned in the 36th and 37th propositions of the decree "Lamentabili": "The Resur-

rection of our Saviour is not properly a fact of the historical order, but a fact of the purely supernatural order neither proved nor provable, which Christian consciousness has little by little inferred from other facts"; "The faith in the Resurrection of Christ pointed at the beginning not so much to the fact of the Resurrection as to the immortal life of Christ with God." (A dogma so fundamental as the Resurrection is treated of by all the commentators on the Gospels and also by all the dogmatic theologians and apologists. It will be sufficient to mention here a few works having reference to recent controversies: *e.g.* Mangenot, in "Revue Pratique d'Apologétique" (1908–9); Ladeuze, "La Résurrection du Christ devant la Critique Contemporaine"; Dentler, "Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi nach den Berichten des N.T." in "Biblische Zeitfragen," I. Münster, 1908; Westcott, "The Gospel of the Resurrection.")

RETREAT. [See EXERCISES.]

REVELATION. [See INSPIRATION; PRIVATE REVELATION.]

RIDDELL (*rideau*). A curtain for the ornament of the altar.

RIGORISM. [See MORAL THEOLOGY.]

RING. The use of rings as ornaments for the fingers goes back to remote antiquity. Though not mentioned in Homer they are spoken of in Gen. xli. 42, and elsewhere in the O.T. Everyone is familiar with the story of Mago flinging down a bushel of gold rings before the Carthaginian Senate, adding that "none but knights, and only the chief of these, were entitled to wear them" (Livy, xxiii. 12). While the ring of gold was a mark of distinction, the ring of iron was a sign of ignominy. St. Isidore of Seville says: "Among the Romans neither slaves nor freed-men wear gold rings in public; only the free-born do this. Freed-men wear a silver ring, slaves an iron one, though persons of the highest rank also wear an iron ring" ("Etym." xix. 32, PL, lxxxii. 701). Rings were also used as seals, and were sometimes worn on the finger for safe custody. The only rings which concern us here are those worn by (1) bishops; (2) abbots and abbesses; (3) nuns; (4) the wedding ring; (5) the "ring of the Fisherman."

(1) The priests of Jupiter at Rome enjoyed senatorial honours, and among these the right to wear a gold ring. This custom may have influenced the Christian bishops to adopt the same mark of honour. We do not meet, however, with any mention of it until, early in the seventh century, Boniface IV., in the third council of Rome (610), speaks of the elevation of monks to the episcopal dignity: "De monachis annulo pontificali subarrhatis." This, and similar other references, show that the use of the pontifical ring was already a well-known custom. St. Isidore says: "Huic (episcopo) autem dum consecratur . . . datur et annulus, propter signum pontificalis honoris vel signaculum secretorum" (De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, ii. 5, 12, PL, lxxxiii. 783–4). In the Pontifical of Egbert we find the formula: "Accipe annulum pontificalis honoris, ut sis fidei integritate munitus" (Martène, ii. p. 342). According to the present Roman Pontifical, the ring is blessed by the consecrating bishop and placed upon the third finger of the right hand of the new bishop. The mystical meaning of the bishop's ring is his union with the church to which he has been appointed: "Episcopus debet habere annulum quia sponsus est" ("Speculum Eccles." ap. Martène, ii. 559). Innocent III. and Calixtus III. both dwell upon this.

(2) No early mention is made of the ring as one of the insignia of abbots. But it was to be expected that they would in time obtain this also among other privileges of bishops. Certain abbeys received from the Holy See the exceptional right for their abbots to wear *pontificalia*. It was only in the Middle Ages that this privilege became common. In the present pontifical the blessing is the same as that of a bishop's ring. It is not easy to trace the history of the abbess's ring. For a long time the ring given in religious profession was the only one worn by an abbess, but with the growing custom of assimilating the privileges of abbots and abbesses, a special ring came to be bestowed at the blessing of an abbess. There is no mention of it in the Pontifical.

(3) The wearing of a ring by virgins consecrated to God is a sign of their mystical marriage with Christ. The analogy with the ordinary wedding ring is so obvious that the practice must have been introduced in early Christian times. St. Ambrose alludes to it in his sermon on St. Agnes ("Serm." xlviii., PL, xvii. 701, 735). Nevertheless, the ancient pontificals do not mention it in the rite of consecration of virgins. It is only in the Middle Ages that we find it. According to the present Pontifical the bishop blesses the ring and places it upon the third finger of the nun's right hand, saying "I espouse thee to Jesus Christ," &c.

(4) Plautus ("Miles Gloriosus," iv. 1, 11) speaks of the custom of giving a ring as a sign of betrothal. Originally it was of iron, but during the second century a gold ring was given (Tertullian, "Apol." vi. PL, i. 302). The history of the transition from the betrothal ring of the ancients to the wedding ring blessed by the priest at the marriage ceremony is very obscure.

(5) "The ring of the Fisherman (St. Peter)" is not mentioned until 1265 during the pontificate of Clement IV. It is the private seal of the Popes, used in Papal briefs.

(Mainly from Leclercq in DACL, *Anneaux*;

Thurston, in "Cath. Enc."; Babington, in "Dict. Chr. Antiq.")

RITES. A Christian rite is the manner of conducting the services for the worship of God and the sanctification of man. It is sometimes confused with liturgy; but it is better to keep the latter for the Eucharistic sacrifice, the Mass. Again, it is sometimes used for a particular ceremony, *e.g.*, the rite of burial, the rite of consecrating a church, &c. Here we use it as meaning the whole collection of Christian services.

The Church is one in doctrine and one in the essential parts of her services. Nevertheless, she allows, and indeed encourages, varieties in the mode of conducting her services, adapted to the varying circumstances of time, place, temperament, history, &c. Thus washing and the recital of words indicating the character of the washing are of the essence of baptism; but the washing may be by immersion, effusion, or aspersion, and by a single or by triple washing; and the words may be "I baptize thee," &c., or "The servant of God is baptized," &c. Wheaten bread must be used in the Holy Eucharist; but it may be leavened or unleavened. And so with other ceremonies of the Church. "Leo XIII., in his Encyclical 'Praeclara' (June 20, 1894), expressed the traditional attitude of the papacy when he wrote of his reverence for the venerable rites of the Eastern Churches and assured the schismatics, whom he invited to reunion, that there was no jealousy of these things at Rome; that for all Eastern customs 'we shall provide without narrowness'" (Fortescue). To show how great is the latitude of the Church, we may mention that the Mass is said in no less than nine different languages; viz. Latin, Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic, Slavonic, Georgian, and Rumanian. (See LITURGIES; the different rites are described in separate articles, *e.g.* BYZANTINE RITE &c.; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc."; Cabrol, "Introduction aux Études Liturgiques," extensive bibliography.)

RITES, CONGREGATION OF. This Congregation was instituted by Sixtus V. in his Constitution "Immensa" (Jan. 22, 1588). The Council of Trent (sess. xxv.) had ordered that the bishops and metropolitans should watch with anxious care all that was done respecting the invocation of saints and the use of images and relics, and sanction no novelties without consulting the Roman Pontiff. Moreover, it defined, with special reference to the Mass, that the Church has instituted certain rites and ceremonies, "such as mystical benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of the like nature, in accordance with Apostolic tradition, so that both the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be recommended, and the minds of the faithful aroused by these visible signs of religion and piety to the contemplation of those deep and high things which are hidden in this sacrifice" (sess. xxii. c. 5). The object of the Congregation is to promote a general uniformity (which is consistent, however, with the permission of innumerable differences of detail, according to the customs and traditions of different nations) in the externals of divine worship, since by this uniformity the unity of the faith is mirrored and more easily retained. With regard to all such matters, the Congregation is ordinary, and is assisted only by Consultors, among whom are the Papal Sacrist and the Master of the Sacred Palace; with regard to the beatification and canonization of saints it is extraordinary, and is assisted by a Promotor Fidei, three auditors of the Rota, theologians, medical men, professors, &c. (See CANONIZATION; Benedict XIV. "De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione"; "Decreta Authentica Congr. Sacrorum Rituum.")

RITUALE. A book which contains the forms to be observed by priests in the administration of the sacraments (communion out of Mass, baptism, &c.), in churchings, in burials, in most of the blessings which they can give by ordinary or delegated authority. Such a book (under the title "Manuale") is mentioned in the year 1279 in the synodal statutes of Odo, Bishop of Paris. It was known by many names—"Manuale," "Sacerdotale," "Agenda," "Institutio Baptizandi," "Pastorale," "Obsequiale," "Sacramentale," &c. "Manuale" seems to have been the common name in England ("Rituale" and "Manuale" in France), and the last edition of the "Sarum Manual" was printed at Douay in 1610. The contents of these books agree on the whole, but not in all details; some, for example, contain the order of confirmation, the blessing of bells, a few Masses, and the like, which are not in our Roman Ritual. A Sacerdotale was edited by Castellanus and printed at Rome in 1537. Previously the different dioceses were free to follow their own Rituals, but in 1614 an edition with the title "Rituale" was drawn up under Paul V., who in the bull "Apostolicae Sedi" exhorted all prelates, secular and regular, to conform to it exactly.[1]

(From Zaccaria, "Bibliothec. Rit." tom. i. There is an edition of the Roman Ritual, with an elaborate commentary by Baruffaldius, 3rd Venetian ed., 1763, which is useful for practical purposes, but gives hardly any historical information. The commentary of Catalani is also well known. Zaccaria also mentions one in Italian by Mariscandolo, Lucca, 1742.)

ROBBER SYNOD. [See LATROCINIUM.]

ROCHET. A vestment of linen, fitting closely, with sleeves reaching to the hands,

[1] The bull says "hortamur" merely; but the Cong. of Rites declared (Sept. 7, 1850) that the laws of the Roman Ritual "affect the universal Church," and (October 5, 1652) that all regulars "were bound" to follow it exactly.

proper to bishops and abbots. The use of it is also granted to certain other dignitaries (*e.g.* to some canons in virtue of privilege). The length and closeness of the sleeves distinguish it from the surplice. Priests who are allowed to wear it are to regard it as a choir vestment, and are not to use it in the administration of the sacraments. Bishops, on the other hand, wear it in giving confirmation.

Our word rochet is from the French, the French from the Low Latin *rochettus*, and that again from the old High German *hroch*, *rocch*, which is the same as the modern High German *Rock*, a coat. (So Littré, "Dict. Franc.") From the instances given in Ducange it appears to have been first an upper garment of common life, then a clerical dress. Lyndwood, our great English canonist of the fifteenth century ("Provinciale Eccles. Cant." lib. iii. tit. 27, quoted by Ducange) speaks of it as sometimes used by clerics serving Mass, or priests baptizing, because it left their arms free, usages now strictly forbidden (see "Manuale Decret." art. v.). so that the modern limitation of the rochet to dignitaries recognized by Urban VIII. cannot have been old in that Pope's time.

The mozzetta and uncovered rochet are signs of plenary jurisdiction. Hence, a bishop may wear his rochet uncovered within his own diocese even in the churches of religious who are exempt, but not beyond its limits (Gavant. P. II. tit. iii.; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 125 *sqq.*; Rock, ii. 14–16).

ROGATION DAYS. The Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Ascension Day are observed by all Catholics of the Latin rite as days of solemn supplication, and are called Rogation days because the Litany of the Saints is chanted in the procession which takes place on each of the three days, *rogatio* being the Latin equivalent for the Greek word litany. Those who are bound to recite the breviary are also bound to say the litany privately, if not in procession. These litanies are called lesser, by comparison with the more ancient and solemn chanting of the litany on St. Mark's Day. [LITANIES.]

The Rogations began in the kingdom of Burgundy, where they were instituted, or at least made solemn and public, by Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, at a time when the province suffered from earthquake and other troubles (Sidon. Apollinar. Ep. vii. 1). Thence they passed into the kingdom of Clovis, where the Council of Orleans (c. 27), in 511, requires the faithful to rest from servile work and to fast, or, as Thomassin thinks, to abstain, on these days.[1] In England the synod of Cloveshoe in 747 prescribes processions and fasting till None on the three days before Ascension, "according to the way of our fathers." A Spanish council (Concil. Gerund. can. 2) in 517 recognizes Rogations with abstinence, but on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday after Pentecost. The ancient custom at Milan, enforced by St. Charles Borromeo, was to hold the Rogations and to fast on the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday after the Ascension. At Rome, according to Anastasius the Librarian, it was Leo III. who introduced the Rogation days. But the obligation of fasting and rest from work which still existed in the French church[1] of Thomassin's time was not imposed at Rome. (From Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," 1 P. ch. 24, 2 P. ch. 21; Rock, iii. 181; Duchesne, "Christian Worship," p. 288.

ROMAN COLLEGE. Founded by St. Ignatius in 1551. At first only the ordinary school subjects (humanities) were taught, but soon afterwards philosophy and theology were added. Gregory XIII., the great patron of ecclesiastical studies, caused the present magnificent structure to be built and richly endowed. He raised the two above-named faculties to the dignity of a university bearing his name (*Universitas Gregoriana*), and gave it the right of conferring degrees. The college was entirely in the hands of the Jesuits, but students attended from many of the other colleges, notably those founded by Gregory XIII., and also from the city. After the suppression of the Society (1773), it was continued by the secular clergy until the year 1824, when Leo XII. restored it to its original owners. The Piedmontese took possession of the building soon after their invasion of Rome in 1870, but the philosophical and theological faculties are still flourishing under another roof. When the whole curriculum was taught the students numbered from 1500 to 2000; they are now more than 1000.

We have not space to give a list of the distinguished personages who have taught or studied at the Roman College. The names of St. Aloysius, St. John Berchmans, St. Camillus of Lellis, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, and St. John Baptist de Rossi will occur to everyone. It can boast of having educated eleven popes, including his present holiness Benedict XV. Among the professors in times past were Toletus, Bellarmine, Cornelius à Lapide, Suarez, De Lugo, Pallavicini, and Segneri; and, in our own day, Passaglia, Perrone, Tongiorgi, Patrizi, Tarquini, Ballerini, Franzelin, Kleutgen, Palmieri, and Billot. As early as the end of the sixteenth century an observatory was established in connection with the college, and has produced the famous astronomers Scheiner, Boscovich, and Secchi. The

[1] The Council of Tours in 567 (can. 17) requires monks to fast on the Rogation days.

[1] English Catholics were bound to abstain from flesh-meat on the feast of St. Mark and the Rogation days, till they were dispensed by Pius VIII. in 1830 (*Conc. Prov. West. III.* Appendix II.).

museum, called after Kircher, its most energetic curator, contains many objects of interest. It was seized, together with the valuable library (63,000 books, 2000 MSS.), by the Piedmontese. (Grisar in "Kirchenlexicon.")

ROMAN CONGREGATIONS. [See CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN.]

ROME. [See POPE.]

ROOD-BEAM AND ROOD SCREEN. (Anglo-Saxon *rod*, a pole, a gallows, and so a cross.) The rood-beam separates the choir from the nave, and is surmounted by a cross. There is no proof that any such thing was known in the early Church (see the article "Rood" in Smith and Cheetham), but it is common in modern churches, and was introduced as early at least as the twelfth century. Other figures besides the crucifix were often placed on it (*e.g.* those of the Blessed Virgin and St. John), and lights were burnt on it. Ducange quotes a mediaeval writer who mentions fifty candles being placed on the tables or rood-beam. A veil used to be suspended from it during Holy Week. (Ducange, art. *Trabes*; Viollet-le-Duc, "Dict. de l'Architecture," art. *Trabes*.)

Screens separating choir from nave were introduced in French cathedrals towards the close of the thirteenth century, and the richest examples date from the fifteenth and sixteenth. It was not till the seventeenth and eighteenth that the heavy stone screens were replaced by grilles. (Viollet-le-Duc, art. *Clôtures*; Pugin, "Treatise on Chancel Screens and Roodlofts.")

ROSARY. A form of prayer in which fifteen decades of Aves, each decade being preceded by a Pater and followed by a Gloria, are recited on beads. A mystery is contemplated during the recital of each decade, and the rosary is divided into three parts, each consisting of five decades, and known as a corona or chaplet. In the first chaplet the five joyful mysteries are the subjects of contemplation—viz. the Annunciation, Visitation, the Birth of our Lord, His Presentation in the Temple, His being found after the three days' loss. The sorrowful mysteries contemplated in the second chaplet are the Agony in the Garden, the Scourging, the Crowning with Thorns, the Carrying of the Cross, the Crucifixion. The glorious mysteries, which are allotted to the third chaplet, are the Resurrection of Christ, His Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Ghost, the Assumption and the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin. The word rosary first occurs in Thomas Cantipratanus, who wrote in the latter part of the thirteenth century ("De Apibus," ii. 13 [1]—quoted by the Bollandists, "Vita S. Dominici"). The original meaning is very doubtful. We think it most likely that the word was used in a mystical sense and meant Mary's rose-garden. (So the writer of the article *Rosenkranz* in Herzog, "Encycl. für protestant. Theol.") It was also called "Psalterium Marianum" because of the number 150. Catholics of the humbler class still speak of a pair of beads, thus preserving a pure and ancient mode of speech, "pair" meaning "set," as in "pair of organs"—*i.e.* a set of organ pipes, or, in other words, an organ.

The practice of using beads, &c., as a help to memory in reciting a set number of prayers is not distinctively Christian, but it has long existed in the Church. Palladius, a writer of the fifth century ("Hist. Lausiac." cap. 23), tells us that the Egyptian monk Paul in Pherme put 300 pebbles in his lap and flung away one as he finished each of the three hundred prayers he said. The English synod of Cealchythe (Mansi, "Concil." tom. xiv. 360) in 816 orders "septem beltidum Paternoster" to be sung for a deceased bishop. We can only guess at the meaning. But Spelman's conjecture that it means belts or circles of Paters is plausible. William of Malmesbury ("De Gest. Pont. Angl." iv. 4, quoted by the Bollandists, *loc. cit.*) says that Godiva, who founded a religious house at Coventry in 1040, left a circle of gems strung together—on which she used to tell her prayers—that it might be hung on a statue of the Blessed Virgin.

So far we have only considered the general question of reciting prayers on beads &c. From the eleventh century the Bollandists produce the following instances of a fixed number of Aves addressed to the Blessed Virgin. Herimannus, at the close of the century, mentions a person who recited sixty Aves daily. The monk Albert, who lived about 1005, said 150 every day; so did St. Agbert, who died in 1140.

Thus we find early traces of the use of something corresponding to beads, and we can trace the 150 Aves back farther than St. Dominic's time, but no instance presents itself of 150 Aves, much less of 150 Aves and 15 Paters, said on beads, before the lifetime of that saint. The notion that the Venerable Bede introduced the rosary is founded on an absurd etymology ("Bead," from "Beda") and the statement of Polydore Virgil, who lived in the middle of the sixteenth century, that Peter the Hermit instituted the rosary, comes too late to have any weight. The common story that St. Dominic learnt the use of the rosary from the Blessed Virgin by revelation, and propagated it during the crusade against the Albigenses, has been accepted by later Popes—viz. Leo X., Pius V., Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., Alexander VII., Innocent XI., Clement XI., and Leo XIII. This belief rests, according to Benedict XIV. ("De Fest." § 160), on the tradition of the order; no contemporary writer vouches for it. But the Dominican Friar Nicolas (Quétif

[1] As a title, however; not in the text.

and Echard, "Script. Ord. Praed." tom. i. p. 411) gave in 1270 to the Blessed Christina a Paternoster, "quod personaliter iv annis portaverat." Dominicans, too, are represented on a tomb of Humbertus Delphinus, who became a Dominican about 1350, with rosaries in their hands, so that the rosary in the strict sense cannot be much later than St. Dominic.

But, of course, the Ave of those days was not identical with the modern form. It was simply "Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." Further, the great Dominican writers Quétif and Echard show that the meditation on the mysteries is much later than St. Dominic. It began with a Dominican, Alanus de Rupe (De la Roche), born about 1428 ("Script. O. P." tom. i. p. 852). (See the Bollandist dissertation on the Rosary, in the first vol. for August; Quétif and Echard; Benedict XIV. "De Fest."; Thurston, in "Cath. Enc."; "Month," Oct. 1900, &c.; Walsh, "Irish Rosary," Dec. 1900, &c. For Feast of the Rosary, see MARY, FEASTS OF.)

According to Benedict XIV., a Confraternity of the Rosary at Piacenza was indulgenced as early as 1254 by Alexander IV. The Living Rosary, in which fifteen persons unite to say the whole rosary every month, was approved by Gregory XVI.

A popular manual by Labis, translated by an English Passionist, enumerates the following rosaries besides the Dominican—viz. that of St. Bridget, 7 Paters and 63 Aves, in honour of the joys and sorrows of the Blessed Virgin and the 63 years of her life; that of the Seven Dolours, a Servite devotion; that of the Immaculate Conception, approved by Pius IX. in 1855; the Crown of our Saviour, attributed to Michael of Florence, a Camaldolese monk, in 1516, and consisting of 33 Paters, 5 Aves, and a Credo; the Rosary of the Five Wounds, approved by Leo XII. in 1823 at the prayer of the Passionists.

ROSE, GOLDEN. [See GOLDEN ROSE.]

ROSMINIANS. That is, the Fathers of the Institute of Charity, a congregation founded by the Italian philosopher Antonio Rosmini in 1828. According to the design of the founder, the members of the new society were to "embrace with all the desire of their souls every work of charity, without arbitrary limitation to any particular branch, undertaking all that should be required of them of which they should be capable." [1] The first house of the institute was built on Monte Calvario, near Domo d'Ossola. In 1831 a branch of the society was established at Trent, and another at Verona two years later. In 1835, Fr. Gentili was sent by the founder on a mission to England. After a short stay with the Trelawny family in Cornwall, Gentili was settled by Bishop Baines in the college of Prior Park, near Bath; before long he began to preach missions with signal success in the large towns, and died at Dublin while thus engaged in 1854. The variety of work done by the society in the first ten years of its existence was fully in accord with its declared aim; it consisted in giving retreats, preaching, sick-visiting, taking care of prisons and hospitals, teaching, missions abroad, literary work, and almsgiving. In 1838, on the report of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, the Institute of Charity and its rule were approved by the reigning Pontiff, Gregory XVI., who had a singular affection and admiration for Rosmini. Three months afterwards the founder and all his followers took the vows required by the rule, and in 1839 the Pope, by letters Apostolical nominated Rosmini Superior-General of the Institute for life. It is well known that two of his smaller works, one of which was "Delle Cinque Piaghe della Santa Chiesa," were condemned by the Congregation of the Index in 1849. Rosmini's submission to the decree was absolute and unreserved; but a far more serious matter was behind, even the general examination of all his philosophical works, including the "Nuovo Saggio sull' Origine dell' Idee." After a severe and protracted scrutiny, the decision of the Congregation was given in 1854, "Dimittantur opera Antonii Rosmini-Serbati." Finally, however, long after his death, forty propositions taken from his writings were condemned (Dec. 14, 1887). Meantime a novitiate had been opened on the side of the hill above Stresa, on the Lago Maggiore; and here Rosmini chiefly resided in the last years of his life. The Institute has houses in Italy, England, Ireland, and the United States. ("La Vita di Antonio Rosmini," written by a priest of the Institute of Charity; Lockhart, "The Life of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati," tr. from the Italian of Pagani.)

ROTA ROMANA. A tribunal within the Curia Romana, formerly the supreme court of justice in the Church, and the universal court of appeal.

In early ages the cases referred to Rome were heard by the Pope himself, usually in Consistory, with bishops assembled. The increasing number of cases made it necessary to appoint an official to deal with them and report to the Pope. He was called an auditor, as his chief duty was to hear the evidence, though he was sometimes empowered to give a decision. By the time of John XXII. the custom of appointing auditors had become so common that the Pope instituted a regular tribunal of them, with certain rules for their guidance ("Ratio Juris," 1331). Succeeding pontiffs defined its competency, notably Sixtus IV., who

[1] *Life of Rosmini* (Lockhart, 1856).

fixed the number of auditors at twelve. The rise of the Roman Congregations (see CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN) gradually deprived the Rota of its importance until, at last, in the pontificate of Gregory XVI., it had become almost a civil court. With the loss of the temporal power even this sphere of action was lost. Leo XIII. gave the Rota a share in the process of Beatification and Canonization.

A great change was made by Pius X. in his Constitution "Sapienti Consilio" (June 29, 1908). The Sacra Rota Romana was entirely re-constituted as one of the three great tribunals of the Holy See, the other two being the Penitentiaria and Signatura. Under the new régime all contentious cases requiring judicial investigation with proof must come before the Rota, *causae majores* excepted. It is also the court of appeal from the decisions of episcopal courts. The auditors are the judges, each of whom has an assistant; there are also a promoter of justice, a *defensor vinculi* (in cases of ordination, religious profession, and matrimony), and three notaries. Three auditors form a quorum; but sometimes the decision is given *in pleno, i.e.* when all are present. The decision is given by the majority.

The explanation of the name "Rota" is said to be the fact that the marble floor of the chamber in which the tribunal used to sit was designed so as to exhibit the appearance of a wheel. So Ducange; but the explanation is doubtful. (See Benigni in "Cath. Enc." and "Lex propria S. Rom. Rotae"; Hilling, "Procedure of the Roman Curia"; Capello, "De Curia Romana."]

RUBRICS. Directions for the order to be followed in Mass and other sacred rites. The word is taken from the Roman law, in which the titles, maxims, and principal decisions were written in red. Juvenal's words—"Causas age. perlege rubras majorum leges" ("Sat." xiv. 192)—refer to this. MS., and even the first printed Missals, have scarcely any rubrics. These were contained in Directories, Rituals, Ceremonials, Ordines. It was Burchard, Master of Ceremonies under Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI., who first set out at length both the words and the ceremonies of the Mass in his Roman Pontifical, printed at Rome in 1485, and again in his "Sacerdotale," printed a few years later, and reprinted under Leo X. After this the ceremonies were joined to the Ordinary of the Mass in some printed Missals, and were finally arranged under their present titles by Pius V. The same course has been followed in the authoritative editions of the Pontifical, Ritual, &c. The rubrics of the liturgical books are real laws. "Rubricae sunt regulae juxta quas officium divinum persolvi, Missae sacrificium celebrari, et sacramenta administrari debent" (De Herdt, "Sacr. Lit. Praxis" i. p. 1). If, however, the wording of the regulation shows that it is of a voluntary character (*e.g.* the prayers before Mass, "pro opportunitate sacerdotis facienda"), it is obvious that it is not binding. (Cabrol in "Cath. Enc."; De Herdt, "Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis"; Le Brun, tom. i. "Traité Prélim." a. 3.)

RULE, RELIGIOUS. At the time when Ferraris wrote, about the middle of the seventeenth century, it was considered that there were four principal rules of the religious life—the Basilian, the Benedictine, the Augustinian, and the Franciscan—under which, or some modification of which, the majority of the existing orders and congregations were ranged; while, in a few isolated cases, rules unconnected with any of these four were observed. So great a number of religious institutes, especially of women, has subsequently arisen in the Church, and obtained the approbation of the Holy See, that the classification of Ferraris is far from accurately corresponding to the present state of things.

1. The rule of St. Basil, founded by that saint about 360, besides being that generally observed by coenobites in the Eastern Church, was followed, down to the recent secularisations, by a number of monasteries in Sicily, Italy, and Spain.

2. The rule of St. Augustine (390), according to the computation adopted by Hélyot, was followed by no less than ninety-seven congregations, including military orders. Among these were the Lateran Canons, the Canons of Arouaise, the Hermits and Regular Canons under the name of St. Augustine, the Premonstratensians, the order of Preachers, (Dominicans), the Servites, the Theatines and the Barnabites. Connected with every general congregation following this rule were nuns of corresponding observance.

3. Hélyot enumerates sixty-seven congregations (including the monks of Camaldoli, the Cluniacs, the Cistercians, the Bridgittines, &c.) as under the rule of St. Benedict (540), besides military orders.

4. The rule of St. Francis (1208) was and is professed, with more or less of rigour, by the various branches of the Franciscan order; of which the principal now are the Friars Minor, the Conventuals, the Capuchins and the Poor Clares.

Among the religious following independent rules are the Carthusians, the Carmelites, the Discalced Carmelites of St. Theresa, and the Society of Jesus.

Many of the institutes contained in Hélyot's enumeration are now extinct; on the other hand, if we consult the Abbé Badiche's continuation of Hélyot, or turn over the pages of "Terra Incognita,"[1] we find that in the last century an extraordinary number of new institutes, for the most part with determinate practical aims, under

[1] By J. N. Murphy (Longmans, 1873).

carefully adapted rules, and with simple vows, has arisen in the Church. (Ferraris.)

RURAL DEANS (*decani rurales*). In the article DEAN it was explained how that title, which originally arose in the monasteries, was introduced into cathedral and collegiate chapters. The institution of rural deans appears to have commenced in Italy in the following manner. The first parishes, owing to the thinness of the population, were very large; as the population increased, the inconvenience of their size was felt, and Alexander III. ordered that new churches should be built in places where they were required, and endowed out of the revenues of the parish churches. The new churches would naturally be dependent on the church within the district of which they were built; this would be their *matrix ecclesia*, and its rector would appoint priests to them. Such larger districts came to be called *plebes*, and the ecclesiastic in charge of one was named *plebanus*, or *archipresbyter*, or *decanus*. The practice grew up of monthly meetings of the priests in each *plebs* or rural deanery, under the presidency of the *plebanus*. An archpriest in this sense differed entirely from the cathedral archpriest, who was at the head of the clergy serving a cathedral church. The rural deans were always subject to the archdeacon; nevertheless, by deputation from the bishop, they gradually drew to themselves a considerable jurisdiction, of which in later times they have been deprived. (See VICAR FORANE; Thomassin, "Vet. et Nova Eccl. Disc." i. 2, 6; Ferraris, *Decanus*; Taunton.)

RUSSIAN CHURCH. According to the Russian legend, St. Andrew first preached the gospel in Russia and planted a cross at Kiev, but the truth is that Christianity came to Russia from Constantinople in the latter part of the ninth century. At that time the Russian Slavs had been united under the rule of Scandinavian princes, and Ruric founded the great Russian monarchy in 864. Soon after, however, two other princes, Ascold and Dir, also of Scandinavian origin, founded an independent kingdom at Kiev, so that Russia was divided into two kingdoms, both under Scandinavian rulers—viz. a northern monarchy with Novgorod, and a southern with Kiev, for capital. In 866 Ascold and Dir attacked Constantinople, and are said to have been converted by miracles, variously reported; but the fact is certain that their expedition led to the sending of missionaries from Constantinople to Russia. The exact chronology, which has a curious interest here, is hard to fix. According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the mission from Constantinople was sent in 867, when Ignatius, the lawful and Catholic Patriarch, was in possession, so that the first Russian Christians were Catholics, united to Rome. If, on the other hand, Nestor, the father of Russian history (d. 1113), is to be believed, the mission was sent in 866, and therefore under Photius, the schismatical Patriarch, so that the first Russian church was not in union with Rome. In any case, the impression made on the mass of the people at this time was very slight.

In 882 Russia was again subject to a single ruler, Oleg, Ruric's successor; Kiev, however, being the capital. In 955, Olga, the Russian Helena, was baptized at Constantinople; and in 988 her grandson Vladimir the Apostolic also became a Christian, and strove successfully to Christianize his people. Vladimir, whose life had been stained by infamous cruelty, sent ambassadors to examine the rites and doctrines of the Latins, Mahometans and Greeks, and attached himself to the last because their worship was the most imposing. He sent missionaries through his dominions, destroyed idols, and though there were heathen Russians even in the twelfth century, still Vladimir may fairly be considered to have made the mass of the nation Christian. So far, then, whatever the date of the first mission may have been, Russia, like the mother-church of Constantinople, was in communion with Rome. The union was severed in the middle of the eleventh century by the schism of Michael Caerularius. But for a time the Russian church was in schism unawares, and knew little of the anti-Roman bitterness which prevailed at Constantinople. Even to this day, the Russians, in their liturgical books, written in Old Slavonic, assert the primacy of the Roman See. Pope Sylvester is called the "Divine head of the holy bishops"; Pope Leo, "the successor on the highest throne of St. Peter, the heir of the invincible rock and the successor in his kingdom." Martin, Pope in the seventh century, is thus addressed: "Thou didst adorn the divine throne of Peter, and, holding the Church upright on this rock which cannot be shaken, thou didst honour thy name"; and Leo III. (about 800): "O chief shepherd of the Church, do thou represent the place of Jesus Christ." The feeling was changed, though the liturgy still witnessed to the past, under Vladimir Monomachus[1] (1113). He was filled with hostility to Rome by Nicephorus, who came from Constantinople and was metropolitan of Kiev. This spirit was fostered by successive metropolitans from Constantinople, and has lasted ever since.

Unsuccessful attempts to unite the Russians with the Papacy were made by Alexander III., who corresponded with John III., metropolitan of Kiev (since 1164); by Innocent III. during the Latin occupation of

[1] He was the first prince who was called "Czar" (= "Upper King"); but the title was not usual till the middle of the sixteenth century.

Constantinople; by Clement III., who tried to engage Russia in the third crusade; by Innocent IV., when the Russians were groaning under Mongol domination (Mongol supremacy, 1238–1462). Galicia, however, which had fallen under Hungarian rule, became Catholic, retaining its Slavonic rites, under Pope Honorius III. But there were causes which favoured the success of Catholicism in part of Russia. First, the Russians, weakened by Mongol oppression, could not cope with their enemies on the West—viz. the Poles and Lithuanians, and of these the Poles were Catholics. The Lithuanians, at first heathen, were won over to a great extent by the zeal of Dominican and Franciscan friars; in 1386 they became dependent on the Polish kingdom, and in 1387 all Lithuania except the Ruthenian provinces declared itself Catholic. The Lithuanian prince Vitolt seized strips of Russian territory, and was averse to the connection between his Ruthenian subjects and the Russian metropolitan. Next, the metropolitan see of the Russian church had been transferred to the city of Vladimir in 1299, to Moscow in 1328, though the title "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia" was retained. This weakened the hold of the Russian church in the South-West. In 1414 seven Russian bishops renounced allegiance to the metropolitan at Moscow and chose one of their own, resident at Kiev. After a vacancy of some years this metropolitan see of Kiev was occupied by Isidore, a Greek of Thessalonica, who at the Council of Florence in 1438 warmly supported the cause of union. To this union the church of Northern Russia and the temporal ruler, Vassili II., were from the first bitterly opposed, but it was accepted at Kiev and in the nine suffragan dioceses. All subsequent attempts at the conversion of Russia Proper—*e.g.* under Sixtus IV., Leo X., and Clement VII.—proved fruitless. Russia, freed in 1462 from the Mongol yoke, won and converted vast provinces in the North and East. Even the union of Kiev and its suffragan sees to the Catholic Church was neither real nor lasting; though, as we shall see in a subsequent article on the RUTHENIAN CHURCH, it was afterwards renewed in a much more solid way.

The discipline of the Russian church has undergone many changes. In the Middle Ages the Metropolitan of Russia was nominated by the Duke and consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Once consecrated, the metropolitan had immense power even in secular matters; it was seldom, even in the fifteenth century, that the Duke dared to resist him. The other archbishops and bishops—in whose election the Prince, the clergy and people, and the metropolitan all took part—were placed in the strictest subjection to the metropolitans. Yet the bishops, on their part, had great influence. They were well supported by tithes, and held secular jurisdiction in their own lands. They had, moreover, the privilege of interceding for condemned persons; and no prince could engage in war till a bishop had given his blessing; if the blessing was withheld, no soldier would follow the banner. Thus, in spite of much ignorance and superstition, wretched disputes on the right way of making the sign of the cross, controversies whether processions should move from east to west or west to east, ready belief in grotesque miracles, still the influence of the bishops, who were taken from the monastic orders and were superior both in knowledge and character to the rest of the clergy, was a beneficent one on the whole. They did much to temper the barbarism of the times. At the end of the Middle Ages the power of the Crown was consolidated, that of the nobles and clergy declined, and the Czars began to act more and more as the heads of the Church. Ivan IV. (1533–84) deposed and even murdered bishops, confiscated Church property, and forced the prelates to confirm his fourth marriage, which was against the Greek canon law, and to endure without protest his frequent divorces, his fifth, sixth, and even seventh marriage. In 1589, Jeremias II., Patriarch of Constantinople, consecrated Job, the metropolitan of Moscow, Patriarch of the Russias, and recognized him as the third Patriarch of the Eastern Church, inferior only to those of Constantinople and Alexandria. The metropolitan gained nothing by his change of title, but it suited the policy of the Czars to make the church national and independent. The strife of the Patriarch Nicon with the Czar Alexis Michaelovitz ended with the deposition of the former at a council of Moscow in 1667, and early in the following century the entire subjection of the ecclesiastical to the imperial power was completed. For Peter the Great left the Patriarchal See vacant for twenty years, and then, in 1721, with the consent of the Eastern Patriarchs, placed the whole government of the Russian church in the hands of the "Holy Synod," which depended entirely on the Czar. Catharine II. seized all the Church property, and since then the prelates have had a regular salary apportioned to them by the State.

The synod consists of twelve members, though the number has varied at different times. The members are nominated by the Czar, who may remove them at will.[1] The synod in 1881 was made up of the Metropolitan of Novgorod, president, four other metropolitans, the Emperor's confessor, and the grand chaplain of the army and fleet. The last two are secular priests. To these is attached a chief procurator as representative of the Czar, and other lay officials. This

[1] There is only one *ex-officio* member—viz. the Metropolitan of Tiflis, Exarch of Georgia.

procurator, who in 1770 was a brigadier, may put his veto on any measure till it has been laid before the sovereign. Further, each member on entering office swears that he recognizes the Czar "as supreme judge in this spiritual assembly." But if on the one side the synod is entirely subject to the Crown, on the other the centralizing system of the Russian Government gives the synod enormous power in the church. It proposes suitable candidates for vacant sees to the Czar; it translates and deposes bishops; it can, with the Czar's formal approval, make new laws for the Church; it gives dispensations; it watches over doctrine and ritual, sees to the printing of liturgical books, examines relics and the evidence for alleged miracles, has the control of ecclesiastical colleges, receives appeals from the bishops; it decides on the money to be given for building churches and monasteries, and superintends the payment of the clergy. Nay, since 1809 the bishops must transmit to the synod the money made in their dioceses by sale of candles, use of churches, sale of bridal crowns, collections in churches, &c. The whole sum is then apportioned to the different dioceses according to their needs.

Bishops are really all equal, except so far as they are divided into three classes, and receive more or less support from the Government. Since the time of Peter the Great, metropolitan and archbishop have become mere titles of honour given by the Czar and not attached to any diocese, except that the Bishops of Kiev and of Novgorod and St. Petersburg are always archbishops, while Siberia is always placed under a metropolitan. If a see is vacant, the Holy Synod recommends two candidates to the Czar, who, however, often takes the first step and names a person whom the synod have to choose. The bishops are all unmarried, and therefore chosen from the monks. They cannot leave their dioceses on any account without leave from the synod. They must make a complete visitation at least every three years. They are urged to be zealous in establishing schools, and they may enforce discipline in the case of the secular clergy by punishment, not, however, in that of the regulars, unless they are armed with a decree from the synod. The bishop is assisted by a Consistory composed of the most experienced and distinguished secular and regular clergymen. The bishop presents them to the synod, but cannot remove them when once approved. The Consistory watches over orthodoxy, prepares returns on the state of the diocese for the synod, and for this purpose has a body of officials in Government pay at its disposal. Appeal lies from the Consistory to the bishop, thence to the synod. In very large dioceses —*e.g.* Novgorod and Moscow—a district is placed under a vicar who is in episcopal orders, but differs in this from other bishops, that there is an appeal from him to his metropolitan. Vicars were also appointed in 1832 for countries where the people are mostly Catholic or Protestant. The number of those who compose the bishops' household is settled, and each official fed and paid by the Government. There are three prelates of the first class—viz. the Metropolitans of Kiev, of Novgorod and St. Petersburg (united since 1764), of Moscow and Colomna. There are fourteen archbishops, fifty-nine bishops, and thirty-seven auxiliaries, whom they call vicars. Since 1801 Georgia was incorporated within the Russian Empire, and there the Metropolitan of Tiflis is Exarch, and there are five bishops. There is also, since 1858, a Russian bishop at Jerusalem, and there are bishops in Japan, Alaska, and the United States. The classes of bishops have, of course, nothing to do with their jurisdiction, for in that respect all, except the vicars, are on one dead level under the synod. The classes simply refer to the amount of their allowance from the Government.

The "white" or secular clergy must all be married, and are mostly sons of priests. They begin their education at the parish school, continue it at the district school and diocesan seminary, and finish at one of the four ecclesiastical academies—those of St. Petersburg, Kiev, Moscow, and Kazan. Three or four years are spent at each of these stages. The benefices are all conferred by the bishop, except that landed proprietors have often a right of patronage in country churches—so far, at least, that they can put a veto on the nomination of a cleric whom they do not wish to have. The Government supports a certain number of clergymen in churches which had more than twenty serfs before the confiscations of Catharine II. There are numerous officials at the cathedrals, and even small country churches are supposed to have a deacon as well as a priest. Each regiment has a priest, reader, sacristan, doorkeeper, and sometimes also a deacon. In peace, military chaplains are subject to the bishop of the place; in the field, to a Proto-Pope who is set over them. A canon of the fifteenth century required a priest who lost his wife to live like a layman in a monastery. This law of enforced seclusion was set aside by Peter the Great. A widowed priest may now get leave from the synod to officiate as before; and even in the case of second marriage an edict of Peter the Great in 1724 permits a priest to be employed as rector of a seminary, or in the episcopal chancery, if he has applied himself diligently to study, and especially to preaching.

The Russian religious follow the rule of St. Basil. Men must not be professed till they are forty, women till they are fifty. The noviciate lasts three years, and is followed by another period of probation. The discipline is strict, and only a few monks receive holy

orders. Regular priests never have parishes, but the naval chaplains are taken from monks educated in the Monastery of St. George at Balaclava; and not only the bishops, but also many preachers, confessors, and prelates generally, are supplied by them. According to the synodal report of 1838, there were 225 monasteries and 100 nunneries receiving support from the State in place of confiscated property, besides 161 monasteries and thirteen nunneries maintained by themselves or by the people. Only seven religious houses are *stauropegia—i.e.* exempt from episcopal rule and subject immediately to the synod.

The great symbolical book of the Russian church is Ἔκθεσις τῆς τῶν Ῥώσων Πίστεως ("Exposition of the Faith of the Russians") drawn up by Mogilas, metropolitan of Kiev, and his suffragans between 1630 and 1640. At the desire of the Patriarch of Constantinople, it was examined by a commission of delegates from Constantinople and Kiev, received the title of "Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church" (Ὁμολογία τῆς Πίστεως τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς), was approved by the four Eastern Patriarchs, and again by the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. There are authoritative translations into Slavonic, and it has been edited with a Latin version by Kimmel ("Libri Symbol. Eccles. Orientalis," 1843). The Little Catechism published by order of Peter the Great is merely a compendium of the "Exposition" or "Confession."

This Confession shows that except on a very few points the Russians believe as the Catholic Church believes. It teaches the necessity of good works for salvation; that Scripture and tradition are the two sources of faith; the intercession and invocation of the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and the angels; that the faithful departed are helped by prayers, alms, and the sacrifice of the Eucharist; the Seven Sacraments, transubstantiation (μετουσίωσις), &c. The commandments of the Church—such as fasting, hearing Mass on Sundays and feasts &c.—are much the same as those in Catholic Catechisms. But the Russians deny the Pope's supremacy, and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; further, they hold that marriage may be dissolved on account of adultery, and maintain that baptism by sprinkling is invalid. On this last point they differ from the Greeks. On Purgatory their doctrine is less sharply defined than ours, but they hold all which we hold as of faith.

Such is the formal teaching of the Russian church. But since the latter half of the last century education has made great strides, and Western, but especially German, theology has exercised a marked influence on the more educated members of the clergy. Prelates in high place have shown their leanings to Protestant views, and this tendency has appeared in books printed with the approval of the Holy Synod. The Catechism of Plato, archbishop of Moscow and tutor to Paul I., differs essentially from the old Catechism in the doctrine of the Sacraments, and especially that of the Eucharist. In 1805, Archbishop Methodius, of Tver, published in Latin, with the approval of the synod, a work on the first four centuries of the Church, founded chiefly on Bingham. Philaret, patriarch of Moscow, a man of talent and of cultivated mind, formed a school of theologians imbued with the spirit of German Protestantism. He issued a Catechism, and a Review of the Controversies between East and West. While Germans like Neander and Schleiermacher have been read and studied, Catholic theologians are little known, and there is a constant tendency to soften the points of difference between Russians and Protestants, and to accentuate those which separate Russians from Catholics. At the same time, the interest in the Greek Fathers and in the old Russian orthodoxy has been revived in a certain section of the younger clergy.

(The historical account and the sketch of doctrine are from Hefele's "Essay on the Russian Church," 1864; Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients," ch. iii., 1865; Palmieri, in "Cath. Enc.," good bibliography. An article by Professor Lamy, of Louvain, in the "Dublin Review" for April 1881, has also been consulted. Fortescue's "Orthodox Eastern Church," 1907, is the great authority on the subject in English.[1])

RUTHENIAN CATHOLICS. The name is given to Christians who use the Greek liturgy translated into Old Slavonic, but own obedience to the Pope. They are descendants of converts from the Russian church, who have kept their old rites and discipline.

The metropolitan see of Kiev and its suffragan dioceses were united to the Catholic Church, as has been said in the article on the Russian church. The union was never satisfactory, and the last trace of it had disappeared early in the sixteenth century. But the cause of union was zealously promoted by the Jesuit school established at Vilna by Father Possevin and by the Polish king Calixtus III. In 1595 the Metropolitan of Kiev and seven suffragans were at their own request received by Clement VIII. into the Catholic communion. Thus the Ruthenian province arose; the metropolitan was chosen by the bishops and all were placed under Propaganda, which was represented by the Polish nuncio. But at the partition of Poland all the Catholic Ruthenian dioceses, except Lemberg, Przemysl, and part of Brezk, became Russian dominion.

[1] The reader will find a vivid and interesting account of the Russian church in Palmer's "Visit to the Russian Church," edited by Cardinal Newman.

In 1795 Russia suppressed all the dioceses except one; in 1798 three dioceses were tolerated, a fourth in 1809, two only by Nicholas in 1828. In 1839 three bishops joined the schismatic Russians, and there was till lately only one see of the United Ruthenians in Russian Poland—viz. Chelm and Belz—immediately subject to the Pope. At present there is another bishopric—viz. Minsk — united to Mohilew. The see of Suprasl was erected in 1799 for the Ruthenians in Prussian Poland; they numbered about 40,000.

In the Austrian territory the see of Lemberg, with its suffragan sees of Przemysl, Sanok, and Sambor, belongs to the Ruthenian church of Poland, and the history of its union with the Catholic Church has been just given. The metropolitan see of Lemberg was erected for the two millions of Ruthenian Catholics in Galicia by Pius VII. in 1807, Kalik and Kamenek being united to it. But, besides this, many schismatical Slavs in Hungary followed the example set by their Polish brethren in 1595. The union lasted only till 1627, and though a bishop of Munkacs became Catholic in 1649, the population remained schismatic. More was done for the Catholic cause by the Ruthenian bishop De Camillis at the end of the seventeenth century, and in 1771 the diocese of Munkacs was properly constituted by Clement XIV. The Catholic population amounts to 470,000 souls. From the diocese of Munkacs that of Eperies was divided in 1816. It contains 160,000 souls. Munkacs and Eperies are under the Latin Archbishop of Gran. Cries is under Zagrab (Agram). In Croatia the Ruthenians have one diocese, that of Kreutz (Kőrös), with 20,000 souls, erected in 1777, and subject to the same Metropolitan of Agram. In 1907 a titular bishop, who resides in Philadelphia, was appointed for the Ruthenian immigrants living in North America. They come chiefly from Galicia, Bukowina, and Hungary. They have about 120 priests, with 150 churches.

The Ruthenians have a married secular clergy, and religious who follow the rule of St. Basil. The bishops are usually taken from the monks. The Ruthenians are under the laws made by Propaganda for Catholics of Greek rite living among Latins. Their bishops at their consecration make the profession of faith prescribed for the Greeks by Urban VIII. (Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients"; Streit, "Atlas Hierarchicus"; Shipman in "Cath. Enc.")

S

SABAOTH. This word, retained in the Sanctus, is often confounded with Sabbath, but has an entirely different significance, being from צבאות, hosts. [See SANCTUS.]

SABBATH. [See SUNDAY.]

SABBATINE BULL. [See SCAPULAR.]

SABELLIANISM. A name given to two very different forms of doctrine, which, however, agreed in this that they denied any real distinction of Persons in God. The Catholic Church teaches that there are three divine Persons really distinct from each other, and yet one God. The Sabellians confessed with Catholics the numerical unity of God, but denied the mystery of the Trinity by explaining away the real distinction of the Persons.

(1) The earliest form of the heresy was Patripassianism. Praxeas, who came from Asia Minor to Rome under Pope Eleutherus (175-189), Noetus of Smyrna, who was excommunicated in his own province about 230, Epigonus and Cleomenes, who transplanted the doctrine of Noetus to Rome, all held that God the Father of all is the only God, and that this one God became man, suffered, and died. Thus Praxeas held "that the Father came down into a virgin, that He himself was born of her, that He himself suffered; finally, that He himself is Jesus Christ" (Tertull. "Adv. Prax." 1, PL, ii. 154, and so 28, 29, 30). Pressed to explain how it was that Father and Son could be said on this theory to exist at all after the Incarnation, Praxeas replied that Christ so far as He was flesh was Son, and so far as He was spirit or God was the Father (*ib.* 27, PL, ii. 190). The tenets of Noetus were precisely the same (Hippolytus, "C. Noet." ed. Lagarde, "Philosoph." ix. 7–10). And such also was the original doctrine of Sabellius, a Libyan, who came to Rome under Zephyrinus, was banished from the Roman Church by Callistus, and took refuge in the Libyan Pentapolis. The testimonies as to the original teaching of Sabellius are too early and express to be set aside. "He [Sabellius] blasphemes," says Dionysius, bishop of Rome in the middle of the third century, "saying that the Son himself is the Father, and *vice versa*." (The Epistle of Dionysius is contained in Athanas. "D. Decret. Nicen. Syn." and edited by Routh, "Reli. Sacr." vol. iii. p. 373 *seq.*) Novatian, another author, nearly contemporaneous, speaks of Sabellius as one "who calls Christ the Father" (Novat. "De Trin." c. 12). The Macrostich, a Semi-Arian creed of the Eusebians (apud Athanas. "De Synod." 26), refers to "those whom the Latins call the Patripassians and we the Sabellians." So also Athanasius, iii. 36; and Cardinal Newman ("Oxford Translation of St. Athanas." p. 529) quotes on the same side Euseb. "Eccl. Theol." i. p. 91; Basil. Ep.

210, 5; Rufin. "In Symb." 5; August. "Haer." 41; Theodor. "Haer. Fab." ii. 9.

(2) The doctrine of the Sabellians, and perhaps of Sabellius himself, underwent a complete transformation, and resolved the mystery of the Trinity into three manifestations of God to man. It was difficult for Sabellianism, in its original form, to assume even the appearance of conformity to the traditional teaching, embodied in the form of baptism, on the Holy Ghost. A very early author, Dionysius of Alexandria (apud Euseb. "H.E." vii. 6), reproaches the Sabellians with this very thing, "that they had no idea of the Holy Ghost" (*ἀναισθησίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*). It was conceivable that the Father should have been incarnate in Christ, but there was no room for such an incarnation, and therefore, on Sabellian principles, for a real existence of the third Person in the Trinity. Hence Sabellius, or at least the Sabellians, came to hold that the same Person is the Holy Ghost, so far as He manifests Himself in the Christian Church, and by parity of reasoning the Son, so far as He appeared in Christ. The same Person or Hypostasis (so Theodor. "Haer. Fab." ii. 9, reports the doctrine of Sabellius) was Father when He gave the law, Son when He became flesh in Christ, Holy Ghost when He descended on the Apostles, being "one person with three names" (*ἓν τριώνυμον πρόσωπον*). He compared the three *πρόσωπα* or characters of God (Epiphan. "Haer." 62, 1) to the spherical form, light, and heat of the one sun. Such late authorities are not decisive for the supposition that Sabellius himself held this view, but undoubtedly the Sabellians did. Patripassianism was thus avoided altogether; but on the other hand the Incarnation, no less than the Trinity, was in effect denied, for the manifestation of God in Christ could differ in degree only, and not in kind, from His union with other holy men. This Sabellian doctrine, which takes *πρόσωπον* or *persona* in its original meaning of mask, character, &c., has been maintained by many Protestant divines—*e.g.* by Archbishop Whately in his "Logic." It is of course completely incompatible with Catholic belief, and is contrary, *e.g.*, to the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.

(3) Closely akin to the later Sabellianism is the doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra. He was a strenuous defender of the Nicene definition against the Arians, and this and the obscurity of his doctrine account for the fact that he was defended by Pope Julius, the Synod of Sardica, and Athanasius himself (Athanas. "Apol. c. Arian." 23, 32; "Ep. ad Monach. et Hist. Arian." 6). He made the *Λόγος* a mere attribute of God like the reason of man, manifesting itself in the creation, in the Incarnation, and in the sanctification of Christians. (Theodor. "Haer. Fab." ii. 10.) In Christ the Word dwelt with extraordinary power, to retire from Him at the consummation of all things, when the manhood of Christ would no longer reign. (Euseb. "Adv. Marcell." ii. 2–4; "Eccl. Theol." iii. 8–17.)

(Newman, "Notes on Athanasius"; Petavius, "De Trinitate," lib. i. cap. 6; Franzelin, "De Deo Trino," thes. iii.; Kuhn, "Trinitätslehre"; Döllinger, "Hippolytus and Callixtus.")

SACRAMENTALS. We shall show in the article on SACRAMENTS that the word, not only by Fathers like St. Augustine, but even by mediaeval theologians, was widely used for the most sacred and solemn rites of the Church. We have seen that St. Augustine, like the Roman Rituale in present use, called the salt in baptism a *sacramentum*, while mediaeval writers use the word of religious profession, holy water, &c. After Peter Lombard, when the use of the word sacrament and its definition became restricted and fixed, the name "sacramental" was given to rites which have some outward resemblance to the sacraments. The word *sacramentalia* occurs in St. Thomas (3, q. 71, a. 3), but he does not, so far as we know, enumerate or classify them, and with him *sacramentalia* seems only to mean ceremonies accompanying the sacraments.

The sacramentals are enumerated in the following line—

Orans, tinctus, edens, confessus, dans, benedicens

—*i.e.* the prayers of the Church—above all the Lord's prayer—and alms (however, to be called "sacramentals," prayer must be said or the alms given in the name of the Church or in a consecrated place; otherwise, as Billuart says, they do not differ from other good works), blessed bread, the confession at Mass and in the Office, the blessing of bishops or abbots, holy water (with which we may class blessed ashes, candles, palms, &c.). If the "sacramentals" are used with pious dispositions they excite increased fear and love of God, detestation of sin, and so, not in themselves, but because of these movements of the heart towards God, remit venial sins. They have a special efficacy, because the Church has blessed them with prayer, and so when, *e.g.*, a person takes holy water, accompanying the outward act with the desire that God may cleanse his heart, the prayer of the whole Christian people is joined to his own. The opinion that "sacramentals" remit venial sins by a power given them by God over and above the good dispositions with which they are used is held by some, but rejected by Juenin, and even by Billuart, as destitute of warrant in Scripture or tradition. (See Probst, "Sakramente und Sakramentalien"; Lambing, "Sacramentals of the Holy Cath. Church"; Leclercq in "Cath. Enc.")

SACRAMENTARY (or *Liber Sacramentorum*). A book containing the rites for Mass and the sacraments generally — *e.g.* Holy

Orders, Baptism, &c.; also for various sacramental rites—*e.g.* dedication of churches, consecration of nuns, &c. It is represented by our Missal, Pontifical, and Ritual. On the other hand, the Sacramentary had few rubrics.

An imperfect Roman Sacramentary, without Ordo or Canon, was published by Muratori in his "Liturgia Romana Vetus." It is known as the Leonine, though some of the Missae are probably later than Leo I. The Gelasian Sacramentary was published from a ninth-century MS. in the Vatican by Cardinal Thomasius. The Gregorian is a revision of the Gelasian Sacramentary. Three Gallican Sacramentaries (Missale Gothicum, Gallicum, Francorum) were published by Thomasius, and reprinted by Mabillon and Muratori. Another known as Bobbiense was discovered by Mabillon at Bobbio, and printed by him in his "Museum Italicum." The Mozarabic Sacramentary or "Liber Sacramentorum," the most elaborate collection of the kind, was published in its entirety in 1912, by the lamented Dom Férotin. [See LITURGIES; MISSAL; ORDO; RUBRICS.]

SACRAMENTS OF NATURE AND OF THE JEWISH CHURCH. If we define a sacrament as "a sign of a sacred thing, which thing sanctifies men," we are able to include the sacraments of nature, the old law, and the Christian Church in one common class. All are outward signs and all were instituted by God. But they do not all confer grace *ex opere operato*. It was the primary and direct object of the Jewish sacraments to typify the mysteries of the Christ who was to come. Moreover, the grace which most at least of the Jewish sacraments effected was not grace in the proper sense, but an outward and legal status, a position as members of the Jewish Church. We lay down these principles provisionally, for there is scarcely a question in theology which has occasioned a greater variety of opinion.

The existence of grace given by sacraments before Christ does not seem to have occurred to anyone previous to St. Augustine. His clear apprehension of the doctrine of original sin led him to believe that some remedy for it must have been prescribed before Christ came, and this remedy he found in circumcision ("De Nupt. et Concupisc." ii. 11, PL, xliv. 449; "Adv. Donat." iv. 24, ib. xliii. 174). This explanation, however, did not touch the case of children born before Abraham received the covenant of circumcision. He thinks it incredible that those under the law of nature had no sacred sign of the Mediator (*sacramentum*) by which they "helped their little ones," though he does not profess to know what this sign was ("Adv. Julian." v. 11, PL, xliv. 809). Subsequent Latin Fathers, and the Schoolmen generally, adopted St. Augustine's theory, and the term "sacraments of the old law" has been adopted by the Councils of Florence and Trent. The latter council anathematizes (sess. vii. De Sacr. can. 2) the view of Calvin ("Instit." iv. 14)[1] that there is no difference except in the outward rite between the sacraments of the old law and the new; but this is all the Church has decided in the matter. It is agreed that the statement of Eugenius IV. in the Council of Florence ("Instructio pro Armen.")—viz. that the sacraments of the old law, unlike those of the new, did not confer but only typified grace—is not a definition of faith. (See Tournely, "De Sacr. in Gen." qu. 3, a. 3.)

We have to distinguish between the sacrament or sacraments of the law of nature and circumcision on the one hand and the many sacraments of the Mosaic law—*e.g.* the paschal lamb, the ordination of priests and Levites, legal purifications, &c.—on the other. The opinions of the School divines are thus given by Tournely:—(1) With regard to the Mosaic sacraments, excluding circumcision: The Master of the Sentences denied that anyone was justified by them, even if they were performed in faith and charity. Durandus believed that grace was given by some of the Mosaic sacraments—at least by ordination to the priesthood. Hugo of St. Victor and Bonaventure, followed by Estius, hold that the old sacraments gave grace *ex opere operato*, not indeed in themselves and primarily, but so far as they were signs by which men confessed their faith in the Redeemer. St. Thomas and many others have thought that the sacraments of the old law gave grace not *ex opere operato*, but *ex opere operantis*—*i.e.* because of faith in the minister and recipient. (2) As to circumcision: The Master of the Sentences, Bonaventure, and many of the most celebrated Schoolmen—*e.g.* Alexander of Hales, Scotus, Durandus—held that circumcision was primarily and directly instituted as a remedy for original sin, and of itself sufficed to remove it. We may notice in passing that neither Scripture nor Philo and Josephus, nor the Rabbins, attribute any such efficacy to circumcision. Lastly, St. Thomas holds that circumcision did indeed remit sin and confer grace, not, however, in itself, but as a type of Christ's Passion, the faith of the recipient, if an adult, being requisite, and in the case of an infant the faith of others in his behalf. On these conditions it remitted original and actual sin if the latter had been committed. In the case of male children who died before the eighth day (or, we may add, of female children) he suggests that some other sign of faith on the part of the parents sufficed. But he points out that circum-

[1] He of course admitted this difference, that the sacraments of the old law shadowed forth Christ who was to come, while those of the gospel "bear testimony to Him as already come."

cision did not, like baptism, impress a character which incorporates a man with Christ; nor did it give a title to the immediate possession of heaven, nor bestow such abundant grace as baptism (3ª, q. 70, a. 4). (The dogmatic theologians discuss the question of the sacraments of nature in their treatises "De Sacramentis"; *e.g.* Franzelin, thes. i.–iii.; Drouin, "De Re Sacramentaria," qu. ii.)

SACRAMENTS OF THE GOSPEL. 1. *Definition and General Opposition between Catholic and Protestant Doctrine.*—The Roman Catechism (P. II. cap. i. n. 4), following the Council of Trent (sess. xiii. cap. 3), defines a sacrament as "a visible sign of invisible grace instituted for our justification." There must be a visible sign. Constantly, indeed, is grace bestowed without sign at all; God justifies at once the sinner who turns to Him with sorrow and love, and His grace is continually descending on the hearts of the just, but in all these cases there is no sign, and therefore no sacrament. This sign is efficacious—*i.e.* it really effects the grace which it signifies. Moral and spiritual dispositions, it is true, are required in order that those who have come to the use of reason may receive the grace of the sacraments; but these dispositions are the condition and not the cause of grace; the grace given is far beyond the pious feelings which the mere sign awakens, and herein lies the difference between sacraments such as baptism and sacramental rites instituted by the Church, such as sprinkling with holy water. Lastly, it is beyond the power of man to make earthly things the channels of divine grace; the Church may bless holy water and hope that her prayers for those who use it will be heard; she cannot make water "the laver of new birth." Such power belongs to Christ, the author and the finisher of our salvation, and therefore the institutor of the sacraments.

Very different was the Protestant doctrine against which the definitions of Trent were framed. According to the Lutherans, the sacraments did not produce grace, but were pledges and seals of God's promises to us. Thus Melanchthon says, God invites us to His table in order to remove all doubt from our minds that He has forgiven us; and the Augsburg Confession describes the sacraments as "signs and testimonies of God's good will towards us." Calvin's teaching is substantially the same, while Zwingli made the sacraments signs, not of God's fidelity, but of ours. We receive the sacraments to show that we believe: they are merely the badges of Christian profession. Several consequences followed from the Lutheran definition. It became necessary to reduce the number of the sacraments, for it could not be said—*e.g.* of marriage and holy order—with any show of reason that their primary and direct object was to excite faith. Next, the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments was out of all harmony with Lutheran belief in consubstantiation. Why should Christ work a miracle and place His true body and blood under the bread and wine if He did not mean to confirm and renew His promises? A simple feast of bread and wine received in His name and at His bidding was surely enough, and so Luther's doctrine naturally led to that of the Sacramentarians, which he so bitterly opposed. Further, the Anabaptists were fully justified by the Lutheran definition of a sacrament in rejecting infant baptism, since a sacrament cannot possibly excite faith or assurance in an unconscious child. Equally logical were the Society of Friends and other small sects which abandoned the sacraments entirely; the perfect believer might fairly plead that to him God's word was enough, and needed no confirmation by outward signs or seals. So it happened that while the Calvinists, Zwinglians, Anabaptists, &c., advanced on the path of negation, the later Lutherans retreated and almost accepted the Catholic doctrine. The "Apology" admits that a "promise of grace" is annexed to the sacraments ("sacramenta vocamus ritus qui habent mandatum Dei et quibus addita est promissio gratiae"). (For references on the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines see Möhler, "Symbolism," book i. ch. 4.)

The fact is that the differences between Catholics and Protestants on the doctrine of the sacraments spring from the still more radical difference between them on redemption and justification. The Reformers held that man's nature was wholly and incorrigibly bad; he could only appropriate Christ by faith and have the merits of another set down to his account. The Church, on the contrary, teaches that Christ's grace purifies man within, really makes him just, and ennobles his whole earthly life by imparting to it a divine and heavenly character. And just as Christ appeared in the flesh, just as virtue went forth from that body which He took, just as He saved us by that blood which He willingly shed in love for us, so He continues to make sensible things the channels of that grace by which our lives are elevated and sanctified. In Baptism we are born again; in confirmation we grow up to perfect men in Christ; Communion is the daily bread by which the life of the soul is maintained; in Penance God "heals the soul which has sinned against Him"; when death is near, Unction comes to remove the last remnant of infirmity and prepare the soul for final glory. But man has a social as well as an individual nature. Marriage is given that natural impulses which have often proved the source of corruption and crime may become the fountain of blessing, that the

young may be brought up in God's love and fear, and the Church be the fruitful mother of children. Order is instituted that the Church may be ruled by those whom God has set over her, may be fed by the word of life and with the other sacraments. (St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 65, a. 1.)

(2) *The Number of Sacraments.*—We have already touched on this division of the subject, for we have just given a *rationale* of the Seven Sacraments from the "Summa" of St. Thomas. The Catholic Church has defined that there are seven sacraments of the new law, and seven only. That there are seven sacraments is proved by the arguments given in favour of each from Scripture and the perpetual tradition of the Church, while, on the other hand, as we shall presently show, there is no other rite which can claim a place in the same category. Again, though it is quite true that the enumeration of seven sacraments was unknown for nearly twelve centuries of Church history, this is explained by the fact that the word *sacramentum* has various senses, and till its sense had been definitely fixed, or some other word found as a substitute, the enumeration of seven sacraments was impossible. Indeed, the history of this enumeration furnishes an argument on our behalf. How was it that, when once Peter Lombard had fixed the number and names of the seven sacraments, his view was at once and universally, or all but universally, accepted? The answer is, because he supplied the complete and correct formula for the doctrine which the Church already held. His statement came like a right word which exactly expresses a man's meaning, but which he has been long searching for in vain. Once more, the Greeks separated from the Catholic Church before the list of sacraments had been made. Yet they, too, reached the same conclusion. The "Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church," solemnly accepted by all the Eastern patriarchs and used by the Russians, gives (ad Qu. 97) the number of sacraments as seven, corresponding to the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and names the same seven which we confess (Confirmation being called *τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος*). So, too, the Confession of Dositheus, schismatical patriarch of Jerusalem, accepted in the Council of Jerusalem in 1672, declared that there were seven sacraments, and that it was a sign of "heretical madness" to say there were more or less. The Protestant Confessions, with scarcely an exception, deny that there are more than two. But such a denial had never been made before, except by some of the mediaeval heretics. And even the Protestants were not sure of their ground. The "Apology" of Melanchthon, subscribed by the chief Lutherans, acknowledges that "baptism, the supper, and absolution are three true sacraments." And it adds a fourth, since "no difficulty need be made against putting Order in this rank, if it be taken to mean the ministry of the Word, because it is commanded by God and has great promises." Confirmation and Extreme Unction are said to be "ceremonies received by the Fathers," which have no express promise of grace. In Marriage they recognize divine institutions, but with promises of temporal blessing only. "As if," says Bossuet, "it were a temporal thing to bring up children of God for the Church, and to be saved by begetting them in this fashion (1 Tim. ii. 15), or as if it were not one of the fruits of Christian marriage to cause the children born in it to be called holy, as being destined for sanctity" (Bossuet, "Variations," livr. iii. ch. 51).

In tracing the history of the numeration within the Church, we may distinguish four different stages. Till about the end of the fourth century we find usually two and sometimes three rites placed together as sacraments. Tertullian, for example, speaks in the same place of Baptism and the Eucharist ("De Corona," 3, PL, ii. 79), and he calls the latter a "sacramentum"—though nothing can be made of this, for he uses *sacramentum* for the oath or obligation of Christian service, for a mystery, and for a sign of any kind which conceals a sacred meaning. This use of the words *sacramen'um* and *μυστήριον* is common to the New Testament, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and all the Fathers, and is still retained in Greek and Latin. A century before, Justin (1 Apol. 61 *seq.*, PG, vi. 420) had explained together the two sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, and, long after, Chrysostom ("In Joann." Hom. 84, PG, lix. 463), preaching on the water and blood which flowed from Christ's side, said, "Thence the sacraments [*μυστήρια*] take their origin"—viz. Baptism and the Eucharist—"which the initiated know." On the other hand, Cyprian (Ep. 73, ed. Hartel, p. 785) classes Baptism and Confirmation ("signaculum dominicum") together, clearly making each a channel of sacramental grace in the strict sense; and in like manner Pacian ("De Baptism." 6) speaks of the sacrament or mystery of the laver and of chrism ("lavacri et chrismatis et antistitis sacramentum"—meaning only two rites, not three, for the action of the prelate is common to both sacraments). Further, Ambrose ("De Virgin." cap. 10, PL, xvi. 280) seems to attribute a sacramental efficacy to the washing of the feet. And here we add, for the sake of convenience, that the author of the famous treatise "De Sacramentis" (iii. 7, PL, xvi. 433), long attributed to St. Ambrose, but really written in our second period, eagerly adopts this theory, though he owns the practice of the Roman Church was against him.

Augustine sometimes (see, *e.g.*, "Contr.

Faust." xix. 14, "Pro baptismo Christi, pro eucharistia Christi, pro signo Christi," PL, xlii. 356) classes Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist together, and this was the prevailing classification down to the end of the tenth century. Thus, Isidore of Seville ("Etymolog." vi. 19, PL, lxxxii. 255) writes: "A *sacramentum* consists in a certain rite, when a thing is so done that we understand something to be signified which must be received with holy dispositions. Now, the *sacramenta* are Baptism, and Chrism, the Body and Blood." Aytho, bishop of Basle, in his capitulary: "They are to be taught to know what the *sacramentum* of Baptism and Confirmation *is*, and of the Body of the Lord, how, *in* these same mysteries (*mysteriis*). the visible creature is seen and still invisible grace is supplied for the eternal life of the soul." Rabanus Maurus ("De Universo," v. 11) repeats Isidore almost verbally. So the writers of this period generally, when they enumerate the *sacramenta*, though they often speak of two "principal *sacramenta*," two which flowed from the side of Christ, &c., &c. We, of course, lay *no* stress on the mere use of the word *sacramentum*, else we might have noticed, *e.g.*, that St. Augustine ("De Peccat. Remiss." ii. 26, PL, xliv. 176; "De Catech. Rud." 50, PL, xl. 344) calls the salt in baptism by that name.

From the end of the tenth century to the time of Peter Lombard (d. 1164), we find a long list of *sacramenta* in vogue. Peter Damian (Serm. 69) says there are "twelve *sacramenta* in the Church." Hugo of St. Victor ("De Sacr." ix. 7) counts (α) two necessary *sacramenta*—viz. Baptism and the Eucharist; (β) *sacramenta* useful for sanctification—*e.g.* sprinkling with holy water, blessed ashes, &c., &c.; (γ) those which prepare us for other sacred rites—*e.g.* ordination &c. St. Bernard (Serm. "In Coena Domini") tells his hearers there are many *sacramenta*, but he will only speak then of three—viz. Baptism, Eucharist, and the washing of feet.

The first distinct and certain mention of seven sacraments occurs in Peter Lombard ("Sentent." IV. dist. ii.). "Let us now come to the sacraments of the new law, which are seven in number." It has been said that the Master of the Sentences was anticipated by Otto of Bamberg, the Apostle of Pomerania (1124–28). The question is of little moment, but the statement rests on the word of a biographer, not on any writing of Otto himself. A work of Hugo of St. Victor, often referred to—viz. "De Caerimoniis"—is not his, but later than Peter Lombard.

To sum up: in the earliest ages, Baptism and the Eucharist—the two sacraments most clearly and directly instituted by Christ and most necessary for all—were classed together. Then Confirmation, long given along with Baptism, was added to the number. Next—as this number of three did not seem to rest on any fixed principle—various writers chose various rites of the Church and put them together under the common name of *sacramenta*. At last, theological reflection, just when systematic theology was beginning to be, led Peter Lombard to the conclusion that there were seven rites, with this in common, which separated them from all others—viz. that they were the ordained means of grace. He called them, and them only, sacraments. The Schoolmen at once perceived the accuracy of his doctrine and the convenience of his nomenclature, and, finally, the number of the sacraments was defined to be seven, in 1274, at the Second Council of Lyons ("Prof. Fidei Mich. Palaeolog."), at Florence ("Decret. pro Armen."), and under anathema at Trent (sess. vii. "De Sacr." c. 1).

(3) *The Matter and Form of the Sacraments.*—Eugenius IV. ("Instr. pro Armen.") states that the sacraments are effected by the things which stand for the matter ("tanquam materia"), by the words which stand for the form, and by the person of the minister; and that if any one of these three things be wanting there is no sacrament. The terms "matter" and "form" are borrowed from Aristotle, matter being the indeterminate element which is stamped with a definite character by the form. Thus, washing can be performed for various purposes; *e.g.* cleanliness, health, amusement, or devotion. But when the minister, as he sprinkles the water on the catechumen, adds the words, "I baptize thee," &c., the end and meaning of his action is apparent, and we have the three constituents of the sacrament—viz. the person of the minister, the washing with water, which is the matter, and the words, which are the form. The special difficulties about the matter and form of particular sacraments—*e.g.* Penance, Order, Marriage, &c.—have been discussed under these titles; but we may say in this place that theologians distinguish a double matter in the Eucharist. While the sacrament is being produced, the matter is bread and wine; after consecration the matter consists in the outward appearances or accidents of bread and wine. The difficulty arises from the fact that the Eucharist, unlike all the other sacraments, continues to exist after the words have been spoken. Its duration is not transitory but permanent, so long as the species last.

This terminology began with the Aristotelian or Scholastic theologians. It is unknown, says Juenin (diss. 1, cap. 2), not only to the Fathers, but to Lanfranc, Anselm, Bernard, Hugo of St. Victor, and Peter Lombard, all of whom wrote formal treatises on the sacraments, and it first appears in William of Auxerre about 1215. In early times, the "form" of a sacrament means

something quite different—viz. the whole rite. The Fathers commonly distinguish between the "sign," which includes both matter and form, and the invisible thing, between "things" and "words," and between the *sacramentum*, which includes all the outward part, and the *res sacramenti*, the invisible part. This last distinction is of capital moment for the right understanding of patristic texts.

The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the "substance" of the sacraments. This follows from the very nature of a sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent. How far the matter and the form were specifically, or only generically, determined by Christ is a difficult question (see *infra*, *The Author of the Sacraments*). The custom of the Church in different ages and countries shows that the form is not fixed in its particular words. It is often very hard to determine what change in the form would render the sacrament invalid. Common sense makes the decision turn to a great extent on the intention with which the change is made. Thus to baptize "in the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost and the Blessed Virgin," would always show gross ignorance or gross perversity; but if the intention were to baptize in the name of the Blessed Virgin, as if she were one of the divine Persons, or as if her name were operative in the sacrament, the baptism would be null (St. Thomas, 3ª, q. 60, a. 8).

We first hear of a conditional form ("I do not rebaptize thee, but if thou art not," &c.) in the Capitularies of Charlemagne (lib. vi. cap. 181, quoted by Juenin). The expediency of expressing a condition was not universally admitted till it was approved by Gregory IX. ("Extra. de Baptism." cap. 2, *apud eundem*). Till about 1600 the conditional form was only used in the three sacraments which imprint character (Juenin, i. a. 2). Even now it is not usual to express the condition in the other sacraments, and a sacrament must never be reiterated under condition, expressed or implied, unless the minister, after diligent examination, is unable to satisfy himself as to the validity of the previous act.

(4) *The Author of the Sacraments.*—The Council of Trent defines that the seven sacraments were all instituted by Christ Himself, and this for a reason already given. But the Council does not say that Christ instituted them directly and immediately. Some of the older Schoolmen held that some sacraments were instituted by the Apostles. Tournely quotes, for this opinion, Peter Lombard ("Sent." IV., dist. 23), Hugo of St. Victor ("De Sacr." ii. 2), St. Bonaventure ("In Lib. IV. Sent." ad dist. 17, a. 1, qu. 3), and Alexander of Hales ("Summa," p. iv. qu. 24, 1), the last of whom believed that Confirmation was instituted in 845 at the Council of Meaux. This last opinion must certainly be rejected. But although Tournely holds it to be "true and certain" that Christ immediately and directly instituted each of the sacraments, he by no means agrees with Becanus, Bellarmine, and Vasquez in accepting this as an article of faith, or considering that it is now heresy to attribute the institution of some sacraments to the Apostles, acting with power granted them by our Lord. He quotes, on his own side, these "most grave theologians" Sotus and Estius, the former of whom was a leading theologian at Trent. Indeed, Estius goes further than Tournely, for he is inclined to admit that something may be said for each opinion—that of St. Bonaventure and that common among Post-Tridentine theologians—though more for the latter ("ut aliquid probabilitatis habeat, majori tamen probabilitate diversae sententiae superatur"). Juenin likewise denies that the immediate institution by Christ is of faith. Billuart tends the other way, but speaks doubtfully. The question is admirably discussed by Pourrat, "La Théologie Sacramentaire," ch. vi. The excesses of the Modernists were condemned in the decree "Lamentabili," Props. 39–51; *e.g.* "The sacraments had their origin from the fact that the Apostles and their successors interpreted some idea and intention of Christ, under the influence of circumstances and events." (40).

(5) *The Minister of the Sacraments.*—Little need be said here about the personal holiness required in the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ. "Holy things are to be handled in a holy manner," and the minister is guilty of sacrilege if he confers the sacrament on others while he himself is at enmity with God. But at the same time the Church held against the Donatists that the validity of the sacraments does not depend on the worthiness of the minister, since in any case Christ is always present as the invisible dispenser of grace. A person may even be justified in seeking the sacraments from one whom he knows to be unworthy, if he cannot obtain them otherwise. Neither schism nor heresy deprives a man of the power of Holy Order (see ORDER, HOLY). But a great difficulty remains. The Council of Trent (sess. vii. De Sacr. can. 11) requires us to believe that the minister of the sacraments must have "the intention of doing that at least which the Church does." This definition has been the occasion of much controversy within and without the

Church. Protestants have attacked it as making the effect of the sacraments uncertain. Catholics have interpreted it variously.

Intention is "an act of the will, by which a man chooses a particular thing." This intention may be actual—*i.e.* present at the time; habitual—*i.e.* present as a rule in similar cases and never recalled, but not actually present, or even present in effect; virtual—*i.e.* once present and still surviving as the cause or motive of a man's acts. Thus, if I make up my mind to take a journey, my intention is actual; I set out and continue walking, though the purpose is not at the moment present to my mind, then my intention is virtual. I make up my mind to take a journey next day, and meantime go to bed; while I am asleep my intention is habitual. All theologians agree that at least a virtual intention is needed for the validity of the sacraments. St. Thomas, indeed, pronounces an habitual intention enough, but only because habitual meant then what virtual meant later.

So far all is plain. But what must the object of my intention be? Several answers are conceivable. The minister (α) may intend to perform the outward rite, but as an open mockery, or as children might do in play, actors on the stage, &c. (β) He may intend to perform the outward rite seriously. (γ) He may intend to confer the grace of the sacrament, to regenerate, *e.g.*, the child whom he baptizes, &c. The first and third solutions are inadmissible. A performance of the sacramental rite in open mockery is allowed by all to be invalid, and, on the other side, no one doubts that an infidel or a Calvinist can baptize, or, if he is a priest, can say Mass, anoint, &c., &c., validly. We will give the words of Tournely ("De Sacr." qu. vi. a. 1): "Whatever a man's opinion may be about the sacrament, its effect and end, or about the Church itself, whether he rejects all these things or admits them, makes no difference to the substance of the sacrament." "He need not intend to produce the effect of the sacrament, or to perform the rite of the Church as a sacrament, or to do what the Catholic and Roman Church does; it is enough that he should intend in some general way to do what the Church does, whatever his notion about the Church, the sacrament, its effect and object may be." Unless the Church held this, she would not, as she certainly does, recognize the validity of many sacraments given by heretics, infidels, and even pagans. Protestants sometimes urge that bishops have been secret infidels, Jews, &c., and that therefore on Catholic principles the orders and other sacraments given by them must have been invalid; but it is evident that they have utterly failed to grasp what the doctrine of intention, as held by any Catholic, is.

But is it enough for validity if the minister merely perform the external rite in a serious manner, even if internally he withhold his intention—*i.e.* even if from malice or impiety he says to himself, "I don't mean to act as the minister of the Church, I don't intend to baptize, consecrate, or the like, but merely to deceive the people"? We follow the opinion of those who answer in the affirmative, and we give our reply in the words of Bossuet ("Sententia Episcopi Meldensis, on the 'Cogitationes Privatae' of Leibnitz"). "It is a most common opinion among Catholics that the intention necessary for the validity of the sacraments consists in this—viz. the will on the part of the minister seriously to perform the rites prescribed by the Church, and to do nothing which is calculated to show a contrary intention, which intention he himself cannot make void by any secret intention whatsoever." This clear explanation removes, as we believe, every difficulty. The people are in no possible danger of deception. The serious performance of the exterior rite is all that is required. The difficulty that there is no mention of the necessity of intention in Scripture or tradition falls to the ground. The sacraments are to be given by men—by men acting, in St. Paul's words, as the ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. iv. 1). We only ask that they be given by conscious, human action. For example, in some Masses the words of consecration occur in the Gospel, while the bread and wine are on the altar. Will anyone maintain that the consecration takes place there and then? Does anyone suppose that the ancient Church thought so? Scarcely. Yet, if not, then the ancient Church admitted the whole doctrine of intention which every Catholic is bound to maintain.

This opinion which we have been defending was propounded by Catharinus, a Dominican theologian present at the very session in which the doctrine of intention was defined. Some time after the definition the work of Catharinus was reprinted at Rome in 1552 by Baldus, printer to the Apostolic Chamber. (So Tournely.) Cardinal Pallavicino, in his "History of the Council," ix. 6, allows that the Fathers of Trent did not suspect, much less condemn, the doctrine of Catharinus.[1] The great Jesuits Salmeron and Becanus, and the celebrated Dominican Contenson, espoused it. So in the last century did the learned Oratorian Juenin. It was defended in the Sorbonne in 1685 by Harlai, afterwards archbishop of Paris. We have seen how Bossuet speaks of it. It has never been censured by any competent authority, for a proposition condemned before Alexander VIII. by the Roman Inquisition in 1690 was, as Juenin shows, quite different. F. Ryder, in his book on "Catholic Controversy," admits

[1] The doctrine condemned, as Pallavicino shows, was that of Luther—viz. that a sacrament given in open mockery (*con modo apertamente beffatore e giocoso*) is valid.

that the question is still quite open, though he himself holds the contrary opinion. It is quite true that the majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament. Our objection to this, the common theory, is grounded on the fact that its advocates can adduce no proof from Scripture or tradition,[1] while we fail to see the force of the argument from reason. Reason no doubt requires us to look on the valid administration of the sacraments as a human act distinguished by the outward circumstances from possible combinations of the same words and acts which have no sacramental character. But this does not carry us beyond the opinion of Catharinus.[2] This question also is well discussed by Pourrat (op. cit. ch. vii.), and by Franzelin "De Sacramentis," thes. xvi., xvii.

(6) *The Subject or Recipient of the Sacraments.*—In order that they may be received with profit by adults, certain dispositions are indispensable. To the sacraments of the dead—*i.e.* Baptism and Penance—the recipient must come at least with faith and hope, sorrow for sin, and purpose of amendment; the sacraments of the living—*i.e.* the other five—must be received by those who are already in the grace and love of God, the living members of Christ.[3] Otherwise the sacraments only add to the condemnation of those who receive them. As regards mere validity, the sacrament of the Eucharist is always the same, in whatever state it is received, because in any case it remains the true Body and Blood of our Saviour. In order that the other sacraments may be valid, some intention is necessary on the part of the recipient as well as of the minister. But whereas the latter must have an actual or virtual intention, it suffices for the validity of Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, and Extreme Unction if they are received with an habitual or interpretative intention of accepting the rite of the Church. This is plain from decisions of early councils. For example, the First Council of Orange in 444 (c. 12) ordains that Baptism or Penance may be given to a man who has fallen into frenzy. At the time, he has no intention of receiving the sacrament, but he is to receive it, so the council directs, if others give "testimony to his past desire." There is a special difficulty, however, with regard to Penance, for many theologians, believing that sorrowful confession by word or other sensible sign is the matter of the sacrament, are obliged by their theory to hold that the actual presence of some such sign is always necessary for the validity of absolution. The Scotists, who make absolution both the form and matter of Penance, are able to consider the mere desire of absolution in the past enough, even if the penitent is unable to express it ever so indistinctly at the moment. Again, the mere purpose of living a Christian life involves the intention requisite for Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction. It is different with Matrimony and Holy Order, states of life the desire of which is no way implied in the general resolve to live like a Christian; and it is usually said that a definite desire is also needed for Penance (so Billuart, "De Sacr." diss. vi. a. 1). We have the same disputes here as in the previous section on the necessary object of the intention. The common opinion is that it must be an internal one of receiving the sacred rite; while Juenin thinks it likely that a man "who withheld his intention," and did but mean to submit to the rite with external seriousness, would still receive it validly. The whole doctrine of intention on the part of the recipient, interpret it as we will, is not without historical difficulties. History furnishes several instances in early times of men ordained, and supposed to be validly ordained, in spite of their struggles and resistance. Generally, it may be said that such persons did give a final, though reluctant, consent; and Augustine speaks ("Ad Donat." Ep. 173, PL, xxxiii. 753) of those who were made bishops after being imprisoned and severely handled, "until they consented to undertake a good work." No such explanation will fit the case of the hermit Macedonius, concerning whom Theodoret ("Hist. Relig." cap. 13) relates that he was ordained priest by the celebrated Flavian without the least knowledge of what was going on, and was furious when he learnt what had occurred. The only answer, so far as we can see, is to say that Flavian was mistaken, and the ordination good for nothing. It may be asked wherein does the validity of a sacrament consist if no inward grace accompanies the outward sign? We reply, first, that three sacraments confer character which is always bestowed, even if no grace accompany it; and, next, that Baptism certainly, Confirmation, Order, Marriage, Extreme Unction probably, confer grace which revives when the recipient enters into due dispositions, even if his malice impeded the grace at the time they were received. Some even suppose that this holds good of Penance, and a few of the Eucharist. (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral." vi., Tract. i. cap. 1.)

[1] Innocent III. is the earliest authority they quote. Their text from St. Paul certainly proves the necessity of intention, but only as Catharinus understood it. For a priest who behaves with exterior seriousness always acts as a minister of Christ.

[2] "When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the sacrament, he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does" (*Leo XIII., Apostolicae Curae*, on Anglican Orders).

[3] Accidentally, however, the sacraments of the living may restore a soul to the grace of God; *e.g.* if a person has attrition—*i.e.* sorrow—for his mortal sins, which is supernatural, but imperfect, and a firm purpose of amendment, believing erroneously, but in good faith, that he is already justified.

(7) *The Grace of the Sacraments* is twofold. They increase that sanctifying grace which is the supernatural life of the soul, and they bestow a sacramental grace—*i.e.* one which is special and singular, and proper to each sacrament. A person, *e.g.*, who receives Confirmation worthily obtains, besides the character and the increase of sanctity, a title to special assistance from God when he is tempted to forsake the faith, has occasion to confess it by word or deed, &c. The Thomist opinion is that the sacraments cause grace physically, which means, not, of course, that sensible things have power in themselves to produce it, but that they become instruments in the almighty hand of God. A brush is powerless to paint a picture, but it is the instrument of painting in the artist's hand. The Scotists look on the sacraments as merely moral causes of grace. When the outward signs are present and the other conditions fulfilled, then God, directly and without any instrumentality of the sacraments, infuses grace. Each opinion has found many advocates outside of the Thomist and Scotist schools.

(It would be vain to attempt a list of writers on the sacraments, which would be in fact a list of nearly all Catholic theologians. But we would call particular attention to the excellent work of the French Oratorian Juenin, "Commentarius Historicus et Dogmaticus de Sacramentis" [Lyons, 1717]. We have also derived great assistance from a learned treatise of the Protestant Hahn, "De Numero Sacramentorum Septenario Rationes Historicae" [Breslau, 1859]. The references, as the writer of this article knows by painful experience, are frequently inaccurate, and the general statements require sifting, but the work is one of learning and merit, and much may be learnt from it. Chardon's "Histoire des Sacrements" [Paris, 1745] has no treatise on the sacraments in general. But we take this opportunity of expressing our great obligations to this admirable work. Gibbon—we quote from memory—eulogizes it as containing all that can be known on the subject, and this praise is due. The author was one of the most learned men in the Benedictine Congregation of Vannes. A recent little work by Pourrat, "La Théologie Sacramentaire," is well worthy of study.)

SACRED HEART. [See HEART OF JESUS.]

SACRED HEART, CONGREGATIONS OF THE. There are various religious congregations under this title, *e.g.* (1) a society founded mainly by Père Varin in 1794 in imitation of the then suppressed Society of Jesus. A similar society founded by Baccanari, called the "Society of the Faith of Jesus" a little later, absorbed the former, and both were absorbed into the restored Society of Jesus in 1814. [See BACCANARISTS.]

(2) Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Issoudun). A congregation of priests and lay-brothers founded for the spread of devotion to the Sacred Heart, founded at Issoudun, in France, by Abbé Chevalier. It has houses in England and on the continent of Europe; but its chief energies have been devoted to foreign missions in N. America and Oceania.

(3) The Society of the Sacred Heart, commonly known as the "Dames du Sacré Cœur." This institute of religious women was founded at Paris in 1800 by Madeleine Sophie Barat. The two societies of priests mentioned in (1) recognized the importance of making some provision for the education of girls, and carrying on the work of the destroyed communities of nuns under the new conditions necessitated by the Revolution. Père Varin, who had become the superior of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart, drew up in conjunction with Mme. Barat the first plan of the institute. "The end of the association was the perfection of its members and the salvation of souls; the spirit aimed at detachment from the world, purity of intention for the glory of the Sacred Heart, gentleness, zeal, and obedience; the means, for the religious, the training of the novitiate and spiritual exercises; for others, boarding schools for the upper classes, free schools for the poor, and spiritual retreats. The rule in this preliminary stage was simple; the houses were to be under one superior-general; everything was to be in common; the office of the Blessed Virgin was to be recited; the time appointed for mental prayer was specified. The manner of life was to be simple, without the prescribed austerities of the older orders, which would be incompatible with the work of education" (Mme. Stuart). After some internal difficulties, which are the usual lot of great undertakings, the rule was further elaborated by Mme. Barat and Père Varin, and was formally approved of by Leo XII. in 1826. The attempt to bring the constitutions into closer conformity with those of the Society of Jesus was given a three years' trial, but, as Mme Barat had foreseen, it proved a failure. Gregory XVI. decided that the original constitution should be adhered to. Mme. Barat, who died in 1865, was declared "Venerable" in 1879, and "Blessed" by Pius X. on May 24, 1908. The Society, which has had a large share of persecution in France, Italy, and Germany has flourished exceedingly. Expelled from one country, it has migrated into another. At the present time it has 150 houses and 6500 religious; 27 houses and more than 1100 religious being in the United States. "Originally the plan of studies was more or less uniform in all the houses, but it has become necessary to modify it according to the needs and educational ideals of different countries and the

kind of life for which the pupils have to be prepared. The character of the education of the Sacred Heart, however, remains the same, based on the study of religion and of Christian philosophy, and laying particular stress on history, literature, essay-writing, modern languages, and such knowledge of household management as can be taught at school." (Janet Stuart in "Cath. Enc.," *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*; and also a separate work, "The Society of the Sacred Heart"; an anonymous "Life of Ven. Madeleine Louise Sophie Barat," Roehampton, 1908.)

SACRIFICE. In this article we confine ourselves to the theological notion of Sacrifice, without going into its Biblical history. Sacrifice is an act of external worship in which God is honoured as the Principle and End of man and all things, by the oblation of a visible creature, by submitting it to an appropriate transformation by a duly qualified minister. The term sacrifice is also (metaphorically) applied to internal acts by which man devotes himself to the service of God through either "reforming or giving up his life" for Him. No external sacrifice is perfect without such internal acts, whereby the soul associates itself with the meaning and object of the external rite. This object is that of practical religion in general, viz. practically to recognize and profess our dependence on God as regards our existence and our ultimate happiness. Some post-Tridentine theologians have narrowed the idea of sacrifice into the expression of God's dominion over life and death, or of the Divine Majesty as exalted above all, and its primary object into atonement for sin. Likewise, the external form of sacrifice—an appropriate transformation of the creature offered—has been limited by Vasquez and his followers to a "transformation by destruction." Neither historical nor doctrinal grounds can justify these limitations, unknown to the Fathers and earlier theologians. (See St. Augustine, "De Civ. Dei," x. c. 6, PL, xli. 283: "Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut *sancta societate inhaereamus Deo*," &c., St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 85, and the collection of definitions in Tanner in 2^{am} 2^{ae}, disp. v. q. 3, dub. 1.) The burning of incense, *θυσία*, which has furnished the Greek name for all sacrifices, is not so much a destruction of the incense as its conversion into "an odour of sweetness," the symbol of the soul transformed by the fire of divine charity. In the sacrifice of the Mass, "the immutatio," as the Fathers technically call the sacrificial act, is not the destruction but the production of the victim. (See Scheeben, "Dogmatik," book v. n. 1425 *seq.*; Schanz, "Die Lehre von den H. Sakramenten," § 35; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Man. of Theol." ii. p. 449.)

A lawfully appointed minister is necessary for public sacrifice in the name of the people. If the sacrifice is to have a peculiar dignity and efficacy as oblation and as action, viz. if it is to be more than the most expressive act of external worship and of man's earnest desire of sanctification, a consecrated minister is required. Both as gift and as action, the value of the sacrifice is measured by the personal dignity of the sacrificer. Hence, in the Mosaic dispensation, the hierarchical or lay priesthood of the sacrificer elevated the sacrifices to the dignity of sacrifices of the covenant; under the Christian dispensation, individual self-sacrifice and the public sacrifice derive supernatural efficacy and dignity from the supernatural character of the Christian layman or priest. Sacerdotal and hierarchical consecration are especially necessary to the minister of a sacrifice which is an objective and efficacious means of sanctification, a perfect sacrifice of the covenant between God and His people and a vehicle of sanctifying grace: here the sacrificer must possess a holy power in addition to his holy dignity, a power that enables him to act in the name and power of God, and to be a principle of sanctification to those on whose behalf he acts. There exists, then, between perfect public sacrifice and priesthood a relation of interdependence: without the priesthood there *is neither* a true nor a perfect sacrifice. Acts which may be, or actually have been, sacrifices, cease to be such when withdrawn by God from public cultus (*e.g.* sacrifices of animals in the New Testament), or when deprived of their sacrificial efficacy (*e.g.* the burning of incense). In the former case the act ceases to be a holy act; in the latter, it still is holy, but only retains a distant analogy with real sacrifice; it is used as a ceremony. (See EUCHARIST, p. 323; REDEMPTION; MASS; the dogmatic theologians in their treatises "De Incarnatione" and "De Eucharistia." The question of the theory of sacrifice was discussed at length in the "American Eccl. Review," 1905–6; the "*destruction*" *theory* is urged with much force by Franzelin, "De Eucharistia," thes. xvi.)

SACRILEGE. The violation of a sacred object. A thing is called sacred from the fact that it is set apart for the service of God; it thereby becomes in a sense divine, and has a right to be held in honour. Any irreverence to it is an injury to God, to whom it belongs. The sin of sacrilege, therefore, is opposed to the virtue of religion. It may be of three kinds, Personal, Local, and Real, according as the object violated is a sacred person, place, or thing. Instances of personal sacrilege are: laying violent hands on a cleric, summoning him before a secular tribunal, having immoral intercourse with a cleric in sacred orders or anyone bound by a vow of chastity. [See PRIVILEGE.] Local sacrilege is committed by certain profane,

violent, or immoral acts committed in churches, cemeteries, &c. [See DESECRATION OF CHURCHES, &c.] To administer or receive the sacraments unworthily, to turn the sacred vessels (*e.g.* chalice, ciborium, pyx) to profane uses, would be cases of real sacrilege. Formerly the civil law inflicted the penalty of death on those guilty of sacrilege. The Church still inflicts grave spiritual censures for the various kinds of sacrilege. (See the constitution, *Apostolicae Sedis*; St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 99.)

SACRISTY. [See DIACONICUM.]

SAINT. [See CANONIZATION.]

SAINTE UNION DES SACRÉS CŒURS. [See UNION, LA SAINTE.]

SAINTS, INTERCESSION AND INVOCATION OF. The Council of Trent (sess. xxv. De Invoc. Sanct.) teaches that "the saints reigning with Christ offer their prayers for men to God; that it is good and useful to call upon them with supplication, and, in order to obtain benefits from God through Jesus Christ, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour, to have recourse to their prayers, help, and aid." The prayer which we may address to the saints is of course wholly different from that which we offer to God or Christ. "We pray God Himself," says the Roman Catechism (p. iv. ch. 6) "to give good or free us from evil things; we ask the saints, because they enjoy God's favour, to undertake our patronage and obtain from God the things we need. Hence we employ two forms of prayer, differing in the mode [of address]; for to God we say properly, Have mercy on us, Hear us; to the saints, Pray for us." Or, if we ask the Blessed Virgin or the saints to have pity on us, we only beseech them to think of our misery, and to help us "by their favour with God and their intercession"; and "the greatest care must be taken by all not to attribute what belongs to God to any other" ("Cat. Rom." *ib.*). Two points, then, are involved in the Catholic doctrine —the intercession of the saints and the utility of invoking them.

(1) *Intercession of the Saints.*—The whole of the New Testament enforces the principle that we are members of Christ, and so bound to each other as members of the same body (see, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xii. 12 *seq.*). God might, had it pleased Him, have made us solely and directly dependent on Himself, but He has chosen to display His own power by giving great efficacy to the intercession of the just (James v. 16). He taught us to go to Him with the wants of others as well as with our own, and He has deepened charity and humility by making us dependent to some extent on the prayers of others. Everybody knows the store St. Paul set on the prayers of his fellow-Christians (Eph. vi. 18, 19; 1 Tim. ii. 1). Prayer even for enemies was a duty enjoined by Christ Himself (Mt. v. 44). Now, it is hard to imagine a reason why souls which have gone to God should cease to exercise this kind of charity and to intercede for their brethren. The Old Testament plainly asserts the intercession of angels, as has been proved already [see MEDIATOR], and it seems at least to imply the intercession of departed saints in Jerem. xv. 1; and undoubtedly the later Jews believed in the merits and intercession of the saints of Israel (Weber, "Altsynagog. Theol." p. 314). We find an explicit statement of the doctrine just where we should reasonably expect it. The Apocalypse was written later at least than the death of Nero (June 9, A.D. 68), and the writer is filled with the thought of his martyred brethren who had gone before him to God. He believes that they still sympathise with and intercede for those whom they had left behind. "I saw beneath the altar the souls of them that were slain because of the word of God and the witness which they had, and they cried with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And there was given to each of them a white robe, and they were told to rest a little, until their fellow-servants and their brethren be completed [in number," or else, according to the reading *συμπληρώσωσιν*, complete the number] "who are to be killed even as they" (vi. 9 *seq.*). So again, in v. 8 (cf. viii. 3), the elders before the heavenly altar are represented as falling "before the Lamb, having each a harp and golden vials full of perfumes, which are the prayers of the saints." It matters nothing for our present purpose whether the "saints" mentioned were or were not still on earth. In either case their prayers are offered to God by the elders in heaven, so that the imagery implies that the saints before God offer up our prayers and so help us by their intercession.

But, if Scripture were silent, tradition witnesses to the doctrine so universally and so constantly as to remove all doubt of its Apostolic origin. The genuine "Acts" of the early Martyrs abound in testimonies. Thus, the contemporaries of St. Ignatius, St. John's disciple, tell us that some saw the martyr in vision after death "praying for us" ("Act. Mart." 7). The "Acts" of the Martyrs of Scilla (*anno* 202) speak of them as interceding after death before our Lord (Ruinart, "Act. Mart." ed. Ratisb. p. 132). Theodotus, before his death, says: "In heaven I will confidently pray for you to God" (*ib.* p. 384). "Pious men" built the Martyrium of Trypho and Respicius, "commending their souls to the holy patronage of the blessed martyrs" (*ib.* p. 210). Fresh evidence comes from the early Fathers. Cyprian, writing to Cornelius (Ep. lx. 5, ed. Hartel, p. 695), thus exhorts those who may be martyred first: "Let our love before God endure; let not our prayer to the

Father's mercy cease for our brethren and sisters" (see also "De Habit. Virg." 24, p. 205). Origen ("In Cantic." lib. iii. p. 75, ed. Bened.) thinks it no "unfitting" interpretation of a passage in the Canticles if we take it to mean that "all the saints who have departed this life care for the salvation of those who are in the world, and help them by their prayers and mediation [*interventu*] with God." It is useless to add passages from later Fathers. A long list of them will be found in Petavius ("De Incarn." lib. xiv. cap. 10).

(2) *Invocation of the Saints.*—If it is the will of God that the saints should help us on the road to heaven by their prayers, we may be sure that He makes the communion between the Church militant and the Church triumphant perfect on both sides; that He enables us to speak to them in order that they may speak for us. Our Saviour tells us that the angels rejoice over repentant sinners (Lk. xv. 7), and a passage already cited from the Apocalypse shows that the martyrs in heaven are aware of what happens on earth. The inscriptions in the Catacombs recently brought to light witness to the confidence with which the Church invoked the prayers of departed saints. We select a few instances from those given by De Rossi (in the "Triplice Omaggio" and "Collection of Epitaphs," as quoted in Kraus, "Real-Encycl." art. *Gebet*): "Ask for us in thy prayers, because we know thou art in Christ" (n. 15); "Beseech for thy sister" (n. 19); "We commend to thee, O holy [*Domina*] Basilla Crescentius and Micena, our daughter" (n. 17). The great Fathers of the fourth century directly invoke and bid others invoke the saints. St. Gregory Nazianzen begs a martyr, St. Cyprian, to "look down from heaven upon him with kindly eye, and to direct his discourse and his life" (Orat. xxiv. *ad fin.*, PG, xxxv. 1193). So he invokes his friend St. Basil (Orat. xliv. *ad fin.*). St. Gregory Nyssen, fearing the Scythian invasion, attributes past preservation to the martyr, and not only invokes him, but begs him in turn to invoke greater saints, Peter, Paul, and John (Orat. in S. Theodor., PG, xlvi. 746). St. Ambrose ("De Vid." cap. 9, n. 55, PL, xvi. 251) exhorts Christians to supplicate (*obsecrandi*) their guardian angels and the martyrs, especially those whose relics they possess. "Let us not only on this feast day but on other days also keep near them; let us beg them to be our patrons," are the words of St. Chrysostom on the martyrs Berenice and Prodoce. In his verses the early Christian poet Prudentius habitually invokes the saints; and St. Augustine (Serm. 324, PL, xxxix. 1447) tells a story to his people of a woman who prayed to St. Stephen for her dead son, "Holy martyr . . . give me back my son," and was rewarded by the miracle she asked. It must be remembered that these passages are but samples out of many which might be adduced. They come to us from every part of the Christian world, and the devotion which they attest cannot have sprung up as if by magic at once and in every quarter. We may add that then, as now, Catholics were charged with idolatry because they venerated the saints. Such accusations were made by the heathen generally, and in particular by Julian the Apostate, by the Manicheans, Eunomians (extreme Arians), by Vigilantius, &c. (See Petavius, "De Incarnat." xiv. 14.) St. Augustine's reply is well known—viz. that the sacrifice of the Mass and supreme worship of every kind was offered, not to the martyrs, but to God, who "crowned the martyrs" (so, *e.g.*, "Contr. Faust." lib. xx. cap. 21, PL, xlii. 384).

The fact that the saints hear our prayers was held by the Fathers as certain; the way in which they do so is a matter of philosophical or theological speculation, about which neither they nor we have any certainty. In some way, unknown to us, God reveals to them the needs and prayers of their clients, and Petavius warns us against curious speculation on the matter. The very uncertainty of the Fathers on this point throws into relief their unshaken confidence in the intercession of the saints and the advantage of invoking them. Augustine, Jerome, and others suggest that sometimes departed saints may actually be near those who are calling on them. Modern theologians have generally thought that the blessed beholding God see in Him, as in a mirror, all which it concerns them to know of earthly things. Whatever theory we adopt, the knowledge of the saints depends entirely on the gift of God. We should be idolaters indeed were we to think of them as omnipresent or omniscient.

An account has been given of the institution of the Feasts of the Saints in a previous article [FEASTS]. The devotion of the Church has turned chiefly to the saints who died after Christ. The ancient liturgies do indeed commemorate the Patriarchs and prophets. Abel, Melchisedec, and Abraham are mentioned in the Roman Mass, and more than a score of Old Testament saints in the Roman Martyrology. Abel and Abraham are invoked by name in the Litany for the Dying prescribed in the Roman Ritual. The list of feasts given by Manuel Comnenus mentions one feast of an O.T. saint, that of Elias; but the Church of Jerusalem had many such feasts, and at Constantinople churches were dedicated to Elias, Isaias, Job, Samuel, Moses, Zacharias, and Abraham. But the Maccabees are the only O.T. saints to whom the Latin Church has assigned a feast.[1] The reason, as Thomassin thinks,

[1] *I.e.* a feast kept by the whole Church; for the Carmelites keep the feast of St. Elias, and, *e.g.* at Venice, there are churches dedicated to Moses, Job, &c.

for the exception is that the mode of their martyrdom so closely resembled that of the Christian martyrs, and that their date was so near to the Christian period. (The chief authority followed has been Petavius, "De Incarnat." lib. xiv., which treats the subject exhaustively, and for the last paragraph Thomassin's "Traité des Festes," lib. i. ch. 9).

SALESIAN SOCIETY. This religious institute was founded by Don Bosco (d. 1886) under the patronage of St. Francis of Sales. Its object is "the Christian perfection of its associates, obtained by the exercise of spiritual and corporal works of charity towards the young, especially the poor, and the education of boys for the priesthood." The founder's aim was to promote confidence and love among the children, instead of fear and hatred. His system and institute have had extraordinary success. The Society possesses more than 300 houses, and has found its way into almost every country. The Salesian "Bulletin" is issued in eight different languages. The rule and constitutions were approved by Pius IX. in 1874. "The main work of the institute is the education and training of boys, divided into two classes, students and artisans. The second branch is the missionary one, and finds its scope principally in South America and Asia. The third branch is engaged in the education of adults for the priesthood, and the fourth is occupied in the diffusion of good Catholic literature." (Marsh in "Cath. Enc."; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongregationen.")

SALT. [See BAPTISM.]

SALVE, REGINA. The antiphon said after Lauds and Compline from Trinity Sunday to Advent. Some, with Durandus, ascribe its composition to Peter of Compostella in the tenth century, but Cardinal Bona, with better reason, attributes it to Hermannus Contractus, a Benedictine monk of the eleventh century. St. Bernard, according to the Chronicle of Spires, added the last clause, "O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria." Gregory IX., in 1239, is said to have ordered the recitation of the "Salve" after Compline, and it is certain that the four antiphons of the Blessed Virgin now in use among us were said daily by the Franciscans after Compline as early as 1249. "But even the 'Salve, Regina,' which was the earliest antiphon of the Blessed Virgin commonly recited in the Church, did not find a place in the Breviary till it was put there by Cardinal Quignon, and was thence transferred to the Roman Breviary of Pius V." (Probst, "Brevier und Breviergebet," p. 134). (See Henry in "Cath. Enc."; Julian, "Dictionary of Hymnology"; Thurston, "Month," 1901, 1905, 1916, where he traces our modern Benediction service to the singing of the "Salve" (*Salut*); see BENEDICTION.)

SANCTUARY. 1. The part of the church round the high altar reserved for clergy. Eusebius ("H.E." x. 5) speaks of the altar in the church built by Constantine at Tyre as enclosed with wooden rails. In ancient times, says Morinus ("De Pen." vi. c. 1, n. 10), both the Latin and Greek churches were divided into two parts, the atrium, or court for the laity, and the sanctuary (called by the Greeks *ἱερατεῖον*, but most commonly *βῆμα*, from its raised position, also *ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων*, *ἄδυτα*, *ἱλαστήριον*, *ἀνάκτορον*; by the Latins *presbyterium, tribuna, sanctum*) for bishop, priests, and deacons. The porch, or *νάρθηξ*, is not mentioned till 500 years after Christ. [See NARTHEX.] The Latin word *sanctuarium* occurs in the thirteenth capitulum of the Second Council of Braga, in 563, which forbids any lay person to enter the sanctuary for the reception of communion. (Le Brun, tom. iii. diss. i. a. viii.) Another name is "chancel" [*q.v.*].

2. The name of sanctuary is also applied to a church or other holy precinct, to which, in the Middle Ages, a criminal or a fugitive from secular justice might resort and find immunity [ASYLUM]. The degree of this immunity varied at different times and under different circumstances. The most ancient and famous sanctuary in England was that of Beverley, the immunities of which originated in a grant by Athelstan to St. John of Beverley, after returning from his victory over the Danes at Brunanburg (937). Under the grant the limits of sanctuary extended for a mile around the town, and were marked out by four crosses, of three of which there are still some remains. Violent and arbitrary men often strove to break through or disregard the immunity. "The *pax* of this dead man" [St. Cuthbert], said Barewith,[1] one of Earl Tosti's soldiers, "ought not to be observed so strictly, that thieves, robbers, and murderers, if they flee to his shrine, should triumph over us and escape without punishment." Bury St. Edmund's was also a famous sanctuary; see a story in the work of Hermannus ("Mem. of St. Edmund," i. 31, Rolls series) about the breach of sanctuary attempted by Sheriff Leofstan, about A.D. 1000, and its immediate punishment. In London the precinct on the south side of Fleet Street, where had stood the monastery of the White Friars (Carmelites), retained the privilege of sanctuary long after the Reformation. Debtors, swindlers, and worse criminals frequented it; it was known by the cant name of Alsatia (see Scott's "Fortunes of Nigel"; Stephen, "Commentaries," iv. p. 263, ed. 8).

SANCTUS, THE, also known as the Tersanctus, as the angelic hymn among the Latins, as the triumphal hymn (*ἐπινίκιος ὕμνος*) among the Greeks, forms the conclusion of the Preface in all the liturgies. It is composed of the words, "Holy, holy;

[1] Sim. Dun. i. 244.

holy, Lord God of Sabaoth," from Is. vi., and a fragment of Ps. cxvii. 26 (Heb. cxviii.), "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest" (Mt. xxi. 9). In the Roman rite, except in the Pontifical chapel and during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, a small bell is here rung. But Benedict XIV. says he could not discover when this custom began. It is to be observed that the Missal here follows the old Latin version, which retained the word Sabaoth, while the Vulgate has *exercituum*. This, no doubt, is the right translation, but scholars are not agreed as to the original reference. Ewald believes the reference is to the armies of angels (Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2; 1 Kings [3 Reg.] xxii. 19, "the camp of God"; Gen. xxxii. 2). Schrader suggests, which is very unlikely, that the hosts of Israel are intended; while, probably, the opinion of many other critics, Kuenen, Baudessin, Tiele, Delitzsch, is the right one—viz. that the original reference was to the stars. These are constantly spoken of as the "host of heaven," and in Is. xl. 26 as the host which God musters. The title never occurs in the Pentateuch, Josue, or Judges. But it is constantly employed in the historical books from Samuel onwards, in Psalms, in the Prophets, but not in Osee, Ezechiel, or in Micheas, except iv. 1–4. (See Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 320, where he traces the early history of the practice of singing the words at this point of the Mass; on the other hand Cabrol, "Les Origines Liturgiques," p. 329, says: "Le Sanctus . . . n'est pas dans la liturgie d'une origine primitive, et sa place à la fin de la préface n'est pas non plus primitive.")

SANDALS form part of the bishop's liturgical dress. The fact is interesting, as one of many proofs that Church vestments are derived from the dress of daily life, and had originally no connection with the garb of Jewish priests, who officiated barefoot.

Sandals are first mentioned as part of the liturgical dress by Amalarius of Metz ("De Eccl. Offic." i. 25 and 26). He distinguishes between the sandals of the bishop, which were fastened with thongs, because he had to travel, and those of priests. The deacon's sandals were the same as those of the bishop, whom he had to accompany; those of the subdeacons were again distinct. Rabanus Maurus is the next to mention sandals ("De Cleric. Institut." i. 22); he sees a reference to them in Mk. vi. 9, Ephes. vi. 15, and, as they covered the under but not the upper part of the foot, he sees here a symbol of the teacher's duty of revealing the Gospel to the faithful and concealing it from infidels. Pseudo-Alcuin in the tenth century ("De Div. Offic." 39) copies the authors just named. On the other hand, Hugo of St. Victor ("De Sacram." ii. iv. 14), Innocent III. ("De Altaris Myster." i. 10, 34, 48), and Honorius of Autun ("Gemma Animae," i. 210) show that in their time the sandals of bishops only, not of priests, belonged to the liturgical dress, as is the case still. Innocent mentions the stockings[1] of bishops (*caligae*, also *tibialia*), which since the twelfth century have been of silk. (Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii. p. 219 *seq.*; Rock, ii. 194–208; Braun in "Cath. Enc." and "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 384 *sqq.*)

SARDICA, THE COUNCIL OF, was summoned, as the members of the synod expressly state, by the two emperors Constans and Constantius (*αὐτοὶ οἱ εὐσεβέστατοι βασιλεῖς συνήγαγον ἡμᾶς*—apud Athanas. "Apol. contr. Arian." 44, PG, xxv. 324). The wish for the convocation of the synod began on the part of the bishops Julius of Rome, Hosius of Cordova, and Maximin of Treves. They addressed themselves to Constans, and he arranged matters with his brother (Athanas. "Apol. ad Constant." 4, PG, ib. 600). The date of meeting was long a subject of debate, but the discovery of the Paschal letters of Athanasius in a Syriac translation (first published by Cureton, London, 1852) makes it certain that the synod was held either in 343 or 344. Hefele ("Concil." i. 535) was in favour of the latter date, but his editor Leclercq is in favour of the former (i. 740, note). The place of meeting—Sardica, now Sofia in Bulgaria—lay conveniently on the borders of the two empires. The synod gives three reasons for its convocation: first, the troubles which had arisen from the persecution of orthodox bishops, particularly Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, Asclepas of Gaza; next, the extirpation of the Arian heresy; and, thirdly, the restoration of true faith in Christ (see the letter quoted above, and a slight variation in the statement, Mansi, "Concil." iii. 40). The bishops of the Eusebian or Arianizing party numbered 76, those of the Catholic party 94 (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 746). Julius, bishop of Rome, was represented by the priests Archidamus and Philoxenius; but it was Hosius, bishop of Cordova, who presided (Athanas. "Hist. Arian. ad Monach." iv. 16, *ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἧς προήγορος ἦν ὁ μέγας Ὅσιος*; also Theodor. "H.E." ii. 15; Sozom. iii. 12). In the list given by Athanasius ("Apol. contra Arian." 50, PG, xxv. 712) the Roman priests sign immediately after Hosius. The Eusebians, finding the majority favourable to Athanasius, Marcellus, and the other bishops incriminated by them, withdrew to the neighbouring city of Philippopolis, whence they addressed a letter to the clergy of Christendom. In this they repeat their accusations against Marcellus, Athanasius, Paul of Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza, and the bishops generally who were assembled at Sardica. They append a semi-Arian creed, which is nearly identical with

[1] So Hefele understands the term.

that known as the fourth formula of Antioch. It omits the ὁμοούσιος, which was the test of orthodoxy, and at the same time anathematizes the Anomoeans or strict Arians. The Eusebians claimed to be the true synod of Sardica. The text of their encyclical is given by St. Hilary of Poitiers (Fragm. iii. p. 1307–1326).

Meanwhile, the orthodox bishops were left to pursue their work in peace. After investigation, they acquitted Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas, &c., and anathematized the Eusebian leaders, Theodore of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias, Acacius of Caesarea, Stephen of Antioch, Ursacius of Singodunum, Valens of Mursia, Menophantes of Ephesus, and George of Laodicea.

Next, dogma came directly under consideration, and some proposed that the synod should issue a new Creed. It was ruled, however, that no addition should be made to the Nicene symbol (Athanas. "Tom. ad Antioch." 5). The Sardican Creed, therefore, given by Theodoret ("H.E." ii. 8) cannot be genuine, though the Ballerini conjecture (edition of St. Leo, tom. iii. p. xxxix.), with great probability, that this Creed, a translation of which is given in the Latin acts of the council discovered by Maffei, was actually put forward and approved by some of the Fathers.

Lastly, the council passed a number of canons for the regulation of discipline. Canons 1 and 2 forbid the translation of bishops. Canon 3 forbids bishops to ordain or perform other spiritual acts out of their own diocese, except when called upon to do so by the metropolitan and bishops of the provinces. Charges against a bishop are to be judged by the bishops of the province. Then follow decrees concerning appeal to Rome, which have been the subject of eager controversy. At the end of canon 3, already quoted, the council supposes the case of a bishop who has been condemned by the bishops of his province, and still pleads innocence: It proceeds: "If it seems good to your charity, let us honour the memory of Peter the Apostle." Hefele-Leclercq (i. 775) give the following summary of the council's determinations on this right of appeal to Rome:—

(1) A bishop deposed by his comprovincials may appeal to the Pope personally (canon 5), or through the court of first instance—viz. the comprovincial bishops who have condemned him (canon 3).

(2) Rome may confirm the former sentence or appoint a court of second instance (canon 3).

(3) This latter court is to consist of bishops from another, and that a neighbouring, province (canons 3 and 5).

(4) The Pope may appoint legates to act as assessors and to preside (canon 5).

(5) If a bishop appeals to the Pope, his see is not to be filled up till Rome has either confirmed the original sentence or referred the matter to a court of second instance (canon 4). Of course, in the latter case no step could be taken till the cause had been tried a second time.

In many copies the Sardican canons were appended to, and so confused with, those of the first Nicene council. It was this, in all probability, which led Pope Zosimus, in his dispute with the African bishops, to allege a Nicene canon which recognized the Pope's right of re-examining the cause of a bishop condemned by his colleagues. And, acting on this principle, he received the appeal of the priest Apiarius of Sicca, who had been condemned in his own country (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 504). The African prelates replied that they could not find the canon in question; and, in fact, even the Sardican canon does not contemplate appeals from priests. It was not till the ninth century, in the controversy with Hincmar of Rheims, that the Sardican rule underwent essential alteration, so that all charges involving the deposition of bishops were reserved to Rome as *causae majores*, even in the first instance. This latter principle found complete expression in the forged decretals (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 776).[1]

Canons 7, 8, 9 restrict, and in great measure prohibit, the visits of bishops to the Imperial Court. Canon 10 forbids episcopal consecration *per saltum*. Canons 11 and 12 enforce episcopal residence, and forbid a bishop to officiate in a strange diocese. Canons 13 and 14 forbid one bishop to restore a cleric whom another bishop has excommunicated, but permit the cleric to appeal to the metropolitan or, in his absence, to the nearest bishop. Here the Latin text inserts a canon which forbids a bishop to ordain for his own diocese a cleric who is subject to another bishop. Canon 16: clerics, like bishops (see above, canon 11), must not be absent from their diocese more than three weeks. Canon 17: only if unjustly expelled from his see may a bishop remain in a strange city Canons 18 and 19 concern the strife for the bishopric at Thessalonica and the quarrels that had arisen thence. Canon 20 enforces the previous canons (7, 8, 9) on episcopal visits to the Court, and gives a certain control over travelling bishops to the prelates of the sees on the great roads.

Three additional documents of importance are still extant: the first an encyclical to all Christian bishops; the second a letter to the Church of Alexandria, declaring the innocence of Athanasius; the third a letter to Julius, bishop of Rome, recognizing his

[1] The Carthaginian synod of 424 A.D. rejected appeals to Rome as infringing the rights of the African Church (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 214). Yet Popes Celestine and Leo the Great and the 12th Synod of Toledo make the same confusion between Nicaea and Sardica (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 821).

reasons for absence and giving him an account of the proceedings.

By some historians and critics, viz. Baronius, Natalis Alexander, the Ballerini, and Palma, the Council of Sardica has been considered oecumenical. No doubt it was convoked as an oecumenical council. Moreover, its canons were approved by the council in Trullo, and received, according to Pope Nicolas I., by the whole Church (see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 822). This latter fact, however, proves nothing, since the disciplinary enactments of many other councils —*e.g.* of Ancyra and Neocaesarea—were generally received. On the other side it is to be remembered that, although the episcopate of East and West was summoned, scarcely any Eastern bishops were actually present at the deliberations. This might have been compensated by subsequent subscription of the decrees on the part of absent bishops. But, although the decrees were transmitted through Christendom, only about 200 absent bishops signed, of whom ninety-four were Egyptians. No single ancient authority speaks of the council as oecumenical. St. Augustine ("Contr. Crescon." iii. 34, iv. 44, PL, xliii. 516; Ep. 44 ad Eleus. 3) did not even know that an orthodox synod had met at Sardica. Gregory the Great ("Epist." lib. iii. Ep. 10, PL, lxxvii. 613) and Isidore of Seville ("Etymolog." vi. 16) recognize four General Councils only, viz. Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. These are the chief reasons which have constrained Bellarmine, De Marca, Tillemont, Fleury, Du-Pin, Ceillier, Neander, and many other scholars, to deny Sardica a place among the General Councils. (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 737 *sqq.*; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de L'Eglise," ii. 215 *sqq.*)

SARUM USE. [See LITURGIES, p. 526.]

SATAN. [See DEVIL.]

SATISFACTION. [See PENANCE (4).]

SATURDAY. [See ABSTINENCE and LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.]

SCALA SANTA (Holy Stairs). Twenty-eight marble steps, said to have belonged to Pilate's palace at Jerusalem (the *praetorium* of Jn. xviii. 28), up and down which Christ passed. Like other relics of the Passion, now in Rome, they are said to have been brought by St. Helen, mother of Constantine the Great. Since the time of Clement XII. they have been cased in wood. It is a pious practice of the faithful to ascend them on their knees, at the same time praying and meditating on the Passion. Pius VII. granted an indulgence of nine years for each step, and Pius X. a plenary indulgence as often as the ascent is made after confession and communion.

The history of the Holy Stairs is obscure. De Montault challenges the rather dubious utterances of the Popes, from Sergius I. to Gregory IX. (1227–1241), cited by Benedict XIV. in favour of the traditional story. He also rejects (and Duchesne agrees with him) the appeal to two passages in the "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, i. 502, ii. 91) neither of which connects the steps with Pilate or our Lord. His opinion is summed up in the words: "L'antiquité est complètement muette au sujet de l'origine, du transport et de l'installation de la *Scala Santa*. Le moyen âge est, sinon aussi silencieux, au moins fort obscur à cet endroit" ("Œuvres," i. 505). "The approval of the Holy See," says Father Thurston, "which may be accorded from time to time to such popular devotions as that of the *Scala Santa*, does not involve any infallible pronouncement upon a question of pure history. It implies that reasonable care has been taken to exclude fraud or the probability of error; but that such care is necessarily proportioned to the canons of historical criticism prevalent at the period at which the approbation was first granted." ("Holy Year of Jubilee," p. 185 *sqq.*; Moroni, "Dizionario," lxii. 55 *sqq.*)

SCANDAL (*σκάνδαλον*, "the spring of a trap, the stick which sprang up when the trap was shut, and on which the bait was placed," Skeat). The word is used in English in quite a different sense from the theological meaning. Here we speak only of the latter, which is indeed more in accordance with the etymological and Scriptural sense (Mt. xviii. 6 *sqq.*)

Scandal, according to St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 43, a. 1), is any evil word or deed which is the occasion of sin to another. It may be direct, *i.e.* foreseen and intended; or indirect, *i.e.* foreseen, but not intended. "There is a twofold malice in sins of direct scandal; such sins are against charity and also against the special virtue which he who suffers scandal violates. So that, when A incites B to drink to excess, A sins against charity and against temperance" (Slater, "Moral Theol." i. 199). Another distinction is that between active and passive scandal; the former being given, the latter taken but not given. This latter may again be divided into pharisaical scandal, where the malice of another makes mischief out of what is harmless, and "scandalum pusillorum," where human frailty takes occasion of sin from the same cause. Thus, to some persons the mere sight of a beautiful woman may suggest dangerous thoughts.

How far we are answerable for the sins of others is a difficult question to solve, and moral theologians devote many pages to it in their treatises on charity, and also on the sixth commandment, which is frequently broken through scandal. It is well to be on one's guard against extreme views expressed in sermons by pulpit orators. St. Alphonsus himself, who was both a great preacher and a great theologian, acknowledges that in his former capacity he

had sometimes been too severe. "In the exercise of my duty as a preacher," he says, "I have spoken strongly against (a certain practice); but now as a writer on moral theology I must say what I really (*juxta veritatem*) think of the matter, and what I have learnt from the authors" ("Theol. Mor." ii. n. 55). St. Thomas's treatment is based upon sound reason and common sense. In $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, qq. 168, 169, he deals with the subject of modesty in action and dress, avoiding both dangerous laxity on the one hand, and over-scrupulosity on the other. (See Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. 165 *sqq.*; Slater, "Moral Theol." i. 198.)

SCAPULAR (from *scapulae*, shoulder). A dress which covers the shoulders. It is mentioned in the rule of St. Benedict as worn by monks over their other dress when they were at work, and it now forms a regular part of the religious dress in the old orders. But it is best known among Catholics as the name of two little pieces of cloth worn out of devotion over the shoulders, under the ordinary garb, and connected by cords.

It was through the Carmelites that this devotion began, and the following is the account given of its origin: The Blessed Virgin appeared at Cambridge to Simon Stock, general of the Carmelite order, when it was in great trouble. She gave him a scapular which she bore in her hand, in order that by it "the holy [Carmelite] order might be known and protected from the evils which assailed it," and added, "This will be the privilege for you and for all Carmelites; no one dying in this scapular will suffer eternal burning." Another apparition is related by John XXII. in the famous Sabbatine bull. The Blessed Virgin, he says, appeared to him, and, speaking of the Carmelites and those associated to them by wearing the scapular, promised that, if any of them went to Purgatory, she herself would descend and free them on the Saturday following their death. "This holy indulgence," says the Pope, "I accept, corroborate, and confirm, as Jesus Christ for the merits of the glorious Virgin Mary granted it in heaven." To gain this privilege it is necessary to observe fidelity in marriage or chastity in the single state. Those who read must recite the Office of the Blessed Virgin, unless already bound to the Divine Office; those who cannot must abstain from flesh meat on Wednesdays and Saturdays, unless Christmas falls on one of these days. So the Sabbatine bull, as given in the Carmelite "Bullarium."

It is to be noted, however, that there have been many Catholic writers of great weight who call in question the genuineness of this Sabbatine bull. It has no place in the Roman "Bullarium," and its autograph has never been found. Pope Benedict XIV. ("De Fest." lxxiv., lxxvii.) denies the authenticity of the bull, and says it is as hard, perhaps harder, to believe in this bull than in the story of the chapel built on Mount Carmel in honour of the Blessed Virgin during her lifetime. He says he could find more reasons against it than he cares to produce, and arguments drawn from things [in the bull] which want all appearance of truth.

The authenticity of the bull is also denied by the great Bollandist Papebroch, in his reply to the attacks made upon him on the subject; and Launoy, in a dissertation of wonderful learning, to be found in the second edition of his works (the edition we have used is dated 1731, "Coloniae Allobrogum"), brings forward a superabundance of reasons to show that the bull of John XXII. is a clumsy forgery, and that of Alexander V. another forgery, made to cover the former.

The "Acts" of St. Simon Stock, written down by a Carmelite friar, Peter Swanington or Swaynton, who was his constant companion, were kept in the record-room of the monastery at Bordeaux. As to the fact of the apparition to the saint, it is accepted by Benedict XIV., Papebroch, and Alban Butler on the faith of the above-mentioned "Acts" of the saint by Swaynton, who, it is alleged, was his secretary and wrote the story of the apparition at his dictation. A fragment of this "Life" was produced from their archives at Bordeaux, and printed by one of the Carmelites—viz. Chéron (Cheronensis). We may observe that the Carmelites refused a sight of this "Life" to Papebroch. (See Bollandist "Acta SS." Maii, tom. iii.) Next, to understand the force of Launoy's arguments for regarding this passage in the "Life," if it be authentic, as an interpolation, we must remember that the miracle is represented as gaining immediate notoriety. These are Swaynton's or pseudo-Swaynton's words: "The story running through England and beyond it, many cities offered us places in which to live, and many nobles begged to be affiliated to this holy order, that they might share in its graces, desiring to die in this holy habit." If so, the silence of Carmelite authors for more than a century after is remarkable. St. Simon Stock died in 1265. Ribotus, provincial in Catalonia (about 1340), in his ten books "On the Institution and Remarkable Deeds of the Carmelites," ignores the story. So does Chimetensis in two books specially designed to glorify the order ("Speculum Historiale" and "Speculum Ordinis Carmeli"), and so do three other authors of similar books quoted by Launoy. Strangest of all, Waldensis, a Carmelite, an Englishman, and writing in England ("De Sacramentalibus"), tries hard to prove the religious habit a sacramental, and speaks particularly of the Carmelite habit and the form which it is given. Nothing could have been more to the point

than Swaynton's story, but Waldensis never alludes to it. The vision is mentioned, apparently for the first time, so far as is known for certain, by Grossus, a Carmelite of Toulouse, in his "Viridarium" (1389), then by Paleonidorus ("Antiq. Ord. Carm." vi. 8, apud Launoy), published in 1495. It is right to add, however, that the Carmelites claimed the support of an anonymous MS. in the Vatican said to have been written early in the fourteenth century.

Many of the later Popes have granted numerous indulgences to the Confraternities of the Scapular, and no Catholic, Launoy as little as anyone, doubts the utility and piety of the institution. "The scapular," says Bossuet, "is no useless badge. You wear it as a visible token that you own yourselves Mary's children, and she will be your mother indeed if you live in our Lord Jesus Christ" ("Sermon pour le Jour du Scapulaire," vol. xi. p. 369). Benedict XIV. speaks in a similar tone, but he admits that too many abuse these symbols and badges by a misplaced confidence in them.

There are other scapulars used in the Church: that of the Trinity, of white linen with a red and blue cross, given by the Trinitarians or priests delegated by them; the Servite scapular of the Seven Dolours, which is of black woollen stuff; that of the Immaculate Conception, of light blue woollen cloth, propagated by Ursula Benincasa in the sixteenth century, and given by the Theatines who governed the congregation to which this nun belonged; the red scapular of the Passion, originated by a Sister of Charity at Paris, who is said to have received a revelation on the matter in 1846, and given by the Vincentian Fathers. All these Confraternities are designed to promote prayer and other good works in their members.

This article has been compiled from Benedict XIV. "De Festis"; the Bollandists, Maii, tom. iii.; Launoy, "Dissertat." tom. ii. Swaynton's "Life" does not seem to have been published entire. At least, we have searched in vain for a copy at the British Museum. There is nothing in Alban Butler which had not been already stated by the authors quoted. The brief notice on the other scapulars is from a little book of Labis, "Notices et Instructions sur les Scapulaires," &c. It is merely practical, and has no historical worth.

When the above article was first published, in 1883, it met with much criticism. This found expression in the "Month" Nov. Dec. 1886; "I. E. Record," Sept. 1887; and elsewhere. At the time of the issue of the fourth edition of the present work (1893), an American Review called for the suppression of the edition (Jan. 1894). It is pleasant to note, in contrast with these outbursts, the industry and candour of the learned English Carmelite Provincial Fr. Zimmerman, in the "I. E. Record," May 1901, Feb., March, April, 1904, and the art. in the "Cath. Enc." where the matter is summed up thus: "Hitherto no authenticated testimony has been discovered proving that the small scapular was known from the second half of the thirteenth century and was given to the members of the Confraternity of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. On the contrary, there are many reasons for the view that the small scapular as we now know it, and in the form it has certainly had since the sixteenth century, is of much later origin." Father Thurston, S.J. ("I. E. Record," July 1904, and "Irish Eccl. Review," 1911), maintains that there was no life by Swanington; he recommends "a certain reserve in proclaiming on Our Lady's authority that the wearing of our familiar brown scapular may be regarded as a sure pledge of salvation"; and he rejects the Sabbatine—or rather the Subitine—indulgence altogether.

SCAPULAR MEDALS. It is permitted to wear, instead of the small cloth scapulars, a medal of metal, having on one side a representation of our Lord with His Sacred Heart, and on the other an image of His Blessed Mother (decree of Holy Office, Dec. 16, 1910).

SCHISM (*σχίσμα*). A tear or rent (Mt. ix. 16; Mk. ii. 21); a division of opinion (Jn. vii. 43; ix. 16; x. 19); party spirit in the Christian Church (1 Cor. i. 10; xi. 18; xii. 25); and then, in Fathers and theologians, a technical word to denote formal separation from the unity of the Church. "Schismatics," says St. Thomas ($2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 39, a. 1), "in the strict sense, are those who of their own will and intention sever themselves from the unity of the Church." This unity of the Church, he continues, consists in the connection of its members with each other, and of all the members with the head. "Now, this head is Christ, whose representative in the Church is the Supreme Pontiff. And therefore the name of 'schismatics' is given to those who refuse to be under the Supreme Pontiff and to communicate with the members of the Church subject to him." Further, he thus explains the difference between heresy and schism:—Heresy is opposed to faith, schism to charity; so that, although all heretics are schismatics, because loss of faith involves separation from the Church, all schismatics are not heretics, since a man may, from anger, pride, ambition, or the like, sever himself from the communion of the Church and yet believe all which the Church proposes for our belief. Still, a state of pure schism—*i.e.* of schism without heresy—cannot continue long—at least, in the case of a large number of men. The words of St. Jerome (on Titus, cap. 3), quoted by St. Thomas, are to the point: "Schism, at the beginning,

may be understood as something different from heresy, but there is no schism which does not invent some heresy for itself, in order to justify its secession." History abundantly confirms this observation. Bodies which at first separate from the Church merely because they think their personal rights have been infringed are sure, in the end, to deny the Church's unity and to lose the spirit of faith. And so St. Thomas remarks that, as loss of charity is the way to loss of faith, so schism is the road to heresy.

Schismatics do not, of course, lose the power of order; their priests can say Mass, their bishops confirm and ordain. But they lose all jurisdiction, so that "they cannot either absolve, excommunicate, or grant indulgences, or the like; and if they attempt anything of the kind the act is null" (*loc. cit.* a. 3). Whether pure schismatics do or do not cease thereby to be members of the Church is a question controverted in the Schools. Many theologians consider that all who retain integrity of faith are members of the Church. But all agree that they are not united to the Church by charity—that if members, they are dead members—so that the question is of no great moment. (Ferraris; the dogmatic theologians "De Ecclesia," *e.g.* Franzelin, thes. xxiii.).

SCHISM, EASTERN. [See GREEK CHURCH.]

SCHISM, GREAT. [See ANTIPOPES, p. 37.]

SCHOLASTICISM. [See PHILOSOPHY.]

SCHOLASTICUS (Fr. *écolâtre*). An ecclesiastic attached to, but generally not a member of, a cathedral or collegiate chapter, to whom the administration of its schools was entrusted. The *scholasticus* is also called, in charters of the eleventh century, *capischolus*, *caput scholaris*, and *magister scholarum*. The office seems to have arisen along with the schools which the Capitularies of Charlemagne order with such earnestness and reiteration to be erected in all the Frankish dioceses. Those who held it often combined teaching with the super-intendence of teachers; this was the case with St. Bruno, the founder of the Carthusians, appointed in 1056 Scholasticus in the Church of Rheims. The Council of Trent ordered that the Scholastici of a diocese and others who were bound to lecture or teach should, if competent, themselves give instruction in the seminaries of which the council decreed the erection in all dioceses; and that in future the office of a Scholasticus (*scholasteria*) should only be conferred on doctors, masters, or licentiates in theology or in canon law, and other fit persons capable of teaching; the collation otherwise to be void.[1] (Thomassin, i. 3, 70.)

SCHOOLS. A child is usually sent to school in order that he may obtain, with greater ease and fewer interruptions than would be possible at home, knowledge which will be serviceable to him in after-life. This is a motive which acts on parents independently of State instigation; it filled the school of Flavius at Venusia with "big boys, the sons of big centurions,"[1] and took Horace to that superior establishment at Rome which received the sons of "knights and senators." The earliest Christian school of which we have a distinct account—that of Pantaenus at Alexandria (A.D. 180)—was one for religious and catechetical instruction (*ἱερῶν λόγων κατηχήσεων*).[2] The earliest State provision for secondary instruction was made by the Emperor Vespasian,[3] who established a group of "imperial schools" at all the great provincial towns; Besançon, Arles, Cologne, Rheims, and Treves are particularly mentioned. In these schools rhetoric, logic, and Latin and Greek literature were well taught, and many a Christian apologist owed to them the mental culture which he employed after his conversion in the service of Christ. Julian the Apostate knew well what he was about when he allowed none but pagans to teach. This meant for Christians the loss either of their faith or of their intellectual life. After a generation or two a certain number of them would have become pagans, while others, true to their faith, would have become unable to defend it with skill or to take any part in the higher affairs of state. Happily his reign was short. When the empire had finally become Christian the schools still retained the old methods and subjects of instruction, and even, to a great extent, the old spirit. St. Jerome, who had himself been educated in one of them, was alive to the perilous nature of this influence, and interdicted the reading of the pagan authors to all those under his direction who were in training for the religious life. Every bishop's residence was from the first more or less definitely a school, in which clerics were trained for the ecclesiastical life. Similarly, after the commencement of the monastic life under St. Antony and St. Hilarion, the monastery, besides subserving the ends of self-discipline and continual intercession, became a school for training monks. This was especially seen in the monasteries in Gaul which followed the rule of the abbot Cassian of Marseilles. Early in the fifth century the invasions of the barbarians began; for four centuries Western Europe weltered in chaos, and the institutions of civilized life perished. In the cities of Gaul, as the Franks pressed southwards, the old municipal schools—the schools of the Rhetoricians and the Grammarians—dwindled and were dispersed. Lay life became barbarous; and the arts of barbarism—which are chiefly

[1] Sess. xxiii. c. 18, De Ref.

[1] Hor. *Sat.* i. 6, 73. [2] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.*

[3] J. B. Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great* (1877), p. 12.

fighting, destruction, and coarse indulgence—do not stand in need of schools. But in the wreck the episcopal and monastic schools survived, and, through the degradation of lay life, became ever more attractive. In the island of Lerins, the abbot Honoratus, about 400, founded a celebrated monastery, the school of which was known as the *Studium Insulanum*. Ireland, soon after its conversion by St. Patrick, was dotted over with monastic schools, in which such learning as was then accessible was prosecuted with remarkable success.

The suppression of the schools of Athens by order of Justinian (529) sounded the knell of the educational institutes of antiquity. These schools were, in fact, a university, although that name was of later introduction. They had never been able to shake off the pagan modes of thought which gave birth to them, and now the advancing tide of Christian ideas engulfed them, without being able for a long time to supply their place. A few months after the suppression St. Benedict founded the abbey of Monte Cassino, and the schools for the erection of which his rule provides were soon spread over Western Europe. These gradually produced a race of teachers and students whose higher and wider views suggested the resuscitation of academic life. It is sufficient to mention Iona, Lindisfarne, Canterbury, York, Fulda, Rheims, Corbie, Fleury, and Seville—not as being all of Benedictine origin, but as among the best schools to be found in the troubled period from the fifth to the tenth century.

The great organizing mind of Charlemagne endeavoured to make use of education, as of all other forces within his reach, for restoring civilization in the West. He invited Alcuin, the Scholasticus of York, as the best-known teacher in Europe, to his Court at Aix-la-Chapelle, and gave into his charge the palace school. Conscientious and painstaking, Alcuin was yet essentially *borné*; there is something cramped and unsatisfactory in his way of handling all the subjects of his narrow curriculum. The age of universities was not yet. Charlemagne, and his son after him, were perpetually urging the bishops to improve their schools. Rabanus Maurus, a pupil of Alcuin, made the school of Fulda illustrious; that of Corbie, in the same age, produced Paschasius Radbert. The *trivium* and *quadrivium*—the invention of which is ascribed by some to Martianus Capella, a Carthaginian professor of rhetoric, by others to St. Augustine—supplied the *cadre* of the most advanced instruction for several centuries. Between 850 and 1000, the inroads of the Normans and Danes again made havoc of all that had been hitherto done in France and England to promote education. The Normans, however, when once fully converted, became the most active propagators of all civilizing ideas that the world has ever seen. The Norman school of Bec, founded in the eleventh century by the Abbot Herluin, numbered among its teachers Lanfranc and St. Anselm. In schools of this class, where knowledge was sought at first hand and philosophy disdained conventional methods, university ideals began to emerge. In the twelfth century, at Paris, commences the history of modern universities. [UNIVERSITY.] After the establishment of these *foci* of superior teaching, the secondary school became, in theory, on the one hand a stage of preparation for the university, on the other a place of final training for those who had to begin work early. But for a long time the first of these two aspects of a secondary school overpowered the other. William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, founded there, in 1373, the school which still exists, expressly in order to feed the college (New College) which he was establishing at Oxford. The Winchester foundation was for a warden and ten fellows, three chaplains and three clerks in orders, an *informator* or head master, a *hostiarius* or second master, seventy scholars who were to be "poor and in need of help," and sixteen choristers.[1] Imitating this example, Henry VI. founded the school at Eton in 1440, as a nursery to King's College, Cambridge. The later public schools of England—Westminster, Rugby, Harrow, &c.—have been founded, speaking generally, upon the model of these two, but without the same close connection with the universities.

The common belief, perpetuated by the name "King Edward's Grammar School," is that secondary education in England owes its origin to that youthful Protestant monarch. "Never," says Leach ("English Schools at the Reformation"), "was a great reputation more easily gained and less deserved than that of King Edward VI. as a Founder of Schools." The few educational foundations made by Henry VIII. or his son were really the partial restoration of educational endowments seized with the monasteries and chantries. Before Henry's time there were cathedral schools, collegiate grammar schools, monastery schools, guild schools, and especially chantry schools, where the priest was bound to teach as well as sing Mass for the founder. "The proportion of the population which had access to Grammar Schools and used them was much larger than now" (Leach, p. 97). It can truly be said that education was much more democratic in the old Catholic days than it is now.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the necessity of separating primary or elementary instruction from secondary began to make itself felt. The greater complexity and variety of employments, and the increased application of science to all the useful arts, made it desirable, if not indispensable, that the labouring class also

[1] *The Public Schools*, 1867.

should at least be instructed in letters and in the art of calculation. Primary instruction on a large scale was first tried (1684) by the Ven. De la Salle, the founder of the Christian Brothers. [See that article.] The new grade had its two aspects—that by which it was a stage of preparation for the secondary school, and that by which it gave a final training. Up to very recent times the former aspect was little regarded; but, at present, the advantages of making free and easy communications by which the best scholars can pass from the primary to the secondary, and from that to the superior grade of instruction, is clearly perceived by educationists.

All English schools before the Reformation had a Catholic character. That being withdrawn from them by the change of religion, and the laws prohibiting the erection of new schools under Catholic teachers, those who adhered to the old faith were put to great straits for several generations in order to get their children educated under any tolerable conditions. A single sample of Protestant legislation will show what difficulties had to be faced. By the 11 and 12 Will. III. c. iv., "If any Papist, or person making profession of the Popish religion, shall keep school, or take upon himself the education or government or boarding of youth, he shall be adjudged to perpetual imprisonment in such place within this kingdom as the King by advice of his Privy Council shall appoint." [1] Unless foreign education were sought, obscure private schools, such as those of which we obtain a glimpse in the accounts of the early life of Pope, were the only available resort.[2] The first school of a higher class was that established at Sedgley Park (it had previously existed in a humble way at Newcastle-under-Lyme) by Bishop Challoner in 1763. St. Edmund's, Old Hall (a continuation of an earlier school dating from 1769), founded in 1793; Ushaw, which, as Crook Hall, was founded in 1794; Stonyhurst, in the same year; Downside, in 1798; and Edgbaston, in 1858—with Ampleforth, Beaumont, and Prior Park—may be mentioned among our older secondary schools.

The monitorial system of Bell and Lancaster, by means of which it was considered that primary instruction could be much extended at little expense by setting the elder children as "monitors" to teach the rudiments to the younger, was brought out in 1797. The primary schools of Prussia, organized under Hardenberg with great skill and thoroughness, drew general attention; and in 1833 the first public grant, 20,000*l.*, in aid of the elementary education of the people, was voted by Parliament, and its administration confided to a Committee of the Privy Council. The system of aiding local efforts thus introduced has received an enormous development and undergone numerous changes of detail, but in its substantial features it remains unaltered to the present day. In the Anglican communion, the organ through which State help was dispensed was the "National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church," founded in 1812. The corresponding organ for the Dissenters was the "British and Foreign School Society." For Catholics was established, in 1847, the "Catholic Poor School Committee," which, by maintaining efficient training-schools for masters and mistresses, enables Catholic managers to obtain their fair share of the Parliamentary grant for elementary education.

In Ireland the penal laws rendered the erection of Catholic schools impossible until about a hundred and thirty years ago, when the ill-success of the war against the American colonists compelled certain relaxations. A secondary school for forty boarders was founded at Burrell's Hall, Kilkenny, in 1783, under Drs. Lanigan and Dunne.[1] It throve exceedingly, and was transformed in 1836 into St. Kieran's College, under which name it still exists. Of more recent foundation are Carlow and Thurles Colleges, and the Jesuit College of Clongowes. These institutions, with many others, though without State aid or inspection, are already more flourishing than the Royal and Charter Schools —founded in the bad times in order to preserve and extend Protestant ascendency—could ever boast of being. [See UNIVERSITY.]

The National Board of Education—in the schools of which a combined literary instruction was to be given to children of all creeds during certain hours in the day, while separate religious teaching might be given to those whose parents desired it before or after those hours, and also on one particular day of the week—was organized through the exertions of Mr. Stanley, Chief Secretary for Ireland (afterwards Earl of Derby), in 1831. The bishops accepted this arrangement, not as the best, but as the best obtainable measure; and under it, notwithstanding the difficulties caused by extreme poverty, elementary school training has penetrated into every corner of Ireland. As regards secondary education, Catholics received no assistance from the State till 1878. In that year an Act of Parliament established the Commissioners of Intermediate Education to distribute grants to schools of all denominations "on the basis of an annual general examination in the subjects of secular instruction, and giving exhibitions and prizes to the most successful candidates." This Act was further extended in 1900. These Acts have been accepted by prac-

[1] Hook's *Church Dictionary*, "Schools."
[2] B. Ward, *Hist. of St. Edmund's College*, p. 3 *sqq.*

[1] *Trans. of the Ossory Archæological Society*, 1882, vol. ii. part 2.

tically all the Catholic schools and colleges, including those of the Christian Brothers.

An Act for the enforcement of general education, and authorizing the formation of School Boards, and the levying of rates, in all places where voluntary effort should appear to be insufficient for the need, was brought in by Mr. Forster in 1870, and became law. Great efforts have been made by the Catholic body in England, and hitherto with a large measure of success, to provide schools under certificated teachers (and therefore qualified to participate in the educational grant) sufficient for the reception of all the Catholic children in the country. Whether these efforts will prevail, or the Board schools, from which definite religious teaching is excluded, will more and more bring the elementary instruction of the people under their control, is a question still uncertain. This Act, which supported out of the rates none but Board Schools, was amended in 1902 so as to allow the rates to be applied to the support of denominational (voluntary) schools. We only know that society is not likely to go back, and that the necessity of an adequate preparation of all classes for the work of life will become increasingly manifest. At the same time, as was stated in the article on EDUCATION, the Divine and irrefragable right of the Church to share in the control of all schools in which her children are taught, together with the corresponding right and duty of parents, can never be surrendered by Catholics. It is not possible to name the numberless works, treatises, and reports on the subject of schools. The admirable work done by the Nuns in primary and secondary schools is referred to in the articles on the different religious institutes of women. One of the best books on the subject (including higher education) is "Christian Schools and Scholars," by Mother Raphael (Theodosia Drane).

SCIENTIA MEDIA. [See GRACE, and PREDESTINATION.]

SCOTISM. Scholastic philosophy, as has been shown in other articles, was the philosophy of Aristotle interpreted, developed, and harmonized with the Christian faith. In the [illegible] of the Middle Ages, scholastic [illegible] cepting the data of Catholic faith, [illegible] itself in arranging, defending, [illegible] ing deductions from them on the [illegible] ies of the scholastic philosophy. Of [illegible] scholastic philosophy and theology there were two great schools, of which the Thomist found its home in the Dominican, the Scotist in the Franciscan order. The Nominalist school found adherents in both of these orders and in the Church generally, but never exercised an influence like that of the older systems, and really marks the decay of Scholasticism as a whole.[1]

[1] We refer to Nominalism in its later form, as represented by Occam and his followers.

Very little is known about the life of Scotus. His full name, Joannes Duns Scotus, has been variously interpreted. Some (*e.g.* Camden, Leland, Wharton, &c.) suppose that he was born at Dunstane, in Northumberland, Scotch writers (Camerarius, Dempster, McKenzie) have claimed him as their countryman, and argued that "Duns" means "Dunse," a little town to the north-west of Berwick. Wadding, the Franciscan annalist, makes him an Irishman, born in the county of Down and province of Ulster. He contends that he cannot have been an Englishman, since his epitaph runs, "Scotia me genuit, Anglia suscepit"; not a Scotchman, since Bonaventure, in a list of the Franciscan provinces, mentions that of "Scotia, or Ireland." The date of his birth is given by some as 1265, by others as 1274. When he made his noviciate is quite uncertain. Of the names of his teachers one only has been handed down—that of William Varo, or Ware, whom he succeeded in the chair of theology at Oxford. He went to Paris in 1304; to Cologne in 1308, where he died suddenly the same year and was buried in the Franciscan church. His works consist of commentaries on the logical works of Aristotle and the "Isagoge" of Porphyry, a commentary on Aristotle's "De Anima," two commentaries on Aristotle's "Metaphysics," besides a shorter work, "Conclusiones ex xii. Libris Metaphys. Aristot.," "Grammatica Speculativa," "Tractatus de Rerum Principio" and "De Primo Principio," "Theoremata," "Collationes," "Quaestiones Miscellaneae," "Quaestiones Quodlibetales," and an unfinished "Tractatus de Cognitione Dei." All these books, except the "Collationes" and "Quodlibetica," were written at Oxford. There, too, he wrote his "Opus Oxoniense," a commentary on the "Four Books of the Sentences," which contains his whole philosophical and theological teaching in a collected form. The "Reportata Parisiensia" is an abridgment by Scotus himself of the "Opus Oxoniense." At the end of book iii. dist. 18, Scotus was called to Cologne, and left the work incomplete. The "Quodlibetica" consists of twenty-one questions on which Scotus disputed in public when he took the degree of doctor at Paris. In general chapters of the order, and, as Wadding thinks, soon after his death, decrees were passed requiring the Scotist doctrine to be taught in all the Franciscan schools. His works were collected by the Irish Franciscan Wadding in twelve folio volumes (Lyons, 1639). Commentators on Scotus appear in the latter half of the fifteenth century.[1] Such were the Irishman Mauritius a Portu (d. 1513), professor at Padua, afterwards

[1] But long before this Scotus had distinguished disciples —*e.g.* Antonius Andreae, the "Doctor Dulcificus" (d. *circ.* 1320); Franciscus de Mayronis, the "Magister Abstractionum" or "Doctor Illuminatus" (d. *circ.* 1325); Walter Burleigh, "Doctor Planus et Perspicuus" (1275—*circ.* 1337). (Ueberweg, p. 457.)

archbishop of Tuam; Francis Lychetus of Brescia (d. 1520), minister-general of the order; Joannes Poncius (d. 1550), an Irishman and professor at Rome; Hugo Cavellus, professor at Rome and Louvain, minister-general of the order, finally archbishop and primate in Ireland; Antonius Hiquaeus (Hickey), also an Irishman. Among Scotist theologians the best known are Albergoni ("Resolutio Doctrinae Scotisticae," Lyons, 1643); Baro on the Scotist philosophy (Cologne, 1668); Frassen ("Scotus Academicus," Paris, 1680); Hieron. de Monte Fortino, who arranged, in a very convenient manner, the teaching of Scotus in a "Summa" which corresponds question for question to that of St. Thomas ("Summa ex Scoti Operibus concinnata juxta Ordinem et Dispositionem Summae S. Thom. Aq.," Romae, 1728, 5 vols. fol.). In the middle of the eighteenth century Ferrari undertook the defence of Scotist against modern philosophy ("Philosophia Peripatetica adv. veteres et recentiores praesertim firmioribus propugnata rationibus Joannis Duns Scoti," Venice, 1746).[1]

Scotists no less than Thomists were, in the strictest sense of the word, Schoolmen. The one as well as the other accepted the whole tradition of the Church as it was collected by Peter Lombard; to Scotus no less than to St. Thomas the "Pope is the supreme guardian and divinely-instituted exponent of the deposit of faith left to the Church, the highest guide and ruler of the Christian commonwealth, the supreme representative of the Church's judicial power" (Werner, p. 497). Again, to Scotus as well as to St. Thomas, Aristotle is the representative of human reason, the decisive authority in philosophical discussion.[2] Hence, the differences between the two schools, numerous as they are, move between very narrow limits. Far wider, far more interesting and important, questions arose in the conflict on the power of the Pope begun at Constance and Basle and prolonged in the learned French church, and on a multitude of questions after the rise of scholarship and historical criticism, in the war between the old and the new philosophies. Probably just because the limits of opinion were so narrow, it came to pass that Thomists and Scotists fought on so many points which have little interest for us. So numerous are they that we can but make a selection from them here.

(1) Both Thomists and Scotists were Realists, but the Realism of the latter was more pronounced. To St. Thomas no universal exists as such. The essence is only actually found in the individual; it is by a process of the intellect—viz. abstraction—that we separate humanity in general from humanity as it manifests itself in this particular man and reach the idea of humanity in general. "Universale, dum intelligitur: singulare, dum sentitur." At the same time, St. Thomas, unlike the Nominalists, held that the universal has a "foundation in reality," because the species exists with identical qualities in a number of individuals. It has precisely the same character, though it is not numerically one. But this numerical unity was just what the Scotists maintained. To them the nature in all individuals of the same species was numerically one. The obvious difficulties of this theory led later Scotists to modify it till it was scarcely distinguishable from Thomism, or else to take refuge in unintelligible subtleties. (2) The Thomists made matter the principle of individuation, so that, *e.g.*, in spiritual beings like the angels there could only be one individual in each species. The Scotists believed that in individuals there was an "haecceitas," something which made them individual apart from matter. (3) St. Thomas held that second causes, including the will, only move so far as they are moved by the first cause. God moves the will to act, gives the action as well as the power to act, in such manner, however, as to leave the freedom of the will unimpaired. So, at least, the Dominicans—rightly, as it seems to us—understood their master. Scotus, on the contrary, held that "the created will is the total and immediate cause of its volition, so that God in respect thereto has no immediate but only mediate efficacy." The will is like a "free horse," grace like the rider, and the horse can throw its rider; otherwise, the will could not be free, and there would be no possibility of sin. Observe that both Scotus and St. Thomas argue on general philosophical grounds. Very different from either is St. Augustine's position. To the first man, he says, a grace was given "without which he could not abide [in grace] if he willed; but to will was in his own power." After the [illegible] gives "to those on whom He see[illegible] bestow it an assistance so great [illegible] a nature that we do will." [illegible] freedom of the will consisted in [illegible] not to sin (*posse non peccare*); the [illegible] be much greater, not to be able to s[illegible] *posse peccare*)." "One is the help wit[illegible] which a thing is not done [*i.e.* grace of perseverance before the Fall], and another, the help by which a thing is done" ("De Corrept. et Gratia," cap. xi. xii., PL, xliv. 933). But, clearly, Scotus is far further removed from St. Augustine. Kindred to his teaching on the freedom of the will is the tenet of Scotus that "man without grace may avoid all mortal sin" against the natural law. Again, whereas St. Thomas places final beatitude

[1] There is also a handy work (not, however, Scotist) by Joannes de Rada, *Controversiae inter Thomam et Scotum*, Venice, 1599.

[2] Still, Scotus adopted many Platonic and Neoplatonic conceptions, with which he became familiar through Avicebron's (Ibn Gebirol's) *Fountain of Life* (Ueberweg, *Hist. Phil.* Engl. transl. i. p. 453).

in the intellect which knows God, Scotus attributes it to the will which loves God.[1] (4) Scotus, against St. Thomas, denies that the immortality of the soul can be proved by reason; and he separates, by a much sharper line than St. Thomas, natural from supernatural theology. (5) Scotus held it "more probable" that the Blessed Virgin never contracted original sin, and he proved this belief consistent with the fact that she was redeemed by Christ. (6) He taught that the Word would have become man, even had there been no fall; that the merits of Christ were not infinite in themselves and from the union of his human nature with the Word, but only from the acceptation of them as infinite on the part of God. Consequently, he denied the infinite value of the sacrifice of the Mass. (7) With respect to the Sacraments, his treatment of the mystery of the Eucharist differs on a multitude of subtle points from that of St. Thomas (Werner, p. 283 *seq.*). It is more interesting to observe that he rejected the Thomist doctrine of physical, and admitted only a moral, efficacy in the Sacraments. [For an explanation of this, see SACRAMENTS; and for the Scotist doctrine on the matter and form of Penance, see the article.] (8) On moral points, two doctrines of Scotus may be noted here. St. Thomas denied that any deliberate action, however indifferent in itself, could be really indifferent at the time it was done. Either the action was referred to a good end and so morally good, or not so referred and therefore evil. Scotists rejected this reasoning, and held that the end, and therefore the action, might be indifferent. The other point is connected with the principles of toleration. Scotus, against St. Thomas, held it lawful to take away the children of Jews by force, baptize, and educate them as Christians.

The Scotist philosophy and theology are now, we believe, abandoned, or all but abandoned, in his own order. But many of his opinions have been adopted—*e.g.* by the eclecticism of some Jesuit theologians (*e.g.* on the moral efficacy of the Sacraments; on grace, to a certain extent)—and have exercised an enduring influence. His opinion on the Immaculate Conception finally prevailed, and his theory on the Incarnation has recommended itself, as a philosophical view of that mystery, even to writers of name outside the Church. His differences from St. Thomas served the useful purpose of maintaining intellectual life and preventing a servile adherence to that great author.[2]

[1] "The fundamental position of Scotus in psychology and ethics was this: *Voluntas est superior intellectu*" (Ueberweg, *loc. cit.* p. 456).

[2] The Sacred Congregation, by order of Paul V., declared the doctrine of Scotus free from censure, and forbade anyone to presume to prohibit the printing of any book known as his (Viva, *Disp.* 59, 6, n. 5; Franzelin, *De Deo Trino et Uno*, thesis 20). Scotus, as Ueberweg points out, was a critical rather than a creative genius. His early mathematical training made him impatient of demonstration which was not rigorous; and, accepting the Church's doctrine, he dismisses many Thomist arguments in its favour. Just in the same way, Kant accepted the convictions of the moral sense and of the "religious consciousness," while he rejected the proofs which Leibnitz thought valid.

(This article is drawn chiefly from Werner, "Johannes Duns Scotus," 1881. It forms the first volume of his "Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters.")

SCOTS COLLEGE. In the time of Henry VIII. the Scotch possessed an ancient church and hostel at Rome. Mary Stuart, soon after she assumed the government of Scotland, put the institution on a sound footing; but in consequence of her long imprisonment in England it was abandoned. Clement VIII., by the bull "In Supremo," founded in 1600 a college for training natives of Scotland to the sacred ministry, near the Church of St. Mary of Constantinople; whence, in 1604, he removed it to a site opposite the Palazzo Barberini, granting to it at the same time the neighbouring church of St. Andrew. In 1616 the college was made over by Paul V. to the Jesuits, who had the management of it down to their suppression in 1773. For twenty-five years it continued under the rule, or rather misrule, of Italian clergy until its suppression in 1798 by the French revolutionaries. It was revived under Pius VII., mainly through the exertions of the Rev. Paul MacPherson, the Scots agent, who became rector in 1820. The students have always attended lectures at the Roman College, now the Gregorian University. The college is immediately subject to the Holy See, which exercises its authority partly through the Cardinal Protector, partly through the Consistorial Congregation. Among its distinguished alumni may be mentioned Bishop Hay and Archbishop Smith, the author of a learned work on the Pentateuch. There were also Scots colleges at Douay, Paris, and Valladolid, the last-named being still in existence. (Bellesheim, "Hist. of the Cath. Church in Scotland," tr. iii. 386–7; Fraser in "Cath. Enc."; Guilday, "English Catholic Refugees," 28, &c.)

SCOTTISH CHURCH. The Gospel was originally announced in Scotland by three principal teachers, St. Ninian, St. Kentigern, and St. Columba. The first, a Briton, who had been carefully instructed at Rome,[1] fixed his see at Whithern in Galloway, and thence evangelized the Southern Picts. His death is placed in 432. St. Kentigern or Mungo, a Strath-Clyde Briton, became the first bishop of Glasgow, and in the course of a long episcopate planted the faith firmly in Strath-Clyde, and helped to root out paganism, dying probably about 603. St. Columba, a Scot from Ireland, founded Iona (563), and planted Christianity among the northern Picts—*i.e.* in the Hebrides, and in the Northern and Western Highlands. For

[1] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 4.

more than a thousand years only one religion was known in Scotland, that taught by the Catholic Church, and the immense good done by it is acknowledged even by enemies. A Protestant historian [1] draws a glowing picture of the state of the country before the Reformation, covered over as it was by a network of well-planned institutions, and adorned with magnificent ecclesiastical and monastic buildings, where learning was prized and art encouraged—where the hungry were fed and the miserable consoled. One special service which the land owed to its clergy was the removal or mitigation of slavery. "The priesthood set the first example of mitigating domestic slavery—that curse and disgrace of the Middle Ages—having emancipated all the bondmen belonging to their estates, before the lay proprietors could be taught either the advantage or the obligation" [2] of doing so.

In the article PRESBYTERIANS, SCOTTISH, the religious revolution of 1560 was described. The *perfervidum ingenium* of the Scotch was not content with the establishment of the Knoxian system, unless the old faith was proscribed at the same time. Tytler [3] describes the anti-Catholic legislation of 1560 as consisting mainly of three acts. "The first abolished the Papal supremacy in the realm; the second repealed all previous acts in favour of Popery; the third enacted that any person hearing or saying Mass should suffer for the first offence confiscation of his property; for the second, banishment; and for the third, death." Surprise has often been expressed at the feebleness of the resistance offered. But we may assume that the bishops knew their countrymen, and felt that resistance would no longer avail. The pride and overweening self-confidence of the Scottish character had become irrevocably engaged on the wrong side, and the great majority of the active spirits were favourable to change. For men so obstinate, so self-satisfied, so intensely and enthusiastically bent on having their own way, after they had once turned out of the path of Catholic obedience, it was impossible, humanly speaking, to return to it. Error must take its course; the Scottish people must test to the very utmost the system which it had preferred to the Catholic faith; and not till the proud edifice of Presbytery had been shivered to pieces, and its ambitious discipline become a laughing-stock, would the possibility of a Catholic reaction arise.[4]

[1] Russell, *History of the Church in Scotland*, 1834.
[2] *Ib.* i. 277.
[3] Quoted in *Dublin Review*, vol xxvii. p. 431; see also Robertson's *Hist. of Scotl.* book iii.
[4] Hill Burton (*Hist. of Scot.* v. 204) says that Scottish Presbyterians at the present day are split up into a number of sects, all tracing their descent from the Kirk of 1580, "of which every Presbyterian communion in Scotland"—and there are some that "count their adherents by hundreds"—"professes to be the representative, and the only legitimate representative, all others who profess that title being impostors."

The head of the Scottish hierarchy, Archbishop Hamilton, of St. Andrews, was executed by order of the Regent Lennox in 1571. The last survivor of the bishops dispossessed in 1560 was James Betoun, archbishop of Glasgow; he died at Paris, in his eighty-sixth year, in 1603. Till 1623 the Scottish clergy were subjected to the jurisdiction of the archpriests of England, and afterwards to that of local prefects of the Mission. From 1653 to 1694 Church affairs were administered by three prefects-apostolic, W. Bannatyne, A. Dunbar, and J. Walker. The first vicar-apostolic was Thomas Nicholson, who was consecrated in 1695, and arrived in Scotland in 1697, finding only twenty-five priests in the whole country.

The names of twelve or thirteen Scottish noblemen are recorded in 1583, and again in 1592, as belonging to the Catholic party; the chief of these was the Earl of Huntly. The contemptible character of James VI. suggested various plots and enterprises to turbulent men of all parties during the twenty years preceding his succession to the English crown. In these affairs the Catholic party was mixed up, but with no permanent result. About 1590 the state of things was this: All the northern part of Scotland, including the counties of Inverness, Caithness, Sutherland, and Aberdeen, with Forfarshire on the east, and Wigtonshire and Nithsdale in the south, were for the most part in the interests of the Catholic party, and led by noblemen professing that faith.[1] Negotiations were opened between Huntly, Erroll, Angus, and others on the one side, and Philip II. on the other; Jesuit missionaries were the intermediaries; even after the failure of the Armada it was hoped that a Spanish army of 30,000 men might be landed on the south-west coast of Scotland, and, covered by a force of cavalry to be raised by the Scotch Catholic lords, march south into England to put down the government of Elizabeth.[2] This was known as the affair of the "blanks," because Huntly, Erroll, &c., put their names to blank sheets of paper, on the understanding that above their signatures the particulars of the enterprise should be inserted according to what might be agreed upon between the King of Spain and Fr. W. Creighton, the Jesuit rector of Louvain.

The General Assembly never ceased to press upon the Government the execution of the penal laws against Catholics. Ordinary intolerance might be passed over, but one of their proposals, made to James I. in 1608, calls for some remark. It was "that the sons of noblemen professing Popery should be committed to the custody of [such of]

[1] Statement of Burghley given by Tytler in his *History*; quoted in the *Month* for January 1878.
[2] "A Discoverie of the unnatural and traiterous Conspiracie of Scottish Papists," black letter, Lond. 1593.

their friends as are sound in religion." [1] The penal legislation of England and Ireland, bad as it was, never so absolutely ignored parental authority as it was proposed to do on this occasion.[2] Among the many forms of oppression which Catholics had to bear, not the least intolerable was that was which described as "planting wise pastors." A Catholic family was compelled to give hospitality to a minister, who of course constituted himself a spy on all their movements, and was empowered to "catechize their families twice a day." (Chambers, "Domestic Annals of Scotland," i. 351.)

About 1612 the Jesuits and other missionaries were very active; many conversions were made and apostasies repaired. The Government and the Protestant clergy, both Episcopalian and Presbyterian, were somewhat disturbed. Two Jesuit missioners, Fathers Moffat and Ogilvie, were arrested: the former, after a term of imprisonment, was banished; the latter, being plied with entangling questions on the Pope's deposing power by the King's order, and not answering satisfactorily, was condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered (1615); and the sentence was carried out. However, it is only just to the General Assembly to say that they appear to have been averse to shedding blood, especially after experience had proved that modes of persecution which just stopped short of killing them were more effectual than death itself. Banishment from Scotland, with threat of death or perpetual imprisonment in case of return, was the usual penalty both for priests and laymen. Being joined to a greater or less confiscation of property, and rigorously carried out year after year, this policy of banishment brought the Catholic party to a state of extreme weakness and distress. In 1641 Father Mambrecht was the only priest left in all the South of Scotland; whereas in England, for years before that date, the penal laws had been slackly executed, and Catholics were going openly to Mass in London down to the meeting of the Long Parliament. The same unrelenting bigotry pursued and hunted down every symptom of the revival of Catholic worship till far down in the eighteenth century. As if all truth had come into the world with John Knox, and existed not outside of their own sect, the ministers rejected with indignation the "toleration" and "liberty of conscience" preached by the Independents, and reminded the lukewarm English that their Parliament had joined in the same covenant with the Scots for the reform of religion, "with the extirpation of Popery, Prelacie, and all belonging to that hierarchie." [3] In 1685 James II. vainly besought the Scottish estates to relax the penal laws against the Catholics. He then suspended these laws by an exercise of the prerogative, brought over several Jesuits to Edinburgh, and ordered the chapel of Holyrood to be fitted up for the celebration of Mass. This transient gleam was soon extinguished by the Revolution. Under Anne the magistrates must in some places have been tolerant; for we find the General Assembly in 1713 complaining that the Catholics had set up "openly in divers places their idolatrous worship, notwithstanding the penal laws which stand in force against them." [1] With no little effrontery, considering that they and their predecessors had allowed no Catholic to live in peace in Scotland for a hundred and fifty years past, the ministers attribute to their victims "the hellish design of extirpating the Protestant religion, under the name of the Northern heresie." The son and grandson of James II., in the risings of 1715 and 1745, found great support in the more ardent loyalty of those Highland clans which had retained the ancient faith. The failure of the attempt of 1745 was disastrous to Catholic interests in Scotland. At that time, says Archbishop Strain,[2] "not only individuals, but many entire families fell away from their religion." Deep inroads were made in the Catholicity of the North through the fall of many heads of clans and great landholders, whose example was usually imitated in good faith by their simple followers. "The territory inhabited by the western Celts was portioned off, like a chess-board," [3] into Catholic and Calvinist districts. In the South the resolution of those holding authority to repress any Catholic manifestation was so well known that the attempt was seldom made. There were but seven Jesuits in all Scotland when the order was suppressed. Aberdeenshire was perhaps the county in which religion was least persecuted; the noble house of Gordon (Earls of Huntly) always "gave ready shelter to priests"; and we read of "an inaccessible college of priests living like a band of robbers in the wilds of Glenlivet." [4] A storm of reviling swept over Scotland when it was announced (1778) that the Government, which the turn that events had taken in America had seriously alarmed, was bringing in a bill to relax the penal laws. A multitude of addresses, protests, declaratio[ns] and overtures, from every kirk-ses[sion] presbytery, and synod in poured in upon the Parli[ament] minster, in order to arrest career. These were coll[ected] volume of 350 pages; [3] i[n]

[1] The *Month*, vol. xiii. p. 90.

[2] In Ireland the sons of Catholic landowners were taken from the mother's control when the father had died leaving them under age, but not otherwise. (See Lecky's *Hist. of Ireland in the XVIIIth Century.*)

[3] *Scots' Declaration against the Toleration of Sects*, 1648.

[1] *A Seasonable Warning*, &c[.] Assembly, 1713.

[2] In the Memoir prefixed to [the] 1872–3.

[3] Burton, viii. 429.

[4] *Scotland's Opposition*

to which the existence of an "insidious design" to tolerate Jesuits and seminary priests was deplored, and the legal safeguards were declared insecure which forbade "the very dangerous privilege of Papists' enjoying heritable property." In 1731 the Vicariate which had been established in 1694 was divided into two districts, the Lowland and Highland. A Papal rescript of 1827 erected three Vicariates—the Eastern, the Western, and the Northern. "This last arrangement remained in force till the re-establishment of the hierarchy by the Apostolic letter 'Ex supremo,' March 4, 1878." ("Cath. Dir. for Scot.")

In the article on ENGLISH CHURCH it was mentioned that the shock of the rioting and destruction at London in 1780 was more than the aged frame of Challoner could bear. Bishop Hay, vicar-apostolic for Scotland, had a rather narrow escape at the same time. He had lately completed a chapel and house, from the exterior of which, however, every mark of their ecclesiastical use was carefully banished, in Chalmers' Close, High Street, Edinburgh. In the February of 1779 the excitement against the Catholic Relief Bill was at its height. Returning from a journey the bishop found the High Street occupied by an enormous crowd. He asked a woman what it meant; she replied "Oh, sir, we are burning the Popish chapel, and we only wish we had the bishop to throw him into the fire." [1] The bishop after a time succeeded in obtaining some compensation for the property burnt and destroyed; but he did not venture to rebuild the chapel; that was only done by Bishop Cameron, three years after Dr. Hay's death, in 1814.

During the last sixty years the Catholic population of Scotland has been largely augmented by an Irish immigration, consequent on the demand for labour arising at great industrial centres like Glasgow and Paisley. In 1878 the Holy See judged in its wisdom that the time had arrived for restoring to Scotland some of those ancient sees which had been vacant for nearly three hundred years. The mitre of St. Andrews was now conferred on Bishop Strain, of the Eastern district, with the title of "Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh." The archdiocese of Glasgow, which formerly had four suffragan sees, was committed to [illegible]gr. Eyre, translated from the Western [illegible] sees of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, [illegible] Argyll, which had all been [illegible] Reformation, were resusci[illegible]e time, and made suffragan [illegible] To Argyll the old see of [illegible] annexed. The number of [illegible]d regular, having cure of [illegible] nearly 600. The Catholic [illegible] to number about

[illegible]rain's Memoir.

500,000 souls. (Bellesheim, "Hist. of the Cath. Church in Scotland," tr.; Hunter-Blair in "Cath. Enc.")

SCREEN. [See ROOD SCREEN.]

SCRIPTURE. [See BIBLE; CANON OF THE SCRIPTURE; INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.]

SCRUPLES. [See CONSCIENCE, p. 223.]

SCRUTINY (*scrutinium*). 1. An examination of those who were about to receive baptism as to their faith and dispositions. They were taught the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, exorcized, &c., during those scrutinies. The days appointed for the different scrutinies varied in different places. At Rome the Creed was given to the catechumens on the Wednesday of the fourth week in Lent (*traditio symboli*), and they made profession of faith (*redditio symboli*) on Holy Saturday. In the Roman Church, under Pope Siricius, there were apparently three scrutinies only; at a later date, seven; then, when baptism was seldom given except to infants, the number fell again to three, and from the beginning of the twelfth century—as infants were baptized soon after birth, even if there was no apprehension of death, and not, as formerly, at Easter and Pentecost—the ceremonies of the scrutiny were joined, as in our present Ritual, to the actual baptism. The Gelasian Sacramentary contains four Masses "pro scrutiniis electorum" (Chardon, 49 *sqq.*).

2. The term "scrutiny" is also used for the examination of a candidate for Holy Order. Though the actual term is not used by St. Cyprian, the thing is alluded to by him (Ep. xxxviii. ed. Hartel, p. 579). The ninth canon of Nicaea supposes the scrutiny to be already customary (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 587, note).

3. A third use of the term is to denote election by written ballot or by open pronouncement of the name chosen. It is the usual form for electing the Pope or other ecclesiastical official. [See ELECTION; CONCLAVE.]

SEAL OF ALTAR. [See ALTAR.]

SEAL OF CONFESSION. The obligation of keeping absolutely secret knowledge gained through sacramental confession. It rests on the natural law which binds us to keep secrets communicated in confidence, and on the ecclesiastical law, which, as we shall see, forbids, under most severe penalties, any revelation of sins confessed sacramentally. But it also arises from the positive divine law, and, as Suarez points out, the obligation of the seal is probably connatural, and belongs to the very essence of the sacrament of Penance. In other words, Christ did not impose the obligation of confessing mortal sins committed after baptism and then add a protective law binding the priest to secrecy, but the obligation of the seal follows necessarily from the nature of confession as instituted by Him; otherwise, Penance,

which is the ministry of mercy and reconciliation, would become a burden intolerable to mankind. What the priest hears in sacramental confession he hears not as a mere man, but as one who stands in God's place. He must not by word, or look, or change of conduct remind the penitent himself of anything he has heard, much less convey such knowledge to others. To do so is sacrilege, excusable by no advantage to himself, to the public, or even to the penitent. The law admits of no exception, except where the penitent freely gives the confessor leave to use his knowledge. Not only sins however slight, but moral or natural weaknesses, sins of accomplices, all that may bring the penitent into trouble, or contempt, or suspicion of any sort, fall, if known through confession, under the sacramental seal. A priest might break the seal, in certain circumstances, merely by admitting that a person has confessed to him; or, again, even if there be no danger of suspicion fixing itself on any individual, by revelations which might bring bad repute or suspicion on a community or a certain number of men.

The first express mention of the seal of confession, so far as we know, occurs in Canon 20 of the Armenian Synod at Dovin, in 527. It anathematizes any priest who breaks the seal (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1079). In the West, there is no mention of penalties for breaking the seal till very late; probably because such a sacrilege was scarcely thought possible. There is a decree attributed to Pope Gregory (as Morinus conjectures, Gregory VII.), and quoted by the Master of the Sentences and Gratian (Can. "Sacerdos," 2, causa 33, q. 3, dist. 6), which sentences a confessor guilty of this crime to deposition and to perpetual and ignominious pilgrimage. The Fourth Lateran Council ("Extra. de Poenit. et Remiss."; Const. "Omnis utriusque sexus") condemns such a priest to deposition and perpetual imprisonment in a monastery. The sanctity of the seal is further recognized by all the Oriental sects (Denzinger, "Rit. Orient." vol. i. p. 101), and their canon law threatens with the most severe punishments those who break it. True, a law of Peter the Great requires Russian confessors to reveal the confessions of those who are guilty of treason or of palming off fictitious miracles, unless they desist; but such a law only proves how completely the Russian church has become the slave of the State.

Whether in English law, confession made to a priest is privileged, is a matter of some doubt. Serjt. Badeley ("The Privilege of Religious Confessions in English Courts of Justice") maintains the affirmative. The whole question is well discussed by R. S. Nolan in "Cath. Enc." He quotes Phillimore ("Ecclesiastical Law") as saying: "When this question is again raised in an English Court of Justice that court will decide it in favour of the inviolability of the confession." In the United States the position at common law is the same as in England. But some of the States have made the privilege a matter of Statute Law.

In one respect, modern are stricter than mediaeval theologians with respect to the seal. St. Thomas ("Suppl." q. 11, a. 1, ad 3) says an abbot who knows from the confession of his prior that the office is an occasion of ruin to him may, on some excuse, relieve him of his office, if he will not resign it willingly, provided always there is no danger of the confession being revealed. According to St. Alphonsus ("Theol. Moral." lib. vi. n. 656), this is the docrine of St. Bonaventure and Alexander of Hales, but he adds that it can on no account be put in practice, and this seems to be certain from the eleventh of the Propositions condemned in 1682 by Innocent XI. (Ferraris, *Sigillum Confessionis*; De Lugo, "De Poenitentia," disp. 23; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vol. v. p. 486 *sqq.*)

SECRET. Either *secreta*, neut. pl., "secret things," or *secreta oratio*, a prayer or prayers said by the celebrant in a low voice, which cannot be heard except by himself, after the Offertory and before the Preface. Hence, in some old Missals it is entitled "Super oblata."

The Reformers objected to the practice of saying the Secrets and nearly all the Canon inaudibly, and great disputes on the matter arose in the French church at the beginning of the eighteenth century. About 1709, when the Missal was revised for the diocese of Meaux at the order of Bishop Bissy (five years later Cardinal), the new addition appeared with an "Amen," preceded by an ℟ in red, at the end of the different prayers in the Canon; and the Rubric requiring the prayers to be said "in a low voice" (*submissa voce*) was explained by the additional clause—"*i.e.* without singing" (*i.e. sine cantu*). The chapter (Jan. 29, 1710) and the bishop (in a *mandement* two or three days later) repudiated all complicity in the change, and the copies of the Missal were again corrected by episcopal authority. But the innovation of saying the Secrets and Canon aloud, which had been previously condemned by Savary, bishop of Séez, in a *mandement* of 1698, was eagerly defended and adopted by a number of priests secular and regular, and this number was constantly increasing in Le Brun's time. This great scholar has written an elaborate treatise on the subject, which forms the eighth volume of his "Explication de la Messe." The following are the chief points which he establishes:—

(1) *The Meaning of the Word "Secreta."*—Bossuet ("Explic. des Prières de la Messe," n. 2) suggested that the word came from *secretio*, as *missa* from *missio*, &c., either because said over the oblations, which were then

separated from the rest of the bread offered, or because said after the separation of the catechumens from the faithful. This derivation, adopted as certain by Vert, is proved false by Le Brun. Neither *secretio* nor *secernere* is used for the dismissal of catechumens. Besides, the adjective sense of *secreta—i.e.* "secret"—is fixed by the ancient Sacramentary of Bobbio and the Ordo Romanus, which have "collectio secreta," "dicta oratione secreta," and by the old liturgical writers—*e.g.* Amalarius, who says: "Secreta nominatur quia secreto dicitur."

(2) *The present Discipline of the Church* makes it unlawful for any celebrant (except bishops in the Mass of Ordination) to say the Secrets or Canon audibly. The Council of Trent (sess. xxii. De Sacr. Miss.) approves the custom of saying some parts of the Mass in a "more elevated," others in a low voice, and (canon 9) anathematizes those who assert that such a custom is "to be condemned." The French innovators explained away these words, as we have already seen. But both Sarpi and Pallavicino understand the Council to mean secret prayer, inaudible to others; so did St. Charles; so do the most celebrated commentators on the Rubrics, Gavantus and Quarti. Lastly, there is an authoritative interpretation of the words *submissa voce* in the Roman Missal prescribed by Pius V. The priest is to say the secret prayers so low as not to be heard by those around (Rub. Gen. a. 16). This settles the question of practice. Ecclesiastics are free to think as they please on the historical question about the date at which the usage began; but they must keep the law as it stands.

(3) *The Antiquity of the Usage.*—Cardinal Bona believed that the Secrets and Canon were said audibly till the tenth century. His reason was that the faithful used to answer "Amen" after the words of Consecration, and that Florus, who lived in the ninth century, is the last writer who mentions this response. That the people did answer "Amen" after the Consecration is an unquestionable fact; but there is no reason to believe that they did, and many weighty reasons for thinking that they did not, do so immediately after the words of consecration were uttered. Neither in the old Gallican Missal edited by Thomasius, nor in the first Ordo Romanus, nor in any of the Missals older than the twelfth century examined by Le Brun, is any "Amen" marked till after the "Per omnia saecula saeculorum" which ends the Canon and precedes the Pater Noster. All the Oriental liturgies distinguish the prayers to be said aloud from those which are uttered in an undertone. True, the modern Greeks say the words of consecration in a loud voice, but this custom was introduced by a constitution of Justinian (Novella 132, cap. 6, quoted by Le Brun), and even now the Greeks say the rest of the Canon in an undertone. Add to all this that the Canon of the Mass was never committed to writing in the first four centuries; that St. Cyril of Alexandria ("In Joann." lib. xii. apud Le Brun) speaks of the doors of the sanctuary which were closed, St. Chrysostom of the curtain drawn during the Consecration; and we shall scarcely doubt that Le Brun is right in claiming immemorial antiquity for our present use. We may quote, in conclusion, two other authorities. Martène, in a letter to Le Brun (March 27, 1726), tells him he has treated the question in a manner which leaves no room for reply, and he says Mabillon, who was his master, always held that the Canon had never been said audibly in the Latin Church. The names of Mabillon, Martène, and Le Brun are probably the very greatest which could be adduced in such a controversy. Nor can any valid objection be made on general grounds to the practice of the Church. It is fitting in every way that the priest, in these solemn moments, should speak in the ears of God alone, and that the faithful should meditate in reverent silence on that great mystery of our redemption which is represented, continued, and applied in the sacrifice of the Mass. (See, in addition to the works mentioned, Fortescue, "The Mass," 311.)

SECRET, DISCIPLINE OF THE. [See DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET.]

SECRET SOCIETIES. In the technical sense, a secret society is one which (1) plots against the Church or State; (2) binds its members upon oath not to reveal any of its proceedings; (3) requires blind obedience to the orders of the heads; (4) has a ritual of initiation &c., simulating Christian rites. It is clear that such a society is forbidden by the Church. [See FREEMASONRY.] On the other hand, it is not always easy to decide whether some given society (*e.g.* the Oddfellows, the Good Templars, the Foresters) comes under this condemnation. A society may disclaim all intention of plotting against Church or State, and all profane imitation of sacred rites; and it may point out that secrecy and obedience are necessary for the success of their proceedings, and do not involve any violation of the moral or civil law. Each society must be judged on its own merits, care especially being taken to inquire into the quasi-religious character of the ceremonies. The third Council of Baltimore (no. 253) declares: "We see no reason why the prohibition of the Church against the Masonic and other secret societies should be extended to organizations of working men; which have no other object in view than mutual protection and aid for their members in the practice of their trades. Care must be taken, however, that nothing be admitted under any pretext which favours condemned societies; or that the working men who belong to these organizations be induced, by the cunning arts of wicked men, to withhold, contrary to the laws of justice, the labour due from them, or in any

other manner violate the rights of their employers. Those associations are also entirely illicit in which the members are so bound for mutual defence that danger of riots and murders is the outcome." (See Fanning in "Cath. Enc."; Stevens, "Cyclopaedia of Fraternities"; Rosen, "The Cath. Church and Secret Societies.")

SECULAR CLERGY (*saeculum*, the world). From St. Cyprian downwards, the terms *saeculum, saecularis* were habitually used by Christian writers to express the world outside the Church, and the spirit of that world. In proportion as the monastic institution grew and spread itself, the contrast between the cloister or the cell and life outside of these was more vividly realised, and when the profession of Christianity had become general the contrast was no longer between *saeculum* and *ecclesia*, but between the secular or worldly and the monastic or regular life. To the clergy of all ranks and orders serving Christ in the world, not bound by vows or by a rule of life, the term "secular" seems to have been first applied in the twelfth century. Honorius II. (1125) permitted the monks of Cluny to give their habit to secular clerks who desired to join them; *laicos, seu clericos saeculares . . . ad conversionem suscipere.*[1] (Ducange, *Saeculum.*)

SECULARIZATION. This term may be applied to persons or things. (1) In the former sense it means the authorization given to religious to live in the "world" outside their order. The person remains a religious still bound by his vows. Generally speaking, however, secularization is synonymous with dispensation from vows, whereby the person becomes no longer a religious. Both secularization and dispensation must be carefully distinguished from expulsion or dismissal, which are penal measures. Stringent regulations regarding secularization and dispensation from vows have been laid down by a decree of June 15, 1909 (S.C. of Regular Discipline). (Boudinhon, in "Cath. Enc."; Vermeersch, "De Relig. Inst. et Personis.")

(2) As applied to things, secularization is the extinction of the title by which property, whether real or personal, is held by the Church, and the placing of that property at the disposal of the secular power. It is obvious that such extinction of title cannot justly take effect except with the consent of the Holy See, as representing the whole Church. Historically, such consent has seldom been asked or obtained; the utmost concession to equity that civil governments are accustomed to make in such a case is to enter into a treaty with the Holy See for regulating the compensation, generally a most inadequate one, awarded to the clergy, secular or regular, whose property has been secularized. This has been done [CONCORDAT] in France, Austria, and Catholic countries generally. In England, Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Portugal no compensation for the expropriation of Church property has ever been made.

The principal European secularizations have taken place in the following order: Sweden, 1527; England, 1534–8; Denmark, 1536; North Germany, 1521–1648; France, 1790. In Germany the great secularization took place in 1803, when the territories of the three ecclesiastical Electors, the Prince-Archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Trèves, with those of an immense number of bishops and convents, were apportioned among the German sovereigns as indemnity for the loss which the Empire had sustained at the Peace of Lunéville, through the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France. Spain, 1835–1836; Italy, 1851–1882; France, 1880–1906; Portugal, 1911. [See CHURCH PROPERTY; CHURCH OF FRANCE, &c.]

SEDILIA. The seats in the sanctuary or choir occupied by the priest and his ministers.

SEGNATURA, SIGNATURA. In the early Middle Ages, as petitions to Rome increased in number, certain officials were appointed to examine and report upon them. These were called "Referendarii Apostolici." They are mentioned by Innocent IV. The brief in reply was called "signatura" (Ducange). As the petitions naturally fell into two classes, viz. requests for favours or justice, Alexander VI. divided the officials into two bodies, those belonging to the Signatura of Grace and those to the Signatura of Justice. The former gradually disappeared. The latter was a real tribunal, and received fresh organization from Gregory XVI. in 1834.

By the Apostolic Constitution "Sapienti Consilio" (June 29, 1908), Pius X. made the Signatura one of the three tribunals of the Roman Curia, the others being the Penitentiaria and the Rota (*q.v.*). It consists of six cardinals, one of whom is the prefect, and a number of subordinate officials. It is a sort of court of appeal from the decisions of the Rota, and is sometimes appointed for special purposes. (Ojetti in "Cath. Enc." *Roman Curia*, with bibliography there given.)

SEMIARIANS. [See ARIUS, p. 50.]

SEMIDOUBLE. [See FEASTS.]

SEMINARY. A school or college for the training of young persons destined for the priesthood. Under the headings SCHOOLS and UNIVERSITIES will be found some account of the methods employed by the Church to impart this training, and to adapt it to the changing circumstances of European society, in the primitive times and during the Middle Ages. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the university system was greatly extended; faculties of theology were everywhere erected in them; and the old monastic or cathedral schools, of the

[1] Thomassin, ii. 1, 10, 7.

success of which Bec, Fleury, York, Rheims, and Cologne had given brilliant examples, fell into decay. In the sixteenth century many of the existing universities, coming altogether under Protestant influences, were lost to the Church; and even in the remainder a spirit of disaffection or doubt was rife, which made them ill adapted to nourish and protect that pure and peaceful ecclesiastical temper in which it is so desirable that the future servants of the sanctuary should be reared. The Fathers of Trent, comprehending in their full bearing the difficulties and confusions of the time, and providing with equal piety and wisdom the suitable remedies, resolved that, so far as in them lay, no Catholic diocese should in future be without regular and permanent means for supplying itself from generation to generation with pastors carefully trained to meet its spiritual needs. They accordingly ordered that the metropolitan of every province, and the bishop of every diocese, should establish at some suitable place (if there were no institution of the kind already existing) a college or seminary, into which a certain number of boys of not less than twelve years of age, born in wedlock, able to read and write, and giving some promise of perseverance in the service of the Church, should be admitted. The sons of poor parents were to be preferred; but the rich, provided that they paid their own expenses, were not to be excluded. The tonsure was to be given, and the ecclesiastical dress to be worn from the very first. All branches of study—such as the ecclesiastical chant, the ritual, the administration of sacraments, and especially what relates to the tribunal of Penance—which contribute to form a well-instructed priest, were to be taught to the students; besides, of course, Holy Scripture and theology. The rule *aut disce aut discede* was to be strictly enforced. The management of the seminary was to be in the hands of the bishop and two of the senior canons. On the important question of "ways and means" the Council was full and precise, ordering that the prebends of canons and the revenues of ecclesiastical benefices of every description should be taxed to the extent required for the sustentation of the institution. Two poor dioceses might unite to found one seminary; and a rich diocese might found more than one within its own limits (sess. xxiii. cap. 18).

The wish of the Council was but partially fulfilled. In France seminaries arose in every direction before the Revolution; the fame of St. Sulpice, founded by M. Olier about 1650, became European; but the Revolution swept away everything. After the Restoration most of these were refounded, but were once more confiscated in 1906–7. In Germany various obstacles have all along impeded the execution of the Council's decree. The usual practice has been for clerical students to pass two or three years at a university, and afterwards one year or even less in an episcopal seminary, to acquire special professional knowledge. Of this mode of meeting the exigencies of the problem, so different from that appointed by the Council, Pius VII., in a brief dated August 10, 1819, expressed his disapprobation. Recently, we believe, the German bishops have made great advances towards the introduction of the seminary system. In Ireland, besides the great seminary of Maynooth, there are a number of diocesan seminaries and diocesan colleges, the ecclesiastical students from which go up to Maynooth to receive their final preparation for the priesthood. In England four dioceses have seminaries in the strict sense (Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, and Southwark). Blairs (Aberdeen) serves for a number of dioceses. There are also a number of diocesan colleges, in which a certain number of ecclesiastical students are educated for the priesthood.

In recent years a large number of well-equipped seminaries have been founded in the United States, *e.g.* at Baltimore, New York, Rochester, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, &c., besides the provision made for higher theological studies at Washington University and elsewhere.

The training of the clergy in seminaries engaged the attention especially of Leo XIII. and Pius X. The former prescribed the study of St. Thomas's philosophy, and encouraged historical research and Biblical studies. Pius interested himself more particularly in the well-being of Italian seminaries, and indirectly suggested regulations for the guidance of bishops in other countries. Recognizing the impossibility of maintaining efficient seminaries in small dioceses, he directed that, in accordance with the decree of Trent, such dioceses should combine together to form central or interdiocesan seminaries. He drew up a programme of studies for Gymnasium, Lyceum, and Theology courses, corresponding with our Humanities, Philosophy, and Theology. The first course should be conducted in such a way "that students may obtain recognized certificates which will be useful to them in case they should adopt some other state of life. Such certificates are also likely to prove of advantage to those whom God may be pleased to call to the priesthood."

The Secretary to the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars explained the purpose of this. "Our students cannot as a rule decide whether they have a vocation to the ecclesiastical state until they have reached a certain age. If any, therefore, should change their mind, their clerical education would not be an obstacle to the choice of a professional career. They could secure diplomas

required by law and thus be more free in their choice of a state of life."

This most wise provision should be carefully noted, as it applies not only to Italy, but also to non-Catholic countries. The Lyceum course is to occupy three years. An intermediate year is to be devoted to "Propaedeutics": that is, introduction to Theology, Church History, and the Bible. The theological course is to last four years.

On the occasion of his golden jubilee, Pius addressed to the clergy of the whole world an exhortation setting forth the ideal priestly life which all should strive after (August 4th, 1908). (See Bargilliart, "De Institutione Clericorum"; Micheletti, "De Institutione Clericorum in Sacris Seminariis," "De Ratione Studiorum in S. Seminairis"; Taunton; Hogan, "Clerical Studies"; Schneider, "Manuale Clericorum.")

SEMIPELAGIANISM. A heresy which arose from reaction against the doctrine of St. Augustine on grace and predestination. The Semipelagians did not go so far as Pelagius, and they held their errors, so far as can be known, without any intention of rejecting Catholic doctrine. They were not considered heretics; on the contrary, St. Augustine and St. Prosper speak of them as "brethren," "holy men," &c., though their doctrine was undoubtedly heretical. Contention arose among the monks of Adrumetum, occasioned by Augustine's letter to Sixtus, priest, afterwards bishop. of Rome in 418. To these monks Augustine in 426 addressed two letters ("Ad Valentin. Abbat. et Monach. Adrumet.") and sent along with them his little work "On Grace and Free-will," and afterwards another "De Correptione et Gratia" (PL, xliv. 881 *sqq.*, 915 *sqq.*), which Cardinal Noris calls the key to the whole doctrine of the saint. But in the following year St. Augustine had to write to Vitalis, "a certain learned man in the Carthaginian church," who held that "right belief in God and assent to the Gospel was not the gift of God but of ourselves—that is, from our own will" (August. "Ep. ad Vital." ad init., PL, xxxiii. 978). Here we have Semipelagianism appearing in a definite form. Further, Augustine learnt from the letters of Prosper and Hilarius that his book "De Correptione et Gratia" had met with great opposition among the monks of Marseilles. These letters are extant, and give a very clear and coherent account of the Semipelagian tenets, which are often called the heresy of the Massilienses. The monks objected to the Augustinian doctrine that the number of the elect was absolutely fixed by the decree of God. They made predestination the mere foreknowledge of God that some would, others would not persevere. They also held that God allowed some infants to die without baptism, some adults without hearing the Gospel, only because He knew they would have made no use of these graces had they been offered. Again, admitting that "all mankind perished in Adam and could not be freed from that state by their own free will," that "no one was able in his own strength to begin, much less to finish, any [good] work," they still maintained that the wish to be healed, the beginning of faith, "if not entire faith," must proceed from the good use of the natural faculties. Christ was the physician, but the desire to be healed by Him was natural and human. "To that grace through which we are new-born in Christ, man comes by natural power, by seeking, asking, knocking." Lastly, they denied that God gave not only the power to persevere but also perseverance itself ("ut eis perseverantia ipsa donetur"). These two letters, from which the words in inverted commas are taken, are eminently trustworthy, for they speak of the Massilienses not only with courtesy but even with reverence. St. Augustine replied by sending his two books, "De Predestinatione Sanctorum" and "De Dono Perseverantiae," written in 428 or 429 (PL, xliv. 959 *sqq.*, 993 *sqq.*). It was at this time that Cassian finished the writing of his "XXIV. Conferences" (begun in 423, finished in 428). He had come to Provence about 509, and, having been ordained priest, founded two monasteries, one for men, the other for women. He is regarded as the founder of the celebrated abbey of St. Victor at Marseilles, and is said to have had 5000 monks under him. His "Conferences" ("Collationes") have always had a high reputation in the Church. But in them we find Semipelagianism in its most developed and offensive form. "Not only," says Petavius ("De Pelag. et Semipelag. Haer." cap. vii.), "did he attribute the beginning of good-will to the will of man, but even ascribed to it remarkable and heroic virtues." Thus, in Collat. xiii. cap. 14, he supposes that God "withdrew His hand" from Job and left him to obtain an actual victory over Satan in his own strength. So he asserts (*ib.*) that the centurion's faith which Christ praises (Mt. viii.) was due to his natural efforts; else, he says, Christ would not have praised it, and would have said, not "I have not found such faith in Israel," but "I have not given such faith in Israel." Cassian was attacked by St. Prosper in his "Liber adversus Collatorem," written about 432 or rather later. It is specially directed against Conference xiii., already referred to.

Before this, in 431, Pope Celestine, appealed to by Prosper and Hilarius, had addressed a letter of capital importance to Venerius, bishop of Marseilles, and the other bishops of Gaul. The Pope, though he speaks of St. Augustine as one whom previous Popes had always reckoned "among the best masters," carefully abstains from insisting on many points in the Augustinian doctrine

of grace and predestination which had been regarded, and most naturally, as "hard sayings" by the Semipelagians. But he teaches emphatically (1) that "the will is prepared by God"; that "every holy thought, good counsel, movement of the will comes from God"; that only through His grace we "*begin* to *will* and to do any good"; that He acts in us in order "that we may do and will what He wills"; (2) that "no one, except through Christ, can use his free will aright"; that none can overcome temptation "save through God's daily help"; (3) that "we must refer final perseverance to the grace of Christ." These statements, he adds, are enough; while he does not despise, he declines to enter on the "deeper and harder parts of the questions which present themselves." (Celest. "Ad Episc. Gall." ep. 21.)

The controversy entered on its last stage about 475. The Predestinationist heresy appeared for the first time in the persons of Lucidus, a priest, and a certain Monimus of Africa. We have little accurate information about these heretics. Lucidus seems to have denied free will, and to have held that men were lost by no will of their own and simply because they were reprobate by the divine decree. He was opposed by Faustus, abbot of Lerins, and afterwards bishop of Riez, and submitted after he had been condemned by two councils at Arles and Lyons (probably in 475; see Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 908). But Faustus, in his two books "De Gratia Dei et Humanae Mentis Libero Arbitrio," showed himself a Semipelagian, and Scythian monks laid the matter before Pope Hormisdas and then before Fulgentius of Ruspe and other African bishops who had taken refuge in Sardinia, and who anathematized Faustus in 523. Fulgentius refuted Faustus in three books, "De Veritate Praedestinationis et Gratiae Dei." The Catholic doctrine was defended in France by Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Arles (d. 542). In 529, the Synod of Orange (Arausio), in South Gaul, gave the final blow to Semipelagianism. Although only a provincial council, it possesses the highest dogmatic authority, for it was confirmed by Pope Boniface II. It defines that man can neither "believe, will, desire, attempt, labour, watch, strive, seek, ask, knock" "as it behoves him" (can. 6), or even "think any good thing which pertains to the salvation of eternal life" (can. 7), "by the strength of nature" and "without God's grace." "No one has aught of his own, except lying and sin" (can. 22). On the other hand, the Council teaches that the free will of fallen man is not destroyed, but "perverted and weakened"; "A reward is due to good works, but grace, which is not due, comes first, that the works may be done" (can. 18); "Men do their own will, not God's, when they do that which displeases God" (can. 23); "That some are predestined to evil by divine power we not only disbelieve, but also, if there are any who believe so horrible a thing, we say anathema to them with all detestation" (Denzinger-Bannwart, 174-200).

(The great authority on the history of Semipelagianism is Cardinal Noris, "Historia Pelagiana." See also Petavius, in the work cited in the text. The chief sources are the works of Augustine (PL, xliv.), Prosper, and Fulgentius mentioned above.)

SEMPRINGHAM, ORDER OF. This order was founded by Gilbert. the priest of Sempringham in Lincolnshire, about 1135, for both men and women. The rule for the women was that of Benedictine nuns, that of the men was the same as that followed by Austin canons; in either case St. Gilbert added particular statutes of his own. The habit of a Gilbertine canon was a black cassock with a white cloak over it, and a hood lined with lambskin. At his death in 1189 St. Gilbert left thirteen houses of his order, of which nine were double, and the others for men only. In the double monasteries the only common portion was the church, and in that the nuns and canons could neither see nor hear each other; the other buildings were placed at a considerable distance apart. Robert Mannyng, the well-known author of one of the old English "Rhyming Chronicles," was a member of this order.

At the Dissolution, the following twenty-five Gilbertine houses were suppressed:—

Alvingham (Linc.)
Bullington (Linc.)
Cambridge
Catteley (Linc.)
Chicksand (Beds.)
Clattercote (Oxf.)
Elreton (York)
Fordham (Cambr.)
Haverholm (Linc.)
Hitchin (Herts)
Holland Bridge (Linc.)
Lincoln
Marlborough
Mattersey (Notts)
Mirmaud (Cambr.)
Newstede (Linc.)
North Ormesby (Linc.)
Old Malton (York)
Overton (York)
Pulton (Wilts)
Sempringham
Sixhills (Linc.)
Shouldham (Norf.)
Walton (York)
York, St. Andrew's

(Hélyot; Gasquet, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.")

SENTENCES. [See MASTER OF THE SENTENCES.]

SEPARATION. [See DIVORCE and MARRIAGE.]

SEPTUAGESIMA. [See QUINQUAGESIMA.]

SEPTUAGINT. By this name is known the first Greek translation of the Bible, made at Alexandria, about B.C. 286-284. The various more or less fabulous stories concerning its origin are all founded upon a Greek letter purporting to be written by one Aristeas, an alleged partaker in the transaction. According to Aristeas, "the Athenian Demetrius Phalereus induced the Egyptian king, Ptolemy Philadelphus, to have a Greek translation prepared of the Jewish Book of the Law. By buying the freedom of the whole of the Jewish bondsmen in Egypt for a sum of more than 1000 talents

he assured for himself the favour of the Jews. He then requested the high priest, by means of an embassy in which Aristeas took part, to send him men learned in both languages and suitable for the translation, six out of each tribe. The high priest sent the number of men asked for, together with a Hebrew codex written in golden characters. These persons were highly honoured by the king; they completed the translation in seventy-two days, working together at it in a beautiful building on the shores of the island of Pharos. Demetrius wrote down the translation as soon as they agreed on any portion of it. Then Demetrius convoked an assembly of the Jews, and read out the translation in their presence and in that of the translators, and it found general approval. The Jews asked Demetrius to let their principal men have a copy of this translation of the law, and to utter an anathema on any who should venture to alter anything in it. The king was highly rejoiced at the success of the work, and, commanding Demetrius to take particular care for its preservation, dismissed the translators to their homes with rich presents" (Venables' translation of Bleek's "Introduction to the Old Testament," ii. p. 396). This groundwork was successively embellished by Philo ("De Vita Mosis," l. 2, §§ 5-7), Josephus ("Ant." xii. 2); Justin Martyr ("Cohort. ad Graecos," c. xiii., PG, vi. 265), who adds that the seventy translators worked in seventy different cells, had no communication with one another, and yet translated every passage in the same words without the slightest difference. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Augustine, and others repeat Justin's narrative with but slight variations. The fundamental fact of Aristeas' letter, viz. the translation of the Bible into Greek under Ptolemy Philadelphus, is corroborated by the testimony of Aristobulus, who wrote about a century after the event (Clement of Alex. "Strom." i. p. 342, and Eusebius, "Praep. Evang." ix. 6, xiii. 12). The genuineness of Aristobulus is almost universally admitted, whereas the letter of Aristeas is almost universally regarded as spurious. The reader will find the question fully debated in Humphry Hody's "De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata," Oxford, 1705, and in Van Dale's "Dissertatio super Arietea de LXX interpretibus," etc., Amsterdam, 1705, or in the "Introd. to the Old Testament" by Bleek, Keil, etc. After sifting the evidence at hand, Bleek comes to the following conclusions as to the real origin of the Septuagint: (*a*) probably the translation of the Book of the Law was put in hand by Ptolemy Philadelphus and carried on by Demetrius Phalereus in particular, as stated by Aristobulus; (*b*) we have no ground for assuming that this translation embraced any books of the Old Testament besides the Pentateuch; (*c*) it may be assumed as certain that the Pentateuch was then for the first time translated into Greek; (*d*) the character of the translation decidedly points out that the translators belonged to Egypt and not to Palestine, and certainly that they were not those whom the high priest expressly sent to Egypt with a codex of the Law for this purpose. The other books of the Old Testament were also translated in Egypt, some time before 133 B.C., by various authors. A variety of translators may be inferred, both from the different character of the translation in different books, and also from certain perpetually recurring variations. These translations differ in important respects from our Hebrew Bibles. It is not only that we meet with various readings, often strongly commended by internal evidence, but we find certain sections present in the Greek and wanting in the Hebrew, and *vice versa*. These differences are most striking in the books of Samuel and Kings, in Proverbs, and in Jeremiah, in the last of which no fewer than 2,700 words of the Hebrew have nothing answering to them in the Greek. It cannot always be decided whether the translators had a different text before them, or whether they themselves ventured sometimes to make additions and alterations, or whether the translation afterwards underwent change The Jews considered the LXX as an authentic and even inspired version of their Sacred Books and used it even for doctrinal purposes. Philo and Josephus, and the writers of the New Testament, constantly quote it instead of the Hebrew original. It was read out and explained in the Alexandrian and Hellenistic synagogues. This reverence lasted until the Jews returned to the study of Hebrew, when by degrees it gave place to a pronounced aversion. In the Christian Church the LXX retained a higher and more continuous authority. Most of the Fathers held it as equally inspired with the Hebrew text, *e.g.* St. Irenaeus (iii. 25), Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." i. 22), St. Augustine ("De Civ. Dei," xviii. 43, PL, xli. 604: "The same spirit who was in the prophets when they spoke was in the seventy men when they interpreted the prophets"). Origen, however, and still more St. Jerome, discriminate between the text and the version, and in cases of discrepancy give the preference to the original. In the Greek Church the LXX has retained its authority to the present day, whereas in the Latin Church it has been superseded by the Vulgate of St. Jerome. For its critical value see VULGATE, p. 863. (Johannes Bleek, "Introd. to the Old Testament," § 342; Keil, "Introd." § 175; Ewald, "History of Israel," transl. by Carpenter, vol. v. p. 249; Stanley, "The Jewish Church," § 47; Swete, "Introd. to the Old Testament in Greek," "The

Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint.")

SEQUENCE. A rhythm sometimes sung between the Epistle and Gospel; also called a "prose," because not in any regular metre. At first, the sequence was merely a prolongation of the last note of the Alleluia after the Epistle (farcing), till, to avoid the wearisome effect of such a prolongation, words, appropriate to the occasion, were substituted. Notker, a monk of St. Gall, who wrote about 880, is generally said to have been the first writer of sequences; but he himself tells us, in his preface, that he had seen some verses for the notes of the sequence in an Antiphonary which a priest brought him from Jumièges, a Benedictine abbey five leagues from Rouen. Many mediaeval Missals have sequences for every feast and Sunday, and they were made in such number and so carelessly that the Carthusians and Cistercians were praised for not admitting any of them. In the revision of the Roman Missal in the sixteenth century, only four sequences were retained: "Victimae Paschali," at Easter (attributed to Wipso, chaplain to Conrad II., eleventh century); "Veni, Sancte Spiritus," at Pentecost (attributed to Robert, king of France, d. 1031); "Lauda, Sion," at Corpus Christi (by St. Thomas of Aquin); the "Dies Irae" in Masses of the Dead (by Thomas of Celano, d. *circ.* 1250). A fifth prose, "Stabat Mater," by Jacopone da Todi, on the two feasts of the Seven Dolours, must have been added very recently, since neither Le Brun nor Benedict XIV. recognizes it. Other sequences are found in the Missals of religious orders—*e.g.* one for the Feast of the Holy Name in that of the Franciscans. The Lyons Missal, in use till a few years ago, is rich in sequences, some very beautiful. "The sequence is peculiar to the Roman and its derived rites. Neither Milan nor the Mozarabic liturgy, still less the Eastern liturgies, know it." (See Fortescue, "The Mass," p. 272 *sqq.*; Neale, "Sequentiae ex Missalibus"; Dreves, "Ein Jahrtausend Lateinischer Hymnendichtung.")

SERAPH. [See ANGEL, p. 24.]

SERAPHIC DOCTOR, THE. St. Bonaventure; he became Minister-General of the Franciscans in 1256. [See FRANCISCANS.]

SERAPHIC ORDER. [See FRANCISCANS, p. 364.]

SERVITES. The order of the "Religious Servants of the Holy Virgin," commonly called the Servites, was founded in 1233 by seven Florentine merchants, whose names were Monaldi, Manetti, Amidei, Lantella, Uguccioni, Sostegni, and Falconieri. The last named, Alexis Falconieri, who lived to be 110 years old, was uncle of St. Juliana Falconieri, whom Hélyot regards as the foundress of the Servite Third Order (1306). The seven founders, who were already members of a confraternity instituted to sing the praises of Our Lady, being assembled in their chapel on the festival of the Assumption, 1233, were conscious of a common internal admonition that they should renounce the world. They began by selling their goods and distributing the price to the poor; then, having found a mean house outside the city, they took up their abode there, living in great austerity and continual prayer, and, with the consent of the bishop, Ardinghi, begging their bread in the streets. Entering the city one day to ask the bishop's blessing and counsel, they are said to have been greeted by infants in their mothers' arms with cries of "See the servants of the Virgin"; and the name thus given has adhered to them ever since. After a while they removed to Monte Senario, three leagues from Florence, and built a convent on the top of the mountain, which was for centuries the chief seat of their institute. Monaldi was their first superior; St. Philip Benizi, who joined the order in consequence of a vision and became the fifth general (1267), propagated it exceedingly, and saved it from the ruin with which it was threatened in 1276, when Innocent V. wished to suppress it, as coming under the prohibition of the Council of Lyons against the multiplication of religious orders. The habit finally adopted by the Servites was black, with a leather girdle, a scapular, and a cape. They took the rule of St. Augustine, adding to it many particular constitutions. After a period of uncertainty, the pontificate of Honorius IV. witnessed the first of a series of Papal confirmations and graces conferred on this order, culminating in the celebrated constitution "Mare Magnum" (1487), whereby Innocent VIII., confirming all former grants, bestowed on the Servites equal privileges and prerogatives with those enjoyed by the other four mendicant orders —viz. the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Augustinian Hermits, and the Carmelites. So rapidly did the order spread that at the death of the last of the seven founders, Alexis Falconieri, it numbered over 10,000 religious, besides nuns, distributed into more than twenty provinces. Its strength lay chiefly in Italy and Germany; in England it had no houses before the Reformation. Among its distinguished members may be named — besides the seven founders, who have all been canonized, and St. Philip Benizi—the B. Piccolomini of Siena, the learned Ferrari, Francis Patrizzi, Latiosi, &c. Fra Paolo Sarpi, theologian and counsellor to the Republic of Venice, belonged to this order [see TRENT, COUNCIL OF]. The number of Servite houses revived in various countries since the French Revolution is considerable. The second order of Servites consists of cloistered nuns, who have convents in various parts of the world. The "Mantellate" are the Servite third order of nuns. There is

also a third order for men and women in the world. (Ledoux, "Hist. des Sept Saints Fondateurs"; Soulier, "Vie de S. Philippe Benizi"; Lepicier, "Sainte Julienne Falconieri").

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI. The servant of the servants of God. Thomassin seems to say[1] that the phrase was first employed by St. Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, and then adopted by the Roman Pontiffs. But a comparison of dates precludes this supposition, for St. Desiderius became bishop only in 630—*i.e.* twenty-five years after the death of St. Gregory the Great, who had frequently used the phrase at the commencement of his letters.[2] St. Gregory had objected strongly to the title of Universal Bishop, or Oecumenical Patriarch, which John, the patriarch of Constantinople, had assumed; if any new title was needed for the Vicar of Christ, it should be one which likened him still more to the lowliness of Jesus, who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." (Mt. xx. 28.)

SEVEN DOLOURS. [See DOLOURS OF B.V.M.]

SEVEN GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. They are, according to St. Thomas (1^a 2^{ae}, q. 68), certain gifts bestowed upon the just in order that they may promptly follow the instinct and movement of the Holy Ghost. He appeals to the authority of Scripture—viz. Isa. xi. 2, where we are told that seven gifts of the Spirit are to rest upon the Messiah. "And the Spirit of the Lord will rest upon him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and piety, and the spirit of the fear of the Lord will fill him." Even, says St. Thomas, when the soul of man is perfected by the moral and the theological virtues, he still needs to be moved and led by the Holy Spirit, and the Seven Gifts enable him to follow this movement promptly. All this, however, is mere speculation, for the Scotists deny that there is any real distinction between the gifts and the corresponding virtues.

Next, although the Fathers generally (so, *e.g.*, Ambrose, "De Sp. S." lib. i. 16, PL. xvi. 740; August. in Ps. cl., PL. xxxvii. 1960; Greg. "Moral." i. 27) enumerate the seven gifts of the Spirit, just as St. Thomas does, this is because they followed the LXX or Vulgate instead of the original.[3] Both the LXX. and Vulgate render the same Hebrew words "fear of the Lord" (יִרְאַת יְהוָה) in two ways, first by "piety," then by "fear of the Lord." In the Hebrew the words simply are, "The Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Jehovah, and his delight[1] shall be in the fear of Jehovah." It was probably from mere wish to avoid repetition that the LXX varied their rendering, and Jerome may have been unwilling to restore a mere literal rendering, since the enumeration of the seven gifts, based on the LXX and Old Latin, was already recognized in the Church. It is possible, however, to find seven gifts (on the analogy of Zach. iii. 9, Apoc. iv. 5, v. 6) even in the original. The Spirit of the Lord seems most naturally to mean the Divine Spirit itself, from which the six following gifts descend. But the "Spirit of the Lord" may be itself a special gift, and this view is represented by the Chaldee Targum, which has, "The spirit of prophecy shall rest upon him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding," &c. (Besides the works mentioned in the article see Manning, "Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost," vii.–xiv.)

SEXAGESIMA. [See QUINQUAGESIMA.]

SEXT. One of the day hours of the office. [See BREVIARY.]

SEXT. [See CANON LAW.]

SEXTON. [See SACRISTAN.]

SHEPHERD, GOOD. [See GOOD SHEPHERD.]

SHRINE. [See PILGRIMAGE.]

SHROUD, THE HOLY (*σινδών, sindon*). The "clean linen cloth" in which Our Lord was wrapped before He was laid in the tomb (Mt. xxvii. 59). It is said to be still preserved at Turin. The relic there shown can certainly be traced back to the year 1360, when it was kept at Lirey, in the diocese of Troyes. No satisfactory account, however, can be given of its previous history. Chevalier ("Étude Critique sur l'Origine du S. Suaire," 1900) published a series of documents which clearly proved that in 1389 the Bishop of Troyes appealed to Clement VII., the Avignon Pope, to put a stop to the veneration of the so-called relic, declaring that it was the work of an artist who confessed to having painted it; and that the Pope decided that when it was exhibited the priest should declare that it was not the real shroud, but only a representation. The acrimonious controversy which followed may be read in the works quoted at the end of the article. The fact that Julius II. approved of an office "De Sancta Sindone," which continued to be recited till our own day, on the third Friday in Lent, need not cause any difficulty. Such celebrations do not decide the historical question of the genuineness of a relic (see LORETO &c.). Baumgarten in "Historisches Jahrbuch" (Munich, 1903, 319–43) shows that the weight of Catholic

[1] *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Disc.* i. 1, 4, 4.
[2] See Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 23, 24, &c.
[3] It is strange, however, that Jerome, in his Commentary on Isaiah, recognizes the "seven gifts" as commonly enumerated without raising any difficulty.

[1] Lit. "his smelling," sc. "a sweet savour"; others, "the breath of his nostrils." Either rendering is possible, but the doubt does not touch the point in the text. In the Targum the London Polyglot has copied the false pointing in Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible, יְקַרְבִּנֵיהּ (Peal) for יַקְרִבִנֵיהּ (Aphel).

opinion is greatly against the genuineness. (Thurston in "Cath. Enc." and also in the "Month," Jan. and Feb. 1903. On the other side, Vignon "Le Linceul du Christ"; Mackey in the "Dublin Review," Jan. 1903; Garrold in the "Tablet," Apr. 1 and 8, 1911.)

SHROVETIDE. The week preceding Ash Wednesday—the time for *shrift* or confession. *Shrove* is a noun formed from the past tense of the verb to *shrive*. [See CARNIVAL.]

SIGN OF THE CROSS. [See CROSS.]

SIMONY. Giving or receiving, or intending to give or to receive, anything temporal for anything spiritual. It is so called from Simon Magus, who offered St. Peter money for the power of communicating the gifts of the Holy Ghost (Acts viii.). The guilt of this sin arises from the fact that spiritual things are not fit matter for bargaining. And this, says St. Thomas, for three reasons: because the value of a spiritual thing cannot be estimated in money or the like; because the holder of anything spiritual is merely a dispenser and not the owner of it (1 Cor. iv. 1); and because sale is opposed to the origin of spiritual things, since they come from the gratuitous gift of God ("freely have ye received, freely give," Mt. x. 8). Hence simony is a species of real sacrilege (see the art. SACRILEGE). It is of two kinds: (1) simony forbidden by natural or divine law, and (2) simony forbidden by ecclesiastical law. The former, which is simony properly so called, is committed when something temporal is given or taken for something spiritual or connected therewith, *e.g.* grace, blessings, consecration, jurisdiction; the latter when something spiritual or connected therewith is exchanged for the like, *e.g.* benefice for benefice, or even when something in itself temporal but annexed to spiritual functions is bought or sold, *e.g.*, the office of sacristan. The ground of the distinction between the two kinds is that in itself there is no harm in exchanging the spiritual for the spiritual or the temporal for the temporal; the Church, however, out of reverence for holy things, has forbidden such trafficking.

In deciding whether an act is simoniacal we have to consider (1) whether there is any idea of bargaining, *i.e.* of giving or receiving the temporal as the price of the spiritual. Though it is not lawful to receive anything for exercising one's sacred ministry, as the price of such work, yet there is no harm in taking something by way of stipend for one's suitable support. "To sell or to buy what is spiritual is simoniacal; but to receive or to give something for the support of those who minister spiritual things, in accordance with the statutes and approved customs of the Church, is lawful, yet in such wise that there is no idea of buying and selling, and that no pressure is brought to bear on those who will not give by withholding spiritual things which ought to be administered, for this would look like sale. But after the spiritual things have been freely bestowed, then the statutory and customary offerings and other dues may be exacted from those who are unwilling but able to pay" ($2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 100, a. 3). We may add that this doctrine is founded upon the teaching of our Lord (Lk. x. 7) and of St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14). Hence all theologians hold that such stipends are due *ex justitia*. Familiar instances are the offerings made at weddings, funerals, and baptisms, and when Mass is said for anyone's special intention. We have to consider (2) what is understood by the word "temporal." Canonists distinguish three kinds of "*munera*" or temporal objects which must not be given for spiritual things, (a) *munus a manu*, that is, anything exchangeable or passing from hand to hand, *e.g.* goods, whether movable or immovable; (b) *munus a lingua*, that is, favour, defence, and the like; (c) *munus ab obsequio*, that is, any kind of service. (3) Lastly, by "spiritual" is meant any supernatural thing, either formally, such as grace and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, or causally, such as the sacraments, prayers, &c.; or the exercise and results of supernatural powers, such as consecration, blessing, jurisdiction, &c. "Things annexed to spiritual things" are in themselves temporal, but assume a sort of spiritual character from their connection with what is spiritual, *e.g.* the sacred vessels, vestments, right of patronage, &c. It is not easy to draw the line in such matters. The Church has made many positive enactments on the subject, and has imposed the following penalties: (1) excommunication, reserved to the Holy See; (2) invalidity of election, presentation, confirmation, and institution, in the case of benefices; (3) incapacity for holding the same benefices even if afterwards obtained without simony. Moreover, restitution must be made, as the whole transaction is unjust.

Simony was one of the worst banes of the Church in mediaeval times. The great pontiffs St. Gregory VII. and Innocent III. made strenuous efforts to extirpate it. The Council of Trent (sess. xxiv. "De Reform.") also enacted wholesome decrees regarding appointments to vacant benefices. (See St. Thomas, $2^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 100; Ferraris; Ball [illegible] "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 298 *seq.*)

SIMPLE. [See FEASTS.]

SIN. St. Augustine's definition [illegible] viz. "any thought, word, or deed ag[ainst] law of God," has been adopted by St. [illegible] ($1^a\ 2^{ae}$, q. 71, a. 6) and theologians g[enerally]. We have spoken of original sin in a[nother] article, and many of the popular classi[fications] of sin, *e.g.* into carnal and spiritual, of c[ommission] and commission, are easily understo[od]. We need not, therefore, detain us her[e]; something must be said of the dis[tinction]

between mortal and venial sin, both because of its dogmatic importance in itself, and because of the objections made to the distinction by Protestants.

The early Protestants regarded every sin as deserving of eternal wrath. They admitted that some sins were more heinous than others, but they looked upon all alike as mortal. Even the daily falls of good men, according to Calvin ("Institut." iii. 4 [1]), make them "liable to the penalty of death before the judgment seat of God." On the other hand, no sin is imputed to those who believe; so that we may sum up the Protestant doctrine thus: All sins are mortal in their own nature, but in effect no sin is mortal to those who have faith, all sins are mortal to those who are without saving faith.

Very different is the Catholic doctrine. The Church holds that justification consists in a real renewal of man's nature by the grace of Christ, and cannot therefore admit that one who is in friendship with a holy God is guilty of sins which in their own nature [2] expose him to eternal death. The fact of justification implies a passage from death to life, from sin to holiness. On the other hand, the Church, in accordance with the plainest statements of Scripture and tradition (James iii. 2; 1 Jn. i. 8), has defined (Concil. Trident. sess. vi. can. 23) that no one, not even the most holy, can avoid sin altogether "except by a special privilege of God, as the Church holds concerning the Blessed Virgin." Hence, by inevitable consequence, it follows that some sins are mortal, others venial. There is an analogy between human friendship and that of the soul with God, and just as some offences are sufficient to destroy friendship entirely, while others weaken it, so there are some sins which destroy, others which do but weaken the grace and love of God in the soul. There are some sins of which St. Paul says (Gal. v. 21) that they "who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God," and these must be distinct from less serious faults which none entirely avoid. This is the basis of the distinction between mortal and venial sins. The former are against the very end of the law, which is the love of God, utterly destroy charity and grace, cause the death of the soul, and deserve eternal punishment. Venial sin, though it opposes to that which is mortal, and is the worst of all evils except mortal sin, still does not annihilate the friendship of the soul with God. Venial sin is a disease of the soul, but its death, and grace is still left by which the sin may be repaired. Mortal sin is, on the contrary, irreparable, and a man who is guilty of it has lost every principle of vitality, so that he is as unable to recover life as one who has suffered bodily death. Renewal cannot come from within, but only from the Almighty power of God, who can make even the dead hear His voice and live (St. Thomas, 1^a 2^{ae}, q. 78, a. 1). It is very hard to decide in particular what is or is not mortal sin. We know that we cannot fall away from God without a deliberate act of the will, and those walk securely who avoid, not indeed all transgression, for that cannot be, but all deliberate transgression. The distinction, St. Augustine tells us ("Enchirid." cap. 24), between grave and light sins is to be determined by the judgment of God, not of man; and Scripture does furnish many such divine judgments on the point. The tradition of the Church and natural reason, following the analogy of faith, must also be taken into account; but when all is done much remains, and must ever remain, uncertain. Some sins, such as those of blasphemy, perjury, impurity, are, if deliberate, always mortal; others—*e.g.* theft—though mortal in their own nature, are venial if the amount of the wrong done is very small. Others, again, are venial in their own nature, and only become mortal under superadded circumstances. Mortal sins differ very much in gravity. The chief subdivision of venial sins is that into deliberate and indeliberate, though, strictly speaking, the latter are done with imperfect deliberation, for when deliberation is wholly wanting there is no act of the will, and therefore no sin.

It must be remembered that in the Fathers "mortal" and "venial" sin are terms which have quite a different meaning from the modern one explained above. The ancient distinction, often misunderstood by scholastic writers, is clearly put by Petavius in his edition of Epiphanius ("Animadv. in Haer." lix.). The Fathers, he says, mean by mortal sins ("mortalia seu capitalia," also "lethalia") not, as we do, those which deprive us of grace, but sins of an aggravated character, which were specially named in the canons and synodal decrees, and which subjected anyone who was guilty of them to canonical penalties. To these they oppose "lighter and daily sins," including in this class "some which we call mortal and some which we call venial sins." Very often the Fathers simply distinguish between "mortal sins" for which public penance was due and the daily faults of good people. So Tertull. "Pudic." 19, PL, i. 1017; "Adv. Marc." iv. 9, PL, i. 374; Ambrose, "De Poenit." ii. 10; Cassian, "Collat." xxii. 13; Augustine, "In Joann." tract. xii. *ad fin.*; Serm. 352, cap. 2 et 3; "De Symbolo ad Cat." cap. 7. But the Fathers acknowledged in fact our distinction between mortal and venial sin, though they use other

[1] "The sins of believers are venial, not because they do not merit death, but because . . . there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, their sin not being imputed."

[2] The doctrine of Baius stands midway between that of Reformers and the Church. He held that "no sin is mortal of its own nature"—*i.e.* apart from the merciful ordination of God (Prop. 20; condemned by *Pius V.*, Gregory XIII., and Urban VIII.).

words. Thus St. Augustine ("De Fide et Op." 26, PL, xl. 228) divides sins into three classes—those which involve excommunication, sins without which we cannot live ("sine quibus vita non agitur"), and sins to be corrected, not indeed by public penance, but by sharp reproof. We have seen already that he distinguishes between grave and light sins, and means just what we do by mortal and venial sin. Further, in Serm. 393, PL, xxxix. 1713, and "In Joann." tract. xli. 10, PL, xxxv. 1697, he distinguishes between a "sin" and a "crime" ("peccatum" and "crimen"). Man, he says, cannot be without sin, but ought to be without crime, "such as murder, adultery, the impurity of fornication, theft, fraud, sacrilege"; those who are exempt from crime have reached "an inchoate liberty" which will be perfected in heaven. And a little earlier in the same treatise he defines crime as "a grave sin, most worthy of accusation and condemnation." This is precisely the doctrine of the modern Church. (See the moral theologians who deal with the subject in their treatise "De Peccatis," *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. ii.; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." tract. iv. vol. i. p. 427 *sqq.*; Slater, "Moral Theology," i. 133 *sqq.* The dogmatic theologians treat of it in connection with the Fall of the angels and of man. See also Manning, "Sin and its Consequences.")

SINLESSNESS OF CHRIST. [See CHRIST.]

SION, NOTRE DAME DE. The Congregation of our Lady of Sion took its rise from a remarkable event which occurred in 1842, when M. Alphonse Ratisbonne, a member of an influential and wealthy Jewish family at Strasburg, was suddenly converted to the Catholic faith by the apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with which, as he declared, he was favoured while standing in a side chapel of the Church of S. Andrea delle Fratte, at Rome. M. Ratisbonne at once asked to be taken to a priest, and in a short time was baptized and confirmed. His elder brother, Théodore, had become a Catholic many years before, and, having taken orders, was at this time living at Paris. Alphonse suggested to him the opening of a house for the reception of Jewish children, to be educated, with their parents' consent, as Christians. There seems to have been a movement in the Jewish mind at the time inclining many to embrace Catholicism, and when the Abbé Théodore resolved to act on his brother's suggestion there was no lack of candidates for admission. They were all young girls, and were placed provisionally in the Convent of the "Providence" under the care of the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul. In May 1843, Théodore Ratisbonne, with the aid of the Abbé Desgenettes, the venerable founder of the Archconfraternity of the Sacred Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners, obtained the approbation of the Holy See for a new institute, under the title of "Our Lady of Sion," the ladies of which should devote themselves principally to the charge and education of converts from Judaism. The centre of the new foundation was fixed at Paris, in the Rue Notre Dame des Champs. The rule of the congregation aims at the union of the active with the contemplative life. Before long the institute planted itself at Jerusalem; a site was obtained bordering on the Via Dolorosa, where tradition places the praetorium of Pilate, and a large convent was opened in 1862. In recognition of the awful memories which make this spot unique on earth, the religious repeat three times a day, "Pater, dimitte illis, non enim sciunt quid faciunt" (Lk. xxiii. 34). The congregation has since opened houses in other parts of Syria and at Constantinople, and also in England. A "Community of Missionary Priests of Our Lady of Sion," working in concert with the congregation, was organized at Paris with diocesan sanction in 1863; both the brothers Ratisbonne joined it.

SISTERHOODS. This term is not much used by Catholics, who speak rather of convents, religious orders of women, nuns, &c. These have greatly increased in number in quite recent times, and any attempt to enumerate them must necessarily be very imperfect. The chief of them are given under the different headings, MERCY, SISTERS OF; CHARITY, SISTERS OF; &c. (See NUN; Murphy, "Terra Incognita"; Steele, "The Convents of Great Britain.")

SLAVERY. The state of a human being whose present and future lot in life is dependent on the arbitrary will of another person, or of other persons. The young child of free parents, though his *present* lot in all countries, whether civilized or not, is largely determinable at the will of others, knows that his *future* will be his own; after reaching a certain age he will be his own master. The slave has no such prospect; even where the law gives him some protection from his master's cruelty or injustice, he has not during the whole course of his life the control of his own acts or movements, and his children are born to the same condition as himself.

The earliest records of man contain mention of slavery. No slave went into the ark with Noe and the other seven persons who composed his family. It seems to be represented in the book of Genesis as the punishment of the sin of Cham,[1] whose son Chanaan was to be a "servant of servants" (Vulg. *servus servorum*) to his brethren. The first mention of actual slaves is connected with Egypt; both male and female slaves, cattle, &c., were given to Abram

[1] Gen. ix. 22-27.

Egyptians [1] on his surrendering his wife to Pharaoh; and Hagar, the domestic slave of Sarah, was an Egyptian woman.[2] Under the law of Moses, the institution was fully sanctioned among the Hebrews, perhaps because of the "hardness of their hearts"; but they were to take slaves from the nations around them, not from their own people; if any Hebrew were compelled to sell himself into bondage, he could go out free in the year of jubilee.[3] At the return from the Captivity, the slaves are said to have stood to the free Hebrews in the proportion of one to six; [4] but the rate was probably much higher than this in times of national prosperity.

Considering the corrupt selfishness of human nature, unaided by grace, there is nothing to wonder at in the institution of slavery. Men, and women too, like to live at ease, and to have the hard work, without which neither food nor luxuries are obtainable, done for them. Especially is this the case in hot countries, in which physical exertion is always more or less distressing. When then neither conscience nor civilization restrains, any well-armed human tribe has a strong motive for making war upon any neighbouring tribe which it believes to be weaker than itself, in order to obtain the use of the enforced labour of the vanquished. The instructive volumes of Dr. Barth, long a resident in Central Africa, are one long commentary illustrating this statement. Wars for the sole purpose of obtaining slaves were then, and are still, of constant occurrence among the teeming nations of the Soudan. Conversion to Islam, which for many years has been making great progress in Africa, far from checking slavery, tends to spread it; for it gives to the converts a feeling of superiority to the tribes still heathen, which seems of itself to entitle the former to make slaves of the latter. Nothing but the two-fold conviction (1) that all men are equal in the sight of God, (2) that a man is bound to do to others as he would they should do to him, can restrain from making slaves of their fellows those who have the power to do so. This conviction, now generally entertained among civilized nations, is the fruit of Christianity; and it has produced a state of things, within the sphere of peoples equally civilized, which removes the power to enslave. Were the belief in Christianity to fail, it does not appear what principle would remain of sufficient power to prevent the civilized from enslaving the uncivilized.

Among the Greeks the notion prevailed that a man could not effectively discharge the duties of a free citizen unless he were exempted from the drudgery of life. This, except in the case of a few rich men, could only be done by means of slavery. Accordingly the institution was an integral part of Hellênic civilization; and in proportion as a people was more intellectual and refined, it availed itself of slave labour more systematically. Dr. Lee, Protestant bishop of Manchester, one of the best of modern schoolmasters, used to say to his boys at Rugby:—"Remember now: thirty thousand Athenians; four thousand Metœcs; *four hundred* thousand slaves!" The contrast was perhaps accentuated a little too strongly; [1] but its substantial truth and significance are unimpeachable. We are all too apt to forget, in admiring the marvellous fertility of the Attic genius, how ruthlessly these pattern men *exploited* the labour of a gagged and fettered multitude of miserable beings, created equally with themselves for happiness and immortality.

When the Greek mind began to speculate upon slavery, it rejected the cynical tenet of the old times, that force is its own justification, and that any man who *can* enslave another *may*. It suggested that some races of mankind are naturally inferior to other races, and born to be their servants. Aristotle mentions this opinion, without however adopting it as his own.[2] But there were Greeks who expressed nobler views. Not to mention the well-known lines of Homer [3]—

> Jove fixed it certain that the self-same day
> Makes man a slave, takes half his worth away

—Philemon wrote that "no one was ever born a slave by nature; it was ill-fortune which enslaved his body." [4]

The able work of M. Wallon describes the extension of slavery among the Romans, even under the Republic, and delineates the fatal moral corruption which it produced. The domestic side of Roman life is unveiled for us in the plays of Plautus and Terence and in the Satires of Juvenal; we thus see how slavery influenced society and vitiated character. The sternly practical turn of the Roman mind, understanding that slavery was at all times *dangerous* (the war of Spartacus was sufficient to prove that), carried out with horrible consistency the doctrine that the slave, as against his master, has no rights, and that revolt is an unpardonable crime. When Pedanius Secundus, prefect of the city under Nero, had been murdered by one of his slaves, the Senate, on the ground that among the other slaves there must have been some guilty knowledge of the murderer's intention, decreed that the whole household, numbering four hundred—old and young, men, women, and children—should be indiscriminately put to death; and this was done.[5] The gladiators, who were bred to the use of arms that their deadly duels might

[1] Gen. xii. 16. [2] Gen. xvi. 1. [3] Lev. xxv.
[4] 1 Esdr. ii. 65; quoted by Dr. Lightfoot.

[1] M. Wallon estimates the numbers thus: Athenians, 67,000; Metœcs, 40,000; slaves, about 200,000.
[2] *Pol.* i. 2, 6. [3] *Od.* xvii. 322.
[4] Φύσει γὰρ οὐδεὶς δοῦλος ἐγεννήθη ποτε,
Ἡ δ' αὖ τύχη τὸ σῶμα κατεδουλώσατο.
Fragm. Meineke (quoted by Wallon).
[5] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 43 (quoted by Lightfoot).

furnish sport for the Romans, were of course slaves.

Slavery was everywhere one of the conditions of human existence when Christianity appeared in the world. The methods of the Gospel are not revolutionary; they do not deal in those sweeping general assertions which fuller experience always shows to be but half truths; rather they introduce new moral principles into the hearts of men, leaving them there as germs, to bring forth fruit in due season. So it was in the case of slavery. The Gospel never directly attacks slavery as an institution; nor was the liberation of their slaves prescribed by the Apostles to their converts as an absolute duty. Christianity lifted men to a moral height at which the distinctions between slave and free, Jew and Greek, seemed of trifling importance. "There is neither Greek nor Jew; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus."[1] "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"[2]; the liberty of the mind, even though the body be in bondage. "He that is called in the Lord, being a bondman, is the freeman of the Lord"[3]; but if a slave *could* be made free, he was to prefer freedom (1 Cor. vii. 21).[4] A slave was taught to obey his master as though he were Christ Himself, not with eye-service, but heartily and strenuously, "as to the Lord and not to men." Similarly masters were taught to deal humanely with their slaves, as recognizing that they had a common master in heaven, with whom there was no respect of persons.[5]

With such principles introduced into human life, slavery, as being in ordinary cases unjust, was at once undermined, and gradually fell. Besides manumissions in life, it became a common practice for Christian owners of slaves to emancipate them by their last will. Long before the end of the fifteenth century slavery had disappeared from Christendom, and even serfdom had been reduced within a narrow compass. The influence of the clergy, pressing with gentle force in the same direction during many centuries, was the chief agent in this beneficent change. After the discovery of the New World, the adventurers and planters whom Spain sent out enslaved the weak Carib population of the West Indies, and forced them to work in the mines. To save the Caribs, the Dominican Las Casas was instrumental in bringing over negroes from Africa, whose hardy frames were capable of bearing great labour under a tropical sun. Other nations, Protestant as well as Catholic, rushed eagerly into the new field of commerce and settlement, and all alike enslaved the negro. The unscrupulous cupidity of the planters of all nations was pretty much on a par; but in countries occupied by Catholics the Church was a real power, and restrained to a great extent the greed and cruelty of the laity. In the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, the slave was not entirely a slave; a code of laws regulated the relations between him and his master; he could buy his freedom for a fixed price; and the slave mother, by paying a small sum, could emancipate her child at the font. These mitigations did not exist in the English and Dutch colonies, where the ministers of the various Protestant sects, divided by deep sectional disagreements, took no common action, but obeyed the public opinion of those among whom they lived. Before the Civil War in the United States, the Methodist ministers at the North denounced slavery as a sin; the Methodist ministers at the South defended it as an institution sanctioned in Scripture, and eminently pleasing to the Almighty.

In England, after the American War of Independence in the 18th century, a movement against slavery in the British colonies, and against the slave trade which ministered to it, was set on foot by the Quakers. Other philanthropists joined them, and the names of Clarkson, Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, Stephen, and Buxton are deservedly revered. The slave trade was abolished, so far as the British Empire was concerned, in 1807, and slavery itself suppressed in 1833, the planters in the West Indies being compensated with a sum of twenty millions sterling voted them by Parliament. The French, proclaiming in their frantic revolutionary way that in Hayti and their other colonies slavery was at an end, threw the entire system of their colonial society into a confusion from which it has not recovered to this day. Spain, proceeding gradually and prudently, reduced slavery in its magnificent colony of Cuba within very narrow limits, and in Porto Rico abolished it altogether. In Brazil, and in Mexico, and all the other republics carved out of the colonial empire of Spain, slavery no longer exists. In the United States, the Federal Government (1863), as a war measure, declared that all the slaves in the seceded States were free, and as the war ended favourably for the North the declaration has become a fact. Thus Christianity, aided, no doubt, by mere humanitarian views and political considerations, has a second time overmastered those selfish instincts in man which favour the establishment of slavery. In Mahometan and Pagan countries, no such influence being in operation, slavery, it is to be feared, will for a long time hold its ground.

Since the above article was written, the question of slavery has come into special prominence, partly on account of the efforts of Pope Leo XIII., partly on account of the interest aroused by the English occupation of

[1] Gal. iii. 28. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 17. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 22.
[4] The passage will bear the opposite interpretation, but the opinion of the best modern commentators appears to incline to that here adopted; comp. verse 23.
[5] Phil. vi. 5–9

Egypt and the opening up of the interior of Africa by travellers and colonists of various European nations. In a letter addressed to the bishops of Brazil (May 5, 1888) Leo XIII. treats, with his usual erudition, of the origin and history of slavery, dwelling especially on the labours of his predecessors in securing its suppression. St. Gregory the Great granted freedom to all slaves who wished to embrace a monastic life; Hadrian I. allowed them to marry even against their masters' will; Innocent III. confirmed and encouraged the Trinitarian Order for the Redemption of Captives [see TRINITARIAN]; a similar order, under the protection of Our Lady of Ransom, was approved by Honorius III.; Gregory IX. forbade the sale of the Church's serfs, and warmly exhorted the faithful to free their slaves, as satisfaction to God for their own sins. When the great discoveries were being made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Popes raised their voices against the oppression of the natives. Pius II., Leo X., Paul III., and Urban VIII. used their influence with the Kings of Spain and Portugal to prevent the spread of slavery, and imposed censures on those who took part in it. In more recent times, Benedict XIV., Pius VII., and Gregory XVI. have been the slaves' friends. Leo XIII. espoused their cause with characteristic energy and wisdom. He appointed the intrepid Cardinal Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers, to preach a crusade against the infamous traffic in human beings, and supplied him with the munificent sum of 300,000 francs to help to carry on the work. The African Primate's visit to England will long be remembered. His address to the Anti-Slavery Society excited an amount of enthusiasm which proved how deep and widespread is the sympathy for the poor negroes. His plan was to strike the evil at the root; to destroy the markets of the interior, or to render them useless by establishing—as Gordon wished to do for the basin of the Nile—barriers against slavery, composed of natives led and instructed by Europeans. Large numbers of young men enrolled themselves in the new military order which he instituted for the purpose.

(H. Wallon, "Hist. de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité," 1879; *Lightfoot*, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon," 1875; Barth's "Travels in Central Africa"; "Dublin Review," January 1889; "The New Crusade," by E. M. Clerke. The great authority on slavery, especially in its relation with Christianity, is Allard, "Les Esclaves Chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'Eglise jusqu'à la Fin de la Domination Romaine en Occident," "Esclaves, Serfs, et Mainmortables"; also articles in "Cath. Enc." and DAp.; Harnack, "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," i. 167 *sqq.*; Brandi, "Il Papato e la Schiavitù.")

SOCIETY, SECRET. [See SECRET SOCIETY].

SOCINIANS. Anti-Trinitarian heretics who derive their name from the two Sozzini, Lelio (1525–62) and Fausto (1539–1604). They are the modern representatives of the Sabellians, who denied the real distinction of persons; of the Arians, who denied the divinity of the Son; and of the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Though frequently confounded with the Unitarians, the two are not exactly the same; for the Socinians hold a higher doctrine of the Son, believing in His miraculous birth, His perfect manhood, and His mediatorship and adorability. His mediatorship, however, is not a satisfaction for our sins, but merely an example to us and a pledge of forgiveness. Socinianism, in one form or another, is practically the belief of most extreme modernists. (See SABELLIANISM; TRINITY, HOLY, &c.; Petavius, "De Theologicis Dogmatibus," lib. xvi. cap. 1; Neander, "Hist. of Christian Dogmas" ii. 626–700; Pope in "Cath. Enc.")

SODALITY. A religious congregation or association consisting of lay persons, male or female, or both male and female, meeting together at stated times under ecclesiastical direction, for the performance of pious exercises, and recommending to each of its members conformity in life and conversation to a body of rules, framed in order to promote the honour of God, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the spread of good works, and the spiritual advancement of those who faithfully observe them.

Under this general definition will fall, besides other confraternities and pious societies, the Little Oratory of St. Philip Neri, established in every place where there is a congregation of priests of the Oratory.

There are Sodalities both in England and Ireland for promoting temperance; there are also Sodalities founded in honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The greatest and most ancient Sodality in the world appears to be that known as the *Prima Primaria*. (See CHILD OF MARY; Beringer, "De Congregationibus Marianis"; Delplace, "Hist. des Congrégations de la S. Vierge"; Hilgers in "Cath. Enc.")

SOMASCHA, THE REGULAR CLERKS OF. The founder of this order was St. Jerome Emiliani, a noble Venetian, born in 1481. In his youth he adopted the profession of arms, and fought with distinction in the war, disastrous for the republic, which arose out of the League of Cambrai (1509). After valiantly defending the town of Castelnuovo, he fell into the hands of the enemy; but, being delivered, some say miraculously, from his imprisonment, he resolved to give his future life to God. For some years he devoted himself to the care of some orphan nephews, and to the management of their property. Circumstances gradually led him to the establishment of an orphanage at

Venice, about 1528; this was followed up by similar foundations at Brescia and Bergamo. His first associates were laymen, in concert with whom he fixed the centre of their operations at Somascha, a village between Milan and Bergamo. Some fervent priests joined him, and they all lived a life of great regularity and austerity sanctified by continual prayer, at Somascha. The holy founder died in 1537, before his institute had been approved by the Holy See; he was beatified by Benedict XIV., and canonized by Clement XIII. The Papal confirmation came in 1568; it erected the congregation into a religious order, under the rule of St. Augustine and gave it the name of Regular Clerks of St. Mayeul, or of Somascha. The order was in course of time greatly extended in Italy, and was introduced in France; besides orphanages and Magdalen asylums, it had the direction of several colleges. Its principal house is now at Rome. (Hélyot; Heimbucher, "Orden und Kongregationen"; Hubert, "Der hl. Hieronymus Aemiliani.")

SORBONNE. This famous college took its name from the founder, Robert de Sorbon, who in 1252 founded within the University of Paris a college for the maintenance of sixteen theological students, four from each of the French, Norman, Picard, and English "nations." Burses were soon afterwards added for Flemish and German students. The discipline was in the hands of a provisor or curator, appointed by a board, presided over by the Archdeacon of Paris. The formal approbation of the Holy See was given in 1268. The credit and influence of the college continually increased; the majority of the Paris doctors in theology were there trained; in its halls were ordinarily held the meetings of that faculty; and in process of time "the Sorbonne" and the theological faculty became came identified. This was certainly the case as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century. From that time, since the theologians of the university were then and long afterwards its chief celebrities, the history of the Sorbonne can hardly be distinguished, down to the Revolution, from that of the university itself. On the important and not very consistent part which the Sorbonne played in the great Jansenist controversy, see the article JANSENISM.

In 1629 were opened the existing stately buildings of the Sorbonne in the Quartier Latin, including the church in which lie the ashes of Richelieu, an amphitheatre capable of seating more than 1,500 auditors, and residences for thirty-six "doctors of the Sorbonne." The old University of Paris was destroyed by the Revolution; when it was reorganized by Napoleon in 1808, a faculty of Catholic theology, with seven chairs, was established at the Sorbonne. It continued to exist in a feeble way until 1882, when it was finally suppressed. (See Feret, "La Faculté de Théologie de Paris," and in "Cath. Enc."; Rashdall, "The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages"; Franklin, "La Sorbonne, ses Origines, sa Bibliothèque.")

SOUL. The Schoolmen, following Aristotle, mean by soul the primary principle of life, and by living things all such as have the capacity of motion from within. Thus, a stone has no life, and therefore no soul, because it does not move but is moved by forces external to itself; while, on the other hand, vegetables, beasts, and men all have souls. A plant, for example, unlike inorganic substances, has the power, so long as it lives, of absorbing moisture and of assimilating it by the activity of its organs. Brutes have the same power, and add to it that of sense; while the soul of man is at once vegetative, sensitive, and rational. We have to deal here only with the human or rational soul, and the object of this article is to note the principal heads of Catholic doctrine on the subject, not to enter on philosophical discussion foreign to the plan of this work.

1. *The Soul is Immaterial.*—In respect to his vegetative and animal functions man does not differ essentially from the lower animals; but whereas the soul of brutes is a principle which can only exist in matter and only operates in union with it, the human soul, though it also exists in and operates through matter, "has, nevertheless, an existence apart from matter and an operation in which the body takes no part." (Kleutgen). The Schoolmen find the proof of such immateriality in the power which the mind has of forming abstract and immaterial ideas. And although this immaterial or spiritual character of the soul and the freedom of the will are taught by faith, they may also be certainly proved by reason, and so the Congregation of the Index declared June 11, 1855.

2. *The Unity of the Soul.*—The three classes into which the functions of the soul naturally fall led some to assert the existence of three distinct souls—vegetative, animal, and rational. In the middle of the ninth century the question assumed theological importance, and Photius excited great opposition by his doctrine that man had two souls—one rational, one irrational—and that the latter only sinned (Hefele-Leclercq, iv. 420). The immoral consequences which flow from such a denial of the unity of human nature are obvious, and in 869 the Fourth General Council of Constantinople (can. 11), after stating that both Old and New Testaments attributed "one rational and intelligent soul" to man (*unam animam rationabilem et intellectualem, μίαν ψυχὴν λογικὴν τε καὶ νοερὰν*), anathematized the doctrine of "two souls" as a heresy. In the Middle Ages, however, trichotomy, or the doctrine of

"three souls," was upheld by Ockham, who alleged that the doctrine of "two souls"—one good, one bad—not that of separate souls in itself and as a philosophical thesis, had been condemned by the Eighth General Council (Ockham, "Quodlib." II. qu. 10 and 11, quoted by Kleutgen). It deserves notice that although St. Thomas (on 1 Thess. v. 23) speaks of the doctrine of "two souls" as "reprobated in the decisions of the Church," the very learned Estius, in his commentary on the same passage, regards the dispute as merely philosophical, and evidently did not admit that the Church had decided the matter ("an vero ea duo, sc. pars rationalis animae et pars ejusdem sensitiva, re ipsa, an vero, quod magis recepta est, sola ratione distinguantur, philosophi disputant"). In our own time a celebrated German Catholic, Günther (d. 1863), defended the theory that there were in human nature two distinct principles—one the animal soul, the principle of vegetative and animal life; the other a spiritual soul.

3. *Union of Soul and Body.*—The Schoolmen speak of the one soul as the substantial form of the body. By the substantial form they understand that principle by which a thing is constituted in its proper species, that which makes it what it essentially is. They appeal to the unity of nature testified by consciousness and acknowledged in the common language of mankind. We express our consciousness of our own unity when we say, "I feel," "I reason," "I will." It is not, as Aristotle remarks, so correct to say "My eye sees" as "I see through the eye." Further, we are conscious that we who consider and resolve carry out our resolution through the bodily limbs. Our faculties, indeed, are different, but all proceed from one common principle of life which makes each of us a single being. The denial that the "substance of the rational or intellectual soul is truly and in itself the form of the human body" was condemned at the General Council of Vienne as erroneous and out of harmony with (*inimicam*) the truth of the Catholic faith. The condemnation was directed against the teaching of John of Oliva (1247–1297), a Provençal Franciscan, who joined the heretical party of the "Spiritual" Friars. The condemnation was repeated by Pius IX. in 1857, in his brief to the Archbishop of Cologne on the errors of Günther. It is, however, well to remember that the doctrine of Scotus is different here from that of the Thomists. He admitted that the single principle of life is the substantial form, but held that the body had a form of its own, this form of corporeity, as he called it, being distinct from that of inorganic bodies.

4. *Immortality of the Soul.*—Here there is a marked divergence of opinion among Catholic philosophers. St. Thomas and many who follow him believe that it can be proved by reason. Scotus, on the contrary, regards it as a truth cognizable by faith alone. The Roman Congregations have carefully avoided even the appearance of condemning the Scotist position. In the decree of the Congregation of the Index, already cited, it is the spiritual nature, not the immortality of the soul, which is said to be demonstrable by reason.

5. *The Origin of the Soul.*—Origen held with Plato that souls existed before they were united with the body, and this theory forms the subject of the first of the fifteen anathemas issued by Σύνοδος Ἐνδημοῦσα of Constantinople in 543 (see Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1191 *seq.*). Putting this aside, we find that at least three distinct theories on the origin of the soul have been held in the Church.

(*a*) A few held that the soul of men was produced, like that of the brutes, by natural generation, no special power being attributed to the souls of the parents, except so far as the soul is the animating principle of the body. This theory is stated with characteristic coarseness by Tertullian ("De Anima," 27, PL, ii. 694); was stated as a possible theory by Rufinus (see Jerome "Adv. Rufin." ii. 8, PL, xxiii. 430); and perhaps adopted by Macarius (Hom. xxx. 1).[1]

(*β*) It was a common belief in the early Church (Clem. Al. "Strom." iv. 6, p. 638, ed. Potter; vi. 16, p. 808; Hieron. "In Ecclesiast." tom. iii. ed. Vallarsi, p. 492–3) that the soul was immediately created by God and infused by him into the embryo when sufficiently organised. Jerome, however (Ep. 126 ad Marcellin. et Anapsych., PL, xxii. 1085), admits that most Westerns held the soul to be "ex traduce."

(*γ*) Augustine found it hard to defend himself against the Pelagians on the theory that the soul was immediately created by God. If the soul came straight from God, how could it come stained with original sin? The difficulty led Augustine to investigate the assumption from which it arose. He could find no proof in Scripture that the soul is directly created by God, and, while he repudiated Tertullian's theory, he thought it very possible (Ep. "Ad. Optat." 190, al. 157, PL, xxxiii. 861) that an immaterial element ("incorporeum semen") was communicated by the father to the mother. The philosophical reasons seemed to him fairly balanced on either side, though he inclined on theological grounds to the doctrine that the soul came by generation ("De Gen. ad Lit." x. 23, PL, xxxiv. 426). St. Augustine's influence led Fulgentius ("De Verit. Praedest." iii. 18), Gregory the Great (Ep. lib. ix. 52, "Ad Secundin." PL, lxxvii. 989), and Isidore ("De Ordine Creat." cap. 15)

[1] "Earthly fathers from their own nature, from their body and soul, beget children." The words are scarcely definite enough to show which theory Macarius held.

to decide, or rather to abstain from deciding, the matter, just as St. Augustine himself had done. On the other hand, St. Bernard (Serm. II. "De Nativ." *sub fin.*) and the Schoolmen generally (see, *e.g.*, St. Thomas, I. q. 90) reverted to the older view—viz. creationism—and abandoned that of Augustine—viz. generationism. Benedict XII. required the Armenian bishops to accept creationism. The controversy was revived in 1854 by Frohschammer, priest and professor of philosophy at Munich. His errors on the relations of faith and reason were proscribed by Pius IX. in a brief to the Archbishop of Munich (1862), but nothing was said of his teaching on the origin of the soul. (See the dogmatic theologians in their treatise "De Creatione Hominis," and the philosophers on Anthropology and Psychology, *e.g.* St. Thomas, 1ª, qq. 75-93; "Cont. Gentes," ii. 56 *sqq.*; Suarez, "De Anima"; Kleutgen, "La Philosophie Scolastique," tr. iii. 1 *sqq.*; Maher, "Psychology"; Bainvel, &c., in DThC, *Âme.*)

SPEAR, THE HOLY. [See LANCE, THE HOLY.]

SPIRIT, HOLY. [See TRINITY, p. 827.]

SPIRITUALISM, a term formerly employed for philosophical belief in the immateriality of the soul, has been used for the last half-century for a supposed communication with the dead, and for the doctrines connected with such communication. The evocation of persons deceased has been part of every system of magic: its present form dates from 1848, when two girls of nine and twelve in the village of Hydesville, in the State of New York, began to communicate with the spirits by means of "raps" on the walls or on articles of furniture. The practice spread rapidly in the United States, and was introduced into this country by a Mrs. Hayden, in 1854, and further extended, here and on the continent of Europe, by the well-known D. D. Home. From that time spiritualism has been kept before the public by a series of persons laying claim to exceptional powers, as well as by numerous ordinary mediums, and by a few scientific men who have accepted its teachings. Some idea of its present extent may be gained from the account of the International Congress of Spiritualists, which was held in September 1889, in the rooms of the Grand Orient Masonic Lodge of Paris. It was then stated that more than ninety journals and periodicals are published in different countries in the interests of Spiritualism.

The manifestations of the so-called spirits were at first obtained by rapping answers to questions according to a prearranged code. This process was found to be tedious, and has been generally superseded by writing, either in the ordinary manner—but, as is alleged, without any conscious act of the medium—or by the use of a "planchette." Other phenomena appear to be designed as proofs of the power of the spirits, such as raising mediums in the air, elongating the body, "spirit-photographs," playing musical instruments, untying complicated knots, besides other acts too numerous to mention.

These supposed revelations from the unseen world have given rise to doctrines which vary in different schools of spiritualists, but are found most fully developed in the works of Allan Kardec, in whose obscure and verbose system the influence of the kindred views of Swedenborg may be traced. All space, he teaches, is peopled by the spirits of persons who once inhabited this or other worlds. Even when disembodied they retain an ethereal human form; they are of every degree of excellence and happiness, according to their life in the flesh, but all are subject to the law of progress and capable of arriving at perfection. All are able to communicate with mankind through "mediums."

The largest part of the supposed manifestations of Spiritualism may no doubt be set down to conscious imposture. This is especially true of the most striking phenomena, which have all in turn seemed preternatural, and all been repeated by professed conjurers. The mysterious character of many of the communications, and their differences from the apparent capacity of the mediums, have been traced in some instances at least to unconscious mental action ("cerebration"), which manifests itself during hypnotism or some of the allied states. In like manner another series of phenomena connected with Spiritualism—table-turning and thought-reading—have been shown to be due to unconscious muscular movements. Whether beyond all this there is any residue produced by direct spiritual agency is a point which must be left in doubt. If there be such agency it is enough to say that the Church is amply justified in treating it as diabolical, and in condemning all such practices. See particularly the Decree of the Holy Office, June 23, 1856, which permits the use of hypnotism (animal magnetism) as a merely natural process, but forbids all divination, sorcery, or invocation of devils explicit or implicit—every case, in short, where "ordinantur media physica ad effectus non naturales."

The diabolical character of Spiritualism is most clearly shown by its being a ghastly parody on those relations to the dead which religion has consecrated, and by the heartless deceptions and frauds which have sprung from it.

Further details on the theological aspect of the question will be found in Perrone, "De Virtute Religionis deque Vitiis oppositis," and in Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 250. Yung, "Hypnotisme et Spiritisme," Genève, 1890, is a good general account of the

subject, while Gilles de la Tourette, "L'Hypnotisme et les états analogues au point de vue médico-légal," supplies full details of the present degraded state of Spiritualism in France. Raupert, "The Supreme Problem," "The Dangers of Spiritualism"; Miller, "Sermons on Modern Spiritualism."

SPONSORS. "Sponsores," "Fidejussores," "Susceptores," or "Offerentes," mentioned by Tertullian, "Lib. de Bapt.," St. Basil, Epist. cxxviii., and by St. Augustine, are the persons who, according to the practice of the Church, assist at the solemn administration of baptism, to make profession of Christian faith in the name of the baptized. In later times they were called "Patrini"—in English "Godfathers" and "Godmothers." "Gossips" was the old Saxon name by which they were known. They assist at the baptism of adults, but the latter are required to answer the questions put to them by the priest. According to the decree of the Council of Trent, two sponsors at most are permitted—a male and a female (sess. xxiv. "De Reform."). The sponsors in baptism contract a spiritual relationship to the person baptized; hence, not to widen the circle of this spiritual relationship, the number of sponsors is kept at two. According to St. Alphonsus, if a greater number be named the priest may permit them to be present, and even to touch the child, provided he designates from their number two who are the real sponsors. Theologians generally are satisfied that the person acting as sponsor should have been baptized and have attained the use of reason, being at least seven years old. A proxy may be deputed to act as sponsor for another; the sponsor or his deputy must physically hold or touch the child while it is receiving the sacrament, or take it, after baptism, from the hands of the priest. The Catechism of the Council of Trent quotes St. Augustine on the duties of sponsors towards their charges: "They [the sponsors] ought to admonish them to observe chastity, love justice, cherish charity; and, above all, they should teach them the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the first rudiments of the Christian religion" ("Serm. 163, *De Temp.*" PL, xxxix. Append. 2071). "Theologians, however, commonly teach," says O'Kane, in "Notes on the Rubrics," "with St. Thomas, that sponsors are bound to fulfil these duties only when there is reason to think that they are neglected by the parents or others on whom they naturally devolve in the first instance; and hence, generally speaking, sponsors need have no anxiety about the discharge of these duties towards the children of Christian parents." A Protestant sponsor alone cannot be admitted to act; but if one sponsor is a Catholic, the other might be permitted to act as a witness, or the priest, provided a heretic is presented as sponsor, may omit having a sponsor. Members of the secular clergy, except when they are excluded by diocesan or provincial synods, may act as sponsors. Sponsors contract a spiritual relationship with the child baptized and its parents, which is a diriment impediment to marriage between the godfather and the child or its mother, and between the godmother and the child or its father. Such a marriage would be no marriage at all, unless a dispensation had been obtained; but no spiritual relationship is contracted between the sponsors themselves and consequently no impediment exists (Carrière, "De Matrimonio"). Sponsors, if admitted in private baptism, contract no impediment; but a baptism in a private house with all the ceremonies is not a private baptism, according to high authorities.

In the sacrament of Confirmation there must also be at least one godparent, who becomes spiritually related to the recipient and its parents. [See BAPTISM; CONFIRMATION.]

SPOON. Formerly (and the practice continues in some places still) there used to be taken, along with the chalice, a little spoon for measuring, and letting fall into the wine, a few drops of water to be mingled with it in the Holy Sacrifice. An "Ordo Missae Pontificalis," from a ms. of the fourteenth century in the Vatican Library, says: "Debet portare ad altare calicem cum patena et hostiaria desuper, ac quodam parvo cocleari, cum quo debet poni aqua in calicem." These chalice-spoons are frequently mentioned in old wills and inventories, *e.g.* a testator leaves silver "ad faciendum j. cocleare ad calicem" (Test. Ebor. i. 172). (Rock, i. 126.)

In the Eastern rites a spoon is used in communicating the laity. The priest takes with a spoon a particle of the Host soaked in the consecrated wine, and gives It to the communicant.

In the Western church no mention is made of the spoon for the administration of the Precious Blood. But it is possible that it may have been used in exceptional cases, as the paten and spoon are sometimes associated together. (Leclercq in DACL, *Cuiller*; Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," 417.)

STABAT MATER. [See HYMN, p. 429.]

STAFF. [See CROSIER.]

STATES OF THE CHURCH. Under the Pagan emperors Christianity was a *religio illicita*, and the Roman Pontiffs were exposed by their position to the full severity of the laws; a large proportion of them suffered martyrdom. The edicts of Constantine in favour of the religion which he had embraced have been noticed in a previous article [CHURCH PROPERTY, p. 187]. In the Middle Ages it was long believed that the first Christian Emperor had made a solemn "Edict of Donation," conferring on the Pope, Sylvester I., the city of Rome, the imperial

palace there, and the "provinces, places, and cities of all Italy, and the western regions." [1] This donation was long ago recognized as a forgery; Muratori assigns its invention to the eighth century.

At the end of the sixth century the Roman See was in possession of large landed estates, chiefly in Italy and Sicily. After the death of Gregory the Great the power of the Eastern Empire in Italy dwindled more and more, and the Lombards, pressing down from the North, threatened to seize upon Rome. Naturally, in the absence of other authority, the Romans and the people of the surrounding districts came to look on the Popes as their protectors and rulers. To drive back the Lombards, Pope Stephen II. appealed for aid to the young Frankish monarchy; Pepin (754) crossed the Alps, defeated Astolfo, the Lombard king, and endowed the Papacy with the Exarchate of Ravenna. This was the real beginning of the Ecclesiastical State. Charlemagne confirmed his father's grant, but with the understanding that the supreme civil authority remained in his hands as "Patrician" of Rome. The next great acquisition of territory came through the bequest of the Countess Matilda (†1115), the friend of Gregory VII.; it consisted of Southern Tuscany and other districts. But just as other portions of the Papal territory had been seized by various counts and princes, so now the rich lands of the countess were appropriated by the German emperors, and for a hundred years the Popes had little benefit from the gift. At length, under the vigorous rule of Innocent III. (†1216), the right of the Roman See was admitted, and a compact Ecclesiastical State, in which the Popes governed without a superior—except so far as a vague suzerainty was allowed to the emperors—now arose for the first time.

The emperors of the House of Hohenstaufen, ever seeking to extend their power in Italy, left the Popes no rest. After the extinction of that family in the middle of the thirteenth century, a new state of things arose. Rudolf of Hapsburg, the new emperor, guaranteed to the Pope (Gregory X.) in 1274 the tranquil possession of the Pontifical territory. The Popes had for a long time nothing to fear on the side of Germany; on the other hand, the establishment of the House of Anjou at Naples and the calamitous issue of the struggle between Boniface VIII. and Philip le Bel gave to the French monarchy, in the fourteenth century, an unhappy influence over the temporal policy of the Papacy. The Holy See was removed to Avignon,[2] and fixed there more than seventy years (1305-1378). Meantime its Italian territories were full of confusion; from which, indeed, the genius of Cardinal Albornoz (1353-1368) rescued them for a time; but after the schism had broken out (1378) the peaceful and regular government of the Papal States became for a long time impossible. The vice of nepotism was justly chargeable against several of the Popes in the fifteenth century. This culminated in the exaltation of Cæsar Borgia over all the petty princes of Central and Northern Italy. Pope Julius II. (1503-1513) compelled Cæsar to surrender his acquisitions, and with great ability and vigour took measures against all who had encroached upon the patrimony of the Church. He humbled the Venetians, recovered Bologna and Fermo, and became—after Innocent III. and Albornoz—the third founder and restorer of the Papal States. In 1596 Ferrara, and in 1631 Urbino, came by escheat to the Roman See. The States of the Church remained with their frontiers practically unchanged down to the French Revolution, constituting a territory of irregular shape in the centre of Italy, from Ferrara on the north to Terracina on the south, having Ancona for its eastern and Cività Vecchia for its western seaport. By the treaty of Tolentino (1797) Napoleon compelled the Pope to cede the Legations, Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna, and admit a French garrison into Ancona; Avignon had been already seized and annexed to France. Subsequently the whole of the Papal territory was appropriated by the French, and when the Pope (Pius VII.) launched against Napoleon on this account the sentence of excommunication, he was arrested and kept a close prisoner, first at Savona and afterwards at Fontainebleau. After the fall of Napoleon, the Pope was reinstated in the government of an undiminished territory. Pius IX., being elected Pope in 1846, proclaimed an amnesty to political offenders, and sincerely endeavoured so thoroughly to reform the administration in every department as to leave his subjects without just cause of discontent. The hateful crime of the murder of his minister Pellegrino Rossi (1848) was the answer of the Roman democrats to the fatherly overtures of the Pontiff. The Pope was compelled to take refuge on Neapolitan territory, and a republic was set up at Rome by Mazzini and Garibaldi. Louis Napoleon, having been elected President of the new French Republic, sent troops to Rome, under General Oudinot, who, after a slight reverse, drove away the revolutionists and brought the Pope back. All this took place in 1849. A French garrison was left at Rome; but the Pope knew that it did not enter into the designs of Louis Napoleon to defend the entire Pontifical territory; in order, therefore, to keep it intact he raised a small army, commanded by the French General Lamoricière, and composed to a large extent of

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 55. Dante, *Inferno*, xix. 115; *Paradiso*, xx. 35.

[2] The county of Avignon, or the Venaissin, which once belonged to the Counts of Toulouse, passed to the Roman See in 1274.

foreign Catholics. After the war between Austria and France, in which the power of the former was beaten down at Solferino (1859), Piedmont, ruled by the astute Cavour and assisted by the revolutionary sects, succeeded in obtaining possession of Tuscany, the Legations, Modena, Parma, and Naples. The small Papal army was overpowered by a Piedmontese force many times more numerous at Castelfidardo (1860). The Pope was now left with only one province, the "Patrimony of St. Peter," extending some fifty miles along the coast to the north of Rome. Of this also, and of his capital, Pius IX. was deprived in 1870 by the Piedmontese king, who took advantage of the reverses suffered by France in the war with Germany to set at naught the treaty of 1864, by which he had agreed that Florence should be the capital of the Italian kingdom. It was now said that Rome was the indispensable capital of that kingdom, but that the Pope's independence should be respected. The Papal palace of the Quirinal and all the public buildings of Rome were appropriated by the invaders; but the Vatican was left unassailed, and a "Law of Guarantees," passed by the Italian Parliament (and capable of being repealed by the same authority), while assigning to the Pope an annual dotation of two million lire, guaranteed to him sovereign rights within the limits of the Vatican. It is scarcely necessary to say that the dotation has not been accepted, while the fragment of sovereignty guaranteed has already been encroached upon in various ways, and is held on a tenure of the most precarious description. For the present, Rome and the Papal States are lost to the Papacy.

The Popes have not ceased to declare, on all fitting occasions, that the preservation of their temporal independence is necessary, as human affairs are constituted, to the free and full exercise of their spiritual authority. It has been argued that the *raison d'être* of the temporal power has ceased in modern times, because the lay power in states has ceased to be, as it often was in the Middle Ages, arbitrary, corrupt, violent, and ill-informed, but on the contrary is administered on fixed and equitable principles which ensure equal justice for all. It is further maintained that the danger of undue influence, which might reasonably be dreaded while the European Governments were seriously Christian in one direction or another, and which made intolerable to previous generations the notion of the Pope as a French, or Spanish, or Austrian subject, cannot be pleaded in an age when government has ceased to take theology into account, and is administered on a purely utilitarian basis. The Pope, on this view, though a subject of the Italian kingdom, might both be and be known to be absolutely untrammelled in the government of the Church. It is quite true that the objections to the inclusion of the seat of the Papacy in any modern state are no longer precisely what they were. They have changed their character; but they are not less cogent now than in former times. Formerly, even if the influence of a Catholic king or emperor at Rome appeared to be excessive, still it professed, like the Papacy itself, to be directed to Christian ends, and it made use of similar methods. The possession of Rome by a Charles V. or a Louis XIV. did not involve the deluging of the city with immoral and infidel publications, or the permission of the public exhibition of every form of heresy and absurdity. But all this is implied, and cannot but be implied, in the possession of Rome by such a state as Italy, which has ceased to be Christian. With such a state the Roman See cannot possibly live on terms of amity. It is not a question about reasonable toleration or respect for the rights of conscience. As the Popes have not in the past interfered, so they would not in the future interfere with any Protestants residing in Rome who might wish to practise their religious rites in a quiet and unobtrusive manner.

Protestants themselves, or the more reasonable and enlightened among them, view with grief and scorn the process by which Rome is being reduced to the level of an English or American town. They would prefer that at least one place should be left on earth where Catholic principles of government and maxims of life might be applied without disturbance. So far from the changed circumstances of Europe making it a matter of little moment that the Pope should be independent, there has never been a time since the conversion of Constantine when his independence has been more vitally necessary, because in no previous age has the civil authority so openly declared itself unchristian. The Pope *must* oppose, *must* be out of sympathy with the civil power, when he sees it establishing schools without religion, vexing and banishing religious orders, and throwing obstacles in the way of those who desire to embrace the religious life. To make the Pope a subject of any power that governs in this fashion—and nearly all civilized states do so—can only end in one of two ways: either he will be forced to acquiesce in what he knows to be a false and mischievous system, or he will find himself in a state of continual collision with the civil power. The first alternative is, of course, impossible; the second implies a state of things more or less resembling that which now exists, but still worse in this respect, that even the shadow of independence which the Piedmontese left to the Pope in 1870, through forbearing to seize on the Vatican palace, would be swept away if he were openly declared a subject of the King of Italy.

Works relating to the history of the Papal States are numberless. We need only mention Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis," "Les Premiers Temps de l'État Pontifical"; Miley, "Hist. of the Papal States"; Mann, "Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages"; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," tr.; Hergenröther, "Der Kirchenstaat seit der Französischen Revolution"; Schnürer, in "Cath. Enc.")

STATIONS. (1) A name given to the fast kept on Wednesdays and Fridays. In the Roman Church the fast was one of devotion, not of precept, and it ended at None—*i.e.* three o'clock (Tertull. "De Jejun." 2, PL, ii. 956). Tertullian ("De Orat." 19, i. 1181) explains the word from the military usage; the Stations were days on which the Christian soldiers stood on guard and watched in prayer." It was characteristic of the Montanists to prolong the fast of the Stations till the evening ("De Jejun." 10, ii. 966). Prudentius ("Peristeph." vi. 52 *seq.*) relates of the martyr Fructuosus that he refused the cup offered him because it was a Station and the ninth hour had not come. In the East, on the other hand, the fast of the Stations was obligatory ("Apost. Const." v. 20; "Canon. Apost." 69[1]; Epiphan. "Haer." 75, n. 3). In the West, the fast on Wednesday, never obligatory, died out altogether, while that of Friday became obligatory about the end of the ninth century. The Greeks, on the other hand, still maintain the fast of Wednesdays and Fridays. (Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," P. ii. ch. 15; see ABSTINENCE and FAST.)

(2) The word, in another sense, still holds its place in the Roman Missal. Many of our readers must have noticed the words "Statio ad S. Petrum, ad S. Mariam Majorem," &c., before the Introit of certain Masses. Mabillon ("Museum Italicum," tom. ii. p. xxxi.) explains the term as meaning either a fast or "a concourse of the people to an appointed place—*i.e.* a church in which the procession of the clergy halts on stated days to say stated prayers. It is an ancient custom in Rome that the Roman clergy should on particular days meet for prayer in some one church where Mass and other divine services are performed. The procession of the Roman clergy to these Stations is either solemn or private; the latter when individuals betake themselves privately to the appointed place, the former when the Pope and the rest solemnly proceed thither singing litanies and other prayers." The gathering of clergy and people before this procession, Mabillon continues, was called *collecta*, and the name was given then to the prayer said over the people before the procession started from one church to the other in order to make the Station. "It was St. Gregory who regulated the Stations at Rome—*i.e.* the churches where the office was to be performed daily in Lent, on the Ember days, and on the solemn feasts. For the feasts of the saints were celebrated in the churches which contained their relics. St. Gregory then marked these Stations in his Sacramentary, as they are now in the Roman Missal, and attached them chiefly to the patriarchal and titular churches; but although the Stations were fixed, the Archdeacon did not fail, after the Pope's Communion, to announce the next Station to the people" (Fleury, "H.E." livr. xxxvi. § 17). In the Easter of 774, Charlemagne assisted at the Station of Easter Sunday at St. Mary Major, of Easter Monday at St. Peter's, Tuesday at St. Paul's—the same Stations still noted in our Missal (Eginhard, apud Fleury, xliv. § 5; Leclercq, in "Cath. Enc.").

STATIONS OF THE CROSS (*Via Crucis, Via Calvarii*). A series of images or pictures representing the different events in the Passion of Christ, each Station corresponding to a particular event. Each is surmounted by a cross, which is indeed essential to the devotion, the pictures not being necessary. Usually, they are ranged round the church, the first station being placed on one side of the high altar, the last on the other. The Stations are among the most popular of Catholic devotions, and are to be found in almost every church. Sometimes they are erected in the open air, especially on roads which lead to some church or shrine standing on a hill.

The devotion began in the Franciscan order. The Franciscans are the guardians of the Holy Places in Jerusalem, and these Stations are intended as a help to making in spirit a pilgrimage to the scene of Christ's sufferings and death. Innocent XII., in 1694, authentically interpreting a brief of his predecessor Innocent XI. in 1686, declared that the indulgences granted for devoutly visiting certain holy places in Palestine could be gained by all Franciscans and by all affiliated to the order if they made the way of the cross devoutly—*i.e.* passed or turned from Station to Station meditating devoutly on the stages of the history.

Benedict XIII., in 1726, extended these indulgences to all the faithful; Clement XII., in 1731, permitted persons to gain the indulgences at Stations erected in churches which were not Franciscan, provided they were erected by a Franciscan with the sanction of the ordinary. At present the connection of the Stations with the Franciscan order is almost forgotten, at least in England, except as a matter of history. Our bishops

[1] We follow Thomassin in his interpretation of the fourth canon. The passage in the Constitutions (πᾶσαν τετράδα καὶ πᾶσαν παρασκευὴν προστάσσομεν ὑμῖν νηστεύειν) is, as it seems to us, decisive against the view of Hefele (*Concil.* vol. i. p. 821) and others. Hefele's editor, Leclercq, does not support him (i. 1221). Τέτρας often means "the fourth day."

can, by Apostolic faculties, erect the Stations, with the indulgences attached to them, and they constantly delegate this faculty to priests. The English bishops received faculties to this effect, provided there were no religious in the neighbourhood to whom the privilege belonged, in 1857. In 1862 these faculties were renewed without this limitation. The faculties are quinquennial. (Conc. Prov. Westmonast. II. Append. I. Concil. III., Append. III.)

The number of the Stations has varied considerably at different times and in different places; and even when the number has been the same as now (14), they do not always correspond with ours. It is probable "that our present series of Stations, together with the accustomed prayers for them, comes to us not from Jerusalem, but from imitation Ways of the Cross in different parts of Europe, and that we owe the propagation of devotion as well as the number and selection of our Stations much more to the pious ingenuity of certain sixteenth century devotional writers than to the actual practice of pilgrims to the holy places" (Alston in "Cath. Enc."). The Stations now recognized are the following: There are fourteen Stations—viz. (1) the sentence passed on our Lord by Pilate; (2) the receiving of the cross; (3) our Lord's first fall; (4) His meeting with His mother; (5) the bearing of the cross by Simon of Cyrene; (6) the wiping of Christ's face by Veronica with a handkerchief; (7) His second fall; (8) His words to the women of Jerusalem, "Weep not for Me," &c.; (9) His third fall; (10) His being stripped of His garments; (11) His crucifixion; (12) His death; (13) the taking down of His body from the cross; (14) His burial. In the diocese of Vienna the number of the Stations at the end of the eighteenth century was reduced to eleven. On the other hand, a fifteenth Station has been sometimes added—viz. the finding of the cross by Helena. These changes are unauthorized. (See Thurston, "The Stations of the Cross"; De Montault, "De la Construction des Églises," liv. vii., "Le Chemin de la Croix"; Keppler, "Die XIV. Stationen des hl. Kreuzweg"; Alston, in Cath. Enc.")

STIGMATA. The word occurs in Gal. vi. 15, "I bear the marks (*στίγματα*) of Jesus in my body." Such brands or marks were set on slaves who had run away, on slaves consecrated to the service of a heathen god, rarely on captives, and sometimes soldiers branded the name of their general on some part of their body. Probably St. Paul's metaphor is taken from the second of these customs. (See Lightfoot, *ad loc.*) He regarded the marks of suffering in Christ's cause as consecrating him the more to his Master's service. The Latin versions retain the word "stigmata," but no Catholic commentator of repute, so far as we know, ever dreamt that St. Paul received miraculous marks of Christ's Passion. Neither St. Thomas nor Estius allude to such an interpretation, and Windischmann only mentions it to dismiss it.

Still, the idea that miraculous wounds on hands, feet, and side, like those borne by our Lord, were a mark of divine favour certainly existed in the mediaeval Church independently of St. Francis, for in 1222, at a council in Oxford, an impostor who claimed to have stigmata of this kind confessed his guilt and was punished accordingly (Fleury, "H.E." lxxviii. § 56). Only two years later —*i.e.* 1224—St. Francis of Assisi (d. 1226) was on Mount Alvernus to keep his annual fast of forty days in honour of St. Michael. One morning, says St. Bonaventure, about the 14th of September, the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, Francis saw a seraph flying towards him. There was a figure of a man attached to a cross between the wings. After the vision disappeared, the hands and feet of the saint were found to be marked with nails, and there was a wound in his side. The wounds were seen by some of the friars and by Alexander IV. during the lifetime of the saint, and after his death by fifty friars, St. Clare, and a multitude of seculars. St. Bonaventure assures us that he had the testimony of Alexander IV. from the Pope's own lips. The Church keeps a feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, instituted by Benedict XII. (Sept. 17).

The Dominicans claimed a similar distinction for one of their own order, St. Catharine of Siena (1347–1380). They appealed to a letter from the saint to her confessor, Raymond of Capua, in which she states that our Lord had impressed the stigmata upon her, but had at her own request made them invisible to others. They also quoted the testimony of St. Antoninus and the hymn which alludes to the stigmata, inserted in the Office of St. Catharine with the approval of Pius II. The Franciscans, who maintained that the privilege was peculiar to their own founder, carried the matter before Sixtus IV. in 1483. The Pope (himself a Franciscan) forbade, under severe penalties anyone to paint images of St. Catharine with the stigmata. (See Fleury, "H.E." lxxix. § 5, cxv. § 103.) Still the fact of her stigmatization is recorded in the Breviary office, and a special feast in commemoration of it was granted to the Dominicans by Benedict XIII. In a work on the subject Dr. Imbert-Gourbeyre enumerates 145 persons, twenty men, the rest women, who are stated to have received the stigmata. Of these, eighty lived before the seventeenth century. Some are canonized, others beatified, others simply persons of reputed holiness. The work just referred to ("Les Stigmatisées") was published by Palmé in 1873.

"Some physiologists, both Catholics and Freethinkers, have maintained that the wounds might be produced, in a purely natural manner, by the sole action of the imagination coupled with lively emotions. . . . We shall not attempt to solve this question. Physiological science does not appear to be far enough advanced to permit a definite solution, and the writer . . . adopts the intermediate position, which seems to him unassailable, that of showing that the arguments in favour of natural explanations are illusory. . . . It must be remembered that neither religion nor mysticism is dependent on the solution of these questions, and that, in processes of canonization stigmata do not count as incontestable miracles" (Poulain in "Cath. Enc." and "The Graces of Interior Prayer"; Lefebre, "Louise Lateau, Étude Medicale," this famous stigmatic was born in 1850, and died in 1883.)

STIPEND. [See MASS, *application of.*]

STOLE. A narrow vestment made of the same stuff as the chasuble, and worn round the neck. The Pope always wears the stole. Bishops and priests wear it at Mass—the priest crossed over his breast; the bishop, who has already the pectoral cross on his breast, pendant on each side. They also wear it whenever they exercise their orders by administering sacraments or by blessing persons or things. In some places it is, in others it is not, worn in preaching, and the custom of the place is to be followed (S.C.R. 12 Nov. 1837, 23 Maii 1846.) Deacons wear it at Mass, or at Benediction, &c.—when they have to move the Blessed Sacrament—over the left shoulder and joined on the right side.

Stole—*i.e.* στολή in classical Greek—in the LXX and New Testament means a robe of any kind, sometimes (*e.g.* in Mk. xii. 38, Lk. xx. 46) a costly or imposing garment. In Latin *stola* was the upper garment worn by women of position. The conjecture of Meratus (on Gavant. tom. i. P. ii. tit. i.) that our stole is the Roman *stola* of which only the ornamental stripe has been left, is very unlikely, considering that the *stola* was, almost exclusively, a piece of female attire. The stole is never mentioned by that name before the ninth century. Theodoret ("H. E." ii. 27) speaks of "a holy stole" (ἱερὰ στολή) given to Macarius by Constantine, but he only means a "sacred vestment" in general, and Germanus of Constantinople, at the beginning of the eighth century, identifies the στολή with the φελώνιον or chasuble, and distinguishes it from the ὡράριον or stole according to our modern usage (Galland. "Bibliothec." tom. xiii. p. 226).

This word *orarium* belongs to the later Latin, and means a cloth for the face, a handkerchief. It was also used "in favorem," to applaud at theatres &c., and sometimes worn as a scarf. The first mention of it as an ecclesiastical vestment occurs about the middle of the fourth century, when the Council of Laodicea (can. 22 and 23) forbade clerics in minor orders to use it. A sermon attributed to Chrysostom, and probably not much later than his time, compares the deacons to angels, and the "stripes of thin linen on their left shoulders" (ταῖς λεπταῖς ὀθόναις ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ὤμων) to wings ("Homily on the Prodigal Son," PG, lix. 520). In the West, for a long time after, orarium was used for a common handkerchief or napkin (Ambros. "De Excess. Sat." lib. i. 43, PL, xvi. 1304; August. "De Civit. Dei," xxii. 8, PL, xli. 765; Hieron. Ep. lii. 9, PL, xxii. 535; Prudent. "Peristeph." i. 86; Greg. Turon. "De Gloria Mart." i. 93; Greg. Magn. Ep. vii. 30. So the Council of Orleans in 511). It is in the Spanish church that we find the earliest traces of the orarium or stole as a sacred vestment among the Latins. The Council of Braga in 563 (can. 9) speaks of the orarium as worn by deacons; a council of Toledo in 633 recognizes it as a vestment of bishops, priests, and deacons (can. 28 and 40). Another synod of Braga in 675 mentions the present custom according to which priests wear the orarium crossed over the breast (can. 4); while the Synod of Mayence in 813 (can. 28) requires priests to wear it not only at Mass but habitually, as the Pope does now, to mark their sacerdotal dignity. Several of the Ordines Romani (the third, fifth, eighth, ninth, and thirteenth) also mention the orarium. Hence we may conclude that from about the time of Charlemagne the orarium or stole was generally adopted throughout the West as a vestment of bishops, priests, and deacons. The Greeks have always regarded the orarium as a vestment peculiar to deacons. The ἐπιτραχήλιον or περιτραχήλιον of priests differs both in form and in the manner in which it is worn from the orarium of deacons. The Syrian Christians have adopted the same word *orio, ororo,* but with them the orro is worn by clerics of all the orders. Readers among the Maronites wear the orro hanging from the right shoulder, subdeacons in all the Syrian rites round the neck, deacons on the left shoulder, priests round the neck and in front of the breast. The Syrians also use the same word for the ὠμοφόριον or pallium of bishops. (See Payne Smith, "Thesaurus Syriacus," col. 101, 102, *sub voc.* ܐܘܪܪܘ.) Hefele says it appears from ancient pictures that down to the twelfth century the deacon's stole hung over the left shoulder, and was not, as now, fastened together on the right side below the breast. Till a late period the stole was worn outside the dalmatic as now by the Greek deacons over the sticharion. Hefele finds the earliest notice of a deacon's stole worn under the dalmatic in a Salzburg

Pontifical of the twelfth century, and in the fourteenth Roman Ordo, compiled about 1300. Bishops, however, wore the stole over the alb and under the tunicella and dalmatic as early at least as Rabanus Maurus ("De Cleric. Instit." i. 19, 20)—*i.e.* about 816.

The same author (*loc. cit.*) speaks of the orarium which "some call stole." This is the first certain instance of the use of the latter word, for its place in the Gregorian Sacramentary may be one of the many interpolations to which liturgical books are peculiarly subject. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries stole became the common word (so, *e.g.*, the Synod of Coyaca, in the diocese of Oviedo, anno 1050, can. 3). The oraria on ancient pictures are exactly like our stoles, resembling the pattern known as Gothic. They were often adorned with jewels, bells hung from them, and letters or words were worked in. Hefele acknowledges his failure after much search to find the reason why the word "stole" came to be used for orarium. The vestment has been taken as a symbol of the yoke of Christ (Pseudo-Alcuin), of Christ's obedience (Innocent III.). The prayer in our present Missal evidently refers to the original meaning of the Greek στολή. "Give me back, O Lord, the stole or robe of immortality," &c. (Braun, in "Cath. Enc." and "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 562–620; Rock, i. 337 *sqq.*)

STOLE-FEES. The fees, varying in different countries, which it is customary among the laity to pay to a priest at the time of his discharging any sacred function for their benefit—*e.g.* in marriages, christenings, and funerals. [See FEES.]

STYLITES. (Pillar Saints, from στῦλος, a pillar.) Solitaries who, from motives of mortification, lived on the top of a pillar. The most famous of them, who was also the first of Christian Stylites, was St. Simeon. He began this extraordinary mode of life about the year 423, and continued it till his death in 459. He had many imitators in the East, but this form of asceticism found little favour in the West. "God," says Alban Butler ("Lives of the Saints, Jan. 5), "is sometimes pleased to conduct certain fervent souls through extraordinary paths in which others would find only dangers of illusion, vanity, and self-will, which we cannot sufficiently guard ourselves against. We should, notwithstanding, consider that the sanctity of these fervent souls does not consist in such wonderful actions or miracles, but in the perfection of their unfeigned charity, patience, and humility; and it was the exercise of these solid virutes that rendered so conspicuous the life of this saint." "No one had less about him (St. Simeon) of the arrogance or obstinacy of delusion. He comes down from his pillar at a word of advice from neighbouring monks. He casts away the chain that bound him at the suggestion of a visitor. Above all, the good which he effected marks him out as an apostle. . . . Not in the desert, but in the vicinity of vast wicked Antioch, he stands on his pillar and preaches . . . From three o'clock in the afternoon till set of sun he preached from that strange pulpit to the most motley congregation ever assembled to hear the Word of God." (Dalgairns, "Holy Communion," 211–4; see Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Erhard in "Kirchenlex." *Styliten*; Zingerle, "Leben und Wirken des hl. Symeon Stylites.")

SUBDEACONS. Ministers of the Church who rank next to deacons. In the Latin Church they prepare the sacred vessels and the bread and wine for Mass; pour the water into the chalice at the Offertoy and sing the Epistle. Among the Greks they guard the gates of the sanctuary during Mass, and prepare the sacred vessels at the Prothesis. They are therefore allowed to touch the paten and chalice, unless these contain the Holy Eucharist. The 21st Canon of Laodicea forbids them in general terms to touch the holy vessels; but Morinus and Van Espen interpret this canon as referring simply to the "Great Entrance" in the Greek liturgy, when the prepared elements are carried in procession at the beginning of the Missa Fidelium from the Prothesis to the altar.

Among the Greeks and Orientals the subdiaconate is a minor, among the Latins a greater or sacred order. But it was only about 1200 that even the Latins reckoned the subdiaconate among the greater orders. Martène indeed certifies that in Sacramentaries as early as 800 or thereabouts he found the ordination of subdeacons placed along with that of the superior and separated from that of the inferior ministers. In 1097, the Council of Benevento, over which Urban II. presided, says expressly, "We give the name of sacred orders to the presbyterate and diaconate." Fifty years later Hugo of St. Victor speaks of the subdiaconate as a minor order. But Peter Cantor, who died in 1197, says that in his time "the subdiaconate had been recently made a sacred order." Innocent III. really closed the question by ruling that subdeacons, like deacons and priests, might be chosen bishops.

Usually, subdeacons are ordained by bishops. But the Synod of Meaux in 845 permits (can. 44) chorepiscopi (*q.v.*) who certainly were not bishops,[1] to confer the subdiaconate with the sanction of the ordinary, and the same permission is said to have been given by the Pope to Cistercian abbots. In the very ancient collection known as the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage (but really drawn up by St. Cesarius of Arles in 505), can. 5 lays down the rule that a subdeacon

[1] *I.e.* in the West and at that time; see Hefele-Leclercq, i. 702 *sqq.* on the Antiochene Synod *in encaeniis*, can. 10.

is to be ordained by receiving the empty chalice and paten from the bishop, while the archdeacon gives him the cruet and towel. This ceremony is preserved with a very slight alteration in the present Roman Pontifical. The Pontifical also prescribes the tradition of the book of the Epistles, but this rite was unknown till the twelfth century at least; neither Hugo of St. Victor nor the Master of the Sentences, nor even St. Thomas, mentions it. The form among the Latins consists in the words which accompany the tradition: "See what kind of ministry is given to you," &c.; "Receive the book of the Epistles," &c. Even the form accompanying the tradition of the paten and the chalice is much more modern than the tradition itself, for the Gregorian Sacramentary has a prayer ("Benedictio subdiaconi") as the form of ordination. Among the Greeks the matter is the laying on of hands, and the form the prayer during this action. Such has been their use from the fifth century at least, as appears from the false Dionysius. They have no tradition of the instruments except after ordination, when the newly ordained are, as it were, put in possession, and this custom is of modern date.

In the time of Cornelius (elected 254) there were seven subdeacons at Rome. Their functions in the ancient Church were very important. They were the secretaries of bishops, and were often sent on distant and important missions. They had a great part in managing the alms and temporal goods of the Church. The letters of St. Gregory the Great show that in his time the Roman subdeacons administered the affairs of St. Peter's patrimony throughout the provinces, made reports to the Pope on the conduct of bishops, and by the Pope's orders admonished prelates, reformed abuses, and assembled councils. Pandulph, who signed the Magna Charta, is styled "domini Papae subdiaconus."

(Chardon, 789; Juenin, "Commentarius Historicus et Dogmaticus de Sacramentis," diss. ix. qu. vii.; Ferraris, *Ordo*; Gasparri, "De Sacra Ordinatione." For the obligations of the office, see BREVIARY and CELIBACY.)

SUB-DELEGATE. One to whom a judge-delegate transfers his jurisdiction in a particular case. [See DELEGATION.] This privilege is restricted to delegates appointed by the supreme authority in a state, except in the case of a delegate *ad universitatem causarum*—that is, one who is empowered by his principal to try all causes that fall within his jurisdiction, for such a delegate is really a "judex quasi ordinarius." A sub-delegate cannot be named (unless by the consent of both parties) to try cases of great importance, for with respect to these, the special qualifications of the delegate must be presumed to have been what moved his principal to appoint him; and the intention might be frustrated if he could commit the most weighty portions of his charge to another. A delegate whose commission only extends to the bare performance of certain acts cannot do them through a sub-delegate.

SUBREPTION. This term is used sometimes for any defect in a rescript, but more properly for concealment or omission of the truth. [See OBREPTION.] Subreption vitiates a rescript if it be fraudulent or malicious, or if it concern the motive of the rescript. But it has not this effect if it be done through ignorance, or if it does not affect the substantial part of the petition. (See Taunton; Ferraris, *Rescriptum*, 24 *sqq.* and the Canonists generally. The word "subreptio" occurs in the *Oratio super populum* in the Mass of Tuesday in Holy Week.)

SUBURBICARIAN DIOCESES. The dioceses in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, *i.e.* Albano, Frascati (Tusculum), Palaestrina, Sabina, Ostia, Velletri, Porto and Santa Rufina. The bishops of these sees form the order of Cardinal Bishops. The bishop of Ostia is the Dean of the Sacred College, and has the right of consecrating the Pope. Since 1910 this diocese is assigned to the senior Cardinal Bishop, in addition to the diocese held by him already. As the Cardinal Bishops hold important posts in the Roman Curia, to the possible detriment of their sees, Pius X. decreed that in each suburbicarian diocese there should be a coadjutor (suffragan) bishop to govern the diocese in the name of the Cardinal Bishop ("Apostolicae Romanorum," 1910). But this arrangement was revoked by Benedict XV. in 1915. (See CARDINAL; Ferraris, *Cardinal*; Benigni, in "Cath. Enc.")

SUFFRAGAN. [See BISHOP SUFFRAGAN.]

SUICIDE. Those who voluntarily, and while in the full possession of their faculties (*sui compotes*) put an end to themselves, are deprived of ecclesiastical burial. But in such cases the canon law, like the common law of England, inclines to a lenient judgment; and if a person be found, for instance, drowned or poisoned, and it be not proved that he had expressed the deliberate intention of taking his own life, the law prefers to presume some other cause of death, such as the act of a malefactor, or accident or temporary aberration of mind.

In many countries the civil law now requires that persons who have committed suicide, even though the wilfulness of the act and their sanity at the time be established, shall be buried in the churchyards. In such a case the ministers of the Church take no part in the funeral obsequies. (Ferraris, *Homicidium*; "Cath. Enc." *Suicide.*)

SULPICIANS. A society of priests who devote themselves to the care of theological seminaries. They derive their name from the seminary of S. Sulpice in Paris, where

they were established by their founder, M. Olier, in 1642. [See SEMINARIES.]

SUNDAY. The Jewish Sabbath was the weekly day of rest with which the week ended. On that day the Hebrews were forbidden to gather manna (Exod. xv. 23–29). Thus the observance of the Sabbath was made a general law; they were to do no work upon it; the Hebrew family, the stranger in the gates, the slaves, even the cattle, were to rest; and this because God Himself finished the work of creation and rested on that day, blessing it and sanctifying it (Exod. xx. 8–11). In Deut. v. 12–15 it is the kindly and beneficent character of the institution which is emphasized, rather than its sacredness. No reference is made to creation, but the Hebrew is to keep the Sabbath, "that thy man slave and thy woman slave may rest even as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence," &c. The importance attached to the Sabbath in the Deuteronomical and Levitical codes is shown by the very fact that Sabbath-keeping is the subject of a precept in the Decalogue. Further, the Sabbath is the basis of a whole series of enactments. The seventh month is the holy month of the year. It is ushered in by the Feast of Trumpets, its tenth day is the Day of Atonement, its fifteenth the Feast of Tabernacles or ingathering, the "joy of the law." The seventh is the sabbatical year; during which the whole land is to rest[1] (Lev. xxv. 1–7); there is to be no sowing, or vintage, or reaping, and thus the Sabbath extends its dominion over nature. After "seven Sabbaths of years" (*i.e.* $7 \times 7 = 49$ years) comes the year of Jubilee, when Hebrew slaves are to go free, land to revert to its original owner, &c.

Something must be said on three points connected with the Jewish Sabbath which are of theological importance:—

(1) There is no trace of its being observed among the Hebrews before the time of Moses. No doubt, in Genesis ii. 3, we read that "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," but it is never said that He told men in the pre Mosaic period to do so likewise, and evidently the sacred writers make no mention of a Sabbath kept by the Patriarchs. It is implied that the division of days into weeks, unknown among the Romans till the Empire, was very ancient among some of the Semitic people, for Laban (Gen. xxix. 27) speaks of the "week of this woman" [illegible] marriage festivities. We [illegible] among the Assyrians the [illegible] days of every month we [illegible] weeks of seven days [illegible] fourteenth, twenty-first, [illegible] days being Sabbaths; [illegible] general prohibition of wo[illegible] (G. Smith, "Assyrian Epo[illegible] *seq.*). The date of this [illegible] Assyrians is still uncertain ([illegible] p. 214). But we may con[illegible] division was based, not on t[illegible] but on the phases of the mo[illegible] Sayce, "The Higher Cri[illegible] Monuments," p. 75), and w[illegible] and without Israel before [illegible] this it does not follow th[illegible] divine command to keep [illegible]ath, or even that the Israelites reste[illegible]. Indeed, the day of rest implies a settled and agricultural life; to a people of shepherds a Sabbath is not necessary or indeed scarcely possible. (So Wellhausen, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," ch. iii.)

(2) The Jewish was at all times distinct from the Puritan idea of the Sabbath. It is the privilege of rest for the slave and even for the beasts on which the Book of Deuteronomy dwells with characteristic kindliness. In 4 Kings iv. 22, 23, it is mentioned, with the new moons, as a day on which people went to hear the prophets. One of the earliest prophets, Hosea (ii. 13) alludes to it (again in conjunction with the new moons) as a day of joy; Amos (viii. 5) as a day on which no business was done. The prophets of the Exile insist on strict rest; Jeremia *e.g.* forbids carrying of burdens (xvii. 19 *seq.*). They enlarge on the sin of breaking the Sabbath, and the blessings which attend its observance (Ezech. xx. 16; xxii. 26; and so with reference to the Exile, Is. lvi. 2; lviii. 13); and the Levitical Code (Exod. xxvi.; xxxv. 3; Num. xv.) enforces the obligation of rest in minute detail, but not a word is said against recreation on the Sabbath.[1] Even the Pharisees, though they multiplied rules against servile work—forbade, *e.g.*, journeys more than 2000 paces beyond the city; climbing a tree, lest a tree should break; works of mercy, &c., &c.—never prohibited pleasure as such. Even a Chief Pharisee did not scruple to entertain on the Sabbath (Lk. xiv. 1). The Rabbinical law on dancing illustrates exactly the difference between the Pharisaical and the Puritan view. The Rabbins forbid it, not because it is a worldly pleasure, but because it would lead to tuning the musical instruments, which is reckoned work (Buxtorf, "Lex. Rabbin." שְׁבוּת).

(3) Our Lord did not during His earthly

[1] According to the "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xxi. 2–6), Hebrew slaves are to go free not on the, but on every, seventh year, dating from the beginning of their slavery; and every seventh year the harvest is to be left for the poor (xxiii. 10, 11). The former provision is repeated in Deut. xv. 12–18, and the second has its analogy in the law that on a seventh year proclaimed and fixed, debts are to be remitted (Deut. xv. 1–6). The developed Sabbatical year—*i.e.* the fixing of one year for the whole country, in which the land is to rest completely from being sown no less than from being reaped—is peculiar to Leviticus. So also is the crown of the whole system—viz. the year of Jubilee.

[1] Is. lviii. 13 is often quoted in the "Authorized Version," "If thou turn away thy foot . . . from doing thy pleasure on my holy day." But חֶפְצְךָ means "affairs," "business," as elsewhere in later Hebrew.

Sabbath. To do so would istent with His position der the law," and with caching (see, especially, ut he did expose the hypocrisy of men who on the Sabbath and were hrist on the same day ter of Abraham whom " (Lk. xiii. 10–16). He, ated two great principles. , perhaps, part of the better hing: "The Sabbath is not man for the Sabbath." Sabbath is given into your to the hands of the Sabbath," the "Mechilta," a Midrash n parts of Exodus, belonging to t rt of the third century A.D.) Man is ma fulfil the law of love. Not so with regard to the Sabbath, which is simply enforced for man's own good. Next, the "Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Just as the Sabbath law must give way before the natural needs of man, so, and much more, before the requirement of Him who is the head and representative of mankind (Mk. ii. 23–28). If, again, the ministers of the temple broke the Sabbath law in its service and were blameless, much more might the disciples do so in the service of One greater than the temple (Mt. xii. 5–8).

(4) The precept of observing the Sabbath was completely abrogated in the Christian Church. "Let no man judge you," says St. Paul (Coloss. ii. 16), "in eating and drinking or in the matter of a feast or a new moon or of a Sabbath-day [σαββάτων, from the Chaldee שַׁבָּתָא, not "Sabbath days"; cf. "Hodie tricesima Sabbata," Hor. "Sat." i. 9, 69], which things are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's" (cf. Gal. iv.; Rom. xiv. 5, 9). Christians are not to be taken to task on such things; they do not furnish the materials of a judgment, good or bad, since the shadows are characteristic of the Jewish law, the substance of Christ's gospel. Once only does the N.T. refer to a Christian Sabbath. "There is left therefore a Sabbath-keeping (σαββατισμός) for the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9). The reference, however, is to no earthly Sabbath, but to that eternal rest of which the Sabbath was a type. The word "Sabbath" is kept in the Greek and the Latin of the Church to denote Saturday—a day which is not sacred among Christians.

(5) In commemoration of Christ's resurrection the Church observes Sunday. The observance does not rest on the natural law, which does indeed require us to give certain time to the worship of God, but not a whole day rather than parts of several days, much less any particular day; nor, again, on any positive divine law, of which there is no trace. Sunday is merely of ecclesiastical institution, dating, however, from the time of the Apostles. Such is the opinion of St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 122, a. 4, ad 2) and of the greatest Catholic theologians (so Billuart, "De Relig." diss. vi. a. 1; and Turrecremata, Thom. Waldensis, Cajetan, Sylvius, and others whom Billuart cites). The present rule obliges the faithful to hear Mass on that day and to rest from servile work—*i.e.* work done with the hands rather than with the head. But custom permits certain servile work even when not required by necessity or mercy—such, *e.g.*, as cooking food—and ecclesiastical authority may dispense from the law. We proceed to trace the history of the observance.

In a single passage of the N.T.—viz. Apoc. i. 10—we find a special name for the first day of the week, "the Lord's day" (ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ—very different from ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμέρα). In Acts xx. 7 we are told that St. Paul abode seven days at Troas, and that on the first day of the week (ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων) the disciples came together "to break bread." The same Apostle writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 1 *seq.*), "Every first day of the week (κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου) let each of you lay up at home and collect whatever profit he had had," words which do not, indeed, directly imply that there was public service on Sunday, for παρ' ἑαυτῷ (=*chez lui*) cannot refer to a collection in the Christian assembly. But they do seem to indicate that Sunday was already a sacred day, on which deeds of love were specially suitable. Heb. x. 25 shows this much, that the Christians, when the epistle was written, had regular days of assembly.

(6) The Scriptural references given above show that the observance of Sunday had begun in the Apostolic age; but even were Scripture silent, tradition would put this point beyond all doubt. While, however, Sunday was observed from the first, it is possible to trace several stages in the observance.

(*a*) The earliest Fathers speak of the assembly for worship, and especially for the celebration of the Eucharist. As this is well known, the following references will suffice: Ep. Barnab. 15; Ignat. ad Magnes. 9; Justin Mart. i. Apol. 59; Dionys. Corinth. (apud Euseb. "H. E." iv. 23); Tertull. Apol. 16, PL. i. 571; "De Coron." 3, PL. ii. 79. These authors speak of Sunday, which they call the "Lord's Day," the "Day of the Lord's Resurrection," and sometimes, but only in addressing heathen, the "Day of the Sun" (see Probst, "Kirchliche Disciplin in den ersten drei Jahrhund." p. 247), as a day of sacred joy and prayer. But we know of only one passage in any Ante-Nicene Father which alludes to the Sunday rest. Tertullian, after mention of the ritual usage according to which Christians on Sunday

prayed standing, not kneeling, adds that on that day business was put aside, that the soul might be left free for God's service ("differentes etiam negotia ne quem diabolo locum demus," "De Orat." 23, PL, i. 1191). Here was the contrast between Sabbath and Sunday. The former was primarily a day of rest from work, and, although the morning and evening sacrifices were doubled on the Sabbath, no law of Sabbatical worship was imposed on the Israelite. Attendance on the prophets and afterwards on the synagogue, arose naturally out of the enforced cessation of ordinary work. The Sunday, on the other hand, was primarily a day of prayer, and the words in the Apocalypse strike the keynote of Sunday observance: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." The law of rest arose as a protection to the law of worship. It may be objected that, after all, the Church's law only requires a small portion of Sunday to be spent in prayer. But this objection rests on an anachronism, for we shall see presently that the ancient Church required the greater part of the day to be spent in devotion.

(β) When Christianity became, or was on the way to become, the religion of the state, it was necessary to pass some law of rest; otherwise a Christian who kept Sunday might obviously suffer inconvenience from being summoned to court, to military exercise &c., or even from the competition of his heathen rivals in trade. Hence Constantine, as Eusebius reports, required his subjects to rest on the feasts of our Lord (also on Fridays, if Valesius is right in correcting τὰς τοῦ σαββάτου into τὰς πρὸ τοῦ σαββάτου), and on Sundays the Christian soldiers were exempted from work that they might have leisure to pray (Euseb. "Vit. Constant." iv. 18). A long series of imperial enactments on the matter is to be found in the Roman codes. An edict of Constantine prohibited law business and mechanical arts in towns, though the country people were allowed to till the ground on that day. Later emperors not only closed the law courts, but also the theatre and circus on Sundays.

The decree of councils also became more and more stringent. The Synod of Laodicea (between 343 and 381) threatens with excommunication those who Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but exhorts Christians to rest on Sunday "if they can" (c. 29). About the same time Chrysostom speaks (Hom. xliii. in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, PG, lxi. 368) of the Lord's Day as bringing "rest and immunity from labours.' The Second Council of Mâcon (c. 1) (anno 585) desires the faithful to spend the whole day in prayer. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, in his Capitulary (cap. 24), will suffer no relaxation of prayer except to take food. The Third Council of Tours in 813 (c. 40) is still more explicit; the prayer and praise is to continue "till the evening," Sunday being reckoned from evening to evening. The Second Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 836 (cap. 21) tried to restore the old custom of communicating every Sunday. Nor was this wide notion of Sunday observance peculiar to France and Germany. The Council of Friuli in 791 (can. 13) insists on the same devotion of the whole day to prayer, and the Spanish Council of Coyaca in 1050 (can. 6) prescribes not only attendance at matins, Mass, and the "hours," but also abstinence from travelling except in cases of necessity. Theodore of Tarsus (apud Thomassin, "Traité des Festes," p. 527), who became archbishop of Canterbury in 669, assures us that his fellow-Greeks would neither sail nor ride (except to church), or bake or bathe, or write any unnecessary letters on Sunday. In all these authorities and in the Fathers generally there is no confusion between Sunday and Sabbath. References to the Decalogue as in any sense the warrant for Sunday are extremely rare, though Chrysostom ("Gen." Hom. x. 7, PG, liii. 89) deduces this much from God's blessing and hallowing the seventh day, viz. that one day in the week should be given to God's service.[1] This principle is accepted by modern theologians, so far at least that they distinguish between the ceremonial part of the Third Commandment, which enjoins rest on the seventh day, and its moral part, which urges us to consecrate part of our time to heavenly thoughts. But usually the Fathers and even mediaeval writers, appeal simply to the resurrection of our Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost, which happened on Sunday, to the custom of the Church and to Apostolic tradition.

(γ) Sunday used to be reckoned from evening to evening—*i.e.* the sanctification of the day began on Saturday and ended on Sunday evening. "It was," says Thomassin, "about the eleventh or twelfth century that after the abolition of public vigils in

[1] A sermon once attributed to Augustine (Appendix 280) says that the "glory of Jewish Sabbath-keeping" was transferred to Sunday, but the change is attributed to the "doctors of the Church," and, besides, the Benedictine editors have proved that the sermon is at least later than Alcuin. The universal teaching of the Fathers is that the Sabbath is abrogated in the letter, and that it is kept spiritually by rest from sin, or will be kept by eternal rest with Christ. This is the teaching of Justin (Dial. 12, PG, vi. 50); Iren. (*Adv. Haer.* iv. 16, PG, vii. 1015); Clem. Al. (*Strom.* iv. 3); Origen (Hom. viii. § 2, *In Jos. Contr. Cels.* ii. 7); Victorinus (Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* ii. pp. 4, 5, 8); Augustine (*C. Faust.* xviii. 5, PL, viii. 346); Jerome (*In Isai.* liii. *ad fin.*, lvi. 2, lviii. 13, PL, xxiv. 513); Epiphanius (*Haer.* viii. 6, xxix. 7, xxx. 32; *Exposit. Fid.* 32); Gregory the Great (*Moral.* xviii. 43); Arethes (*In Apoc.* xi. 2). The Puritan idea of a Christian Sabbath was unknown to the first Reformers. But in Scotland we find the Book of Discipline drawn up by John Knox and five other ministers enforcing Sabbath observance; and in 1562 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland petitioned the Queen to punish Sabbath-breakers. In England the Puritanical or Judaizing doctrine was developed and systematized by a learned Puritan clergyman, Dr. Nicolas Bownd, of Norton in Suffolk. The Westminster Confession of 1647 (ch. xxi.) was the first Creed which embodied this view. (For the history of Protestant opinion, see Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. i. p. 775 *seq.*)

the Church, people began the celebration of Sundays and feasts on the morning of the same day." He quotes Gratian ("De Consec." d. 3, c. 1), Gregory IX. ("Extra. de Feriis," c. 1, 2), who recognizes the old custom; Alexander III. (*ib.*), who speaks of both customs as existing in his time; and Haytho, bishop of Basle in his Capitulary, (cap. 8), who says simply that Sunday lasts "a mane usque ad vesperam."

(δ) Down to the middle of the fourteenth century it was admitted on all hands that the faithful must hear Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation in their parish church. But about this time the Mendicant Friars pleaded that this law had been changed by Papal privilege in their favour. This led to keen disputes between seculars and regulars under Innocent VI.; and Sixtus IV., more than a century afterwards, in his Constitution "Vices illius," declared that the law obliged parishioners to hear Mass in their own church unless when they absented themselves "for a good reason" ("ex honesta causa"). There has been much controversy on the sense of this last clause. (See Juenin, "Comment. de Sacram." diss. v. § 11.) But in any case the Council of Trent simply recommends (sess. xxii.) attendance at the parish church, and it is certain from a Constitution of Pius V. ("Etsi Mendicantium," anno 1567) that it is enough, so far as strict obligation goes, to hear Mass in any public church.

(ε) Modern discipline has introduced another and a much more important change. Mass used to last for two hours and more; it can now be heard in half an hour. Further, the public recitation of Matins on Sunday before Mass was usual even in secular churches till the end of the Middle Ages, and it was well understood that the faithful must assist at the Office as well as at Mass. This has been shown above from the decrees of councils. Maskell ("Monument. Rit." vol. iii. p. xxxii.) proves that the obligation of hearing Matins, Mass, and Evensong on Sundays and holidays was recognized in England till the change of religion. Even in the last century Billuart and many other theologians admit an obligation (though not a grave one) of hearing Vespers as well as Mass on Sundays. At present, a man who simply hears Low Mass satisfies the letter of the Church law. But if he absents himself from sermons, if, above all, he does not use the opportunity the day of rest affords for increased prayer, for reading good books, for instructing his family and the like, he will in many cases sin against his own soul. He can hardly fail to do so unless he be like the perfect Christian of whom Origen speaks ("C. Cels." viii. 22, 23), with whom every day is a spiritual feast. A man is in a bad way if he makes a practice of hearing a Low Mass, and spending the rest of the Sunday in frivolous recreation. (The moral theologians treat of Sunday under the Third Commandment of God, *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib. iv. tract. 3; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. 506 *sqq.*; Slater, "Mor. Theol." i. 257 *sqq.*; see also Dublanchy, in DThC *Dimanche*, an excellent and exhaustive art.; Tournebize, "Le Repos Dominical.")

SUPERNATURAL ORDER. [See GRACE.]

SUPERSTITION. Etymologically the word means standing still over or by a thing, and so, in religious awe, both in the good sense of "God-fearing," and in the bad sense of excessive dread of the gods. In Acts xvii. 22, the Greek δεισιδαιμονεστέρους (translated in the Vulgate by "superstitiores") probably means "excessively religious" rather than superstitious in the ordinary use of the English word.

As pointed out in the art. RELIGION, superstition is the vice of excess in the worship of God; not that it is possible to give Him too much honour, but we may give it in the wrong way, or give to other persons or things the worship due to Him alone. "Superstitio est vitium religioni oppositum secundum excessum, non quia plus exhibeat in cultum divinum quam vera religio, sed quia exhibet cultum divinum vel cui non debet, vel eo modo quo non debet" (St. Thom. 2ª 2æ, q. 92, a. 1). The Angelic Doctor divides superstitions into four classes: worshipping God in the wrong way, idolatry, divination, and vain observance. For the last three, see the articles under those heads. Wrongful worship of God may be due to the introduction of false or superfluous elements. Common examples are the prayers promising an infallible answer to various requests; indulgences which have never been granted; false relics, miracles, visions, revelations, &c., which have never taken place. In these cases, the propagators of them are often guiltless of formal sin either by their stupidity or by their mistaken zeal. The Fathers of the Council of Trent, knowing from sad experience what evil had been wrought by superstitious practices, issued a special decree for the removal of all abuses in this matter (sess. xxv.). In the art. SAINTS, INVOCATION OF, it is pointed out that the veneration of the Saints, and especially of the Blessed Virgin, in no way savours of the first kind of superstition. Of course, it is possible for foolish people to put their trust in the Saints alone, and to pray to them while neglecting to pray to God; or to use expressions about them derogatory to the honour due to God. A list of such will be found in Newman's "Difficulties of Anglicans," i. 113 *sqq.* But *abusus non tollit usum*: false worship of the Saints is no reason for paying them no honour at all. (St. Thomas, 2ª 2æ, qq. 92-96; Ferraris; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Mor." lib.

iv. tract. i. cap. 1; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 222 *sqq.*; Wilhelm, in "Cath. Enc.").

SUPREMACY, ROYAL. By this is meant the doctrine that the king or chief authority in the state has the power to ordain and judge in the last resort without appeal "in all causes and over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil,"[1] within his dominions. Christianity is thus inferentially denied, inasmuch as the charge given by our Lord to St. Peter, not to feed only, but to govern (*ποιμαίνειν*) his whole flock in the things concerning everlasting life is ignored, and the judgment of the civil ruler substituted for that of the Apostolic See. Nor is this claim to supremacy less obstinately maintained in democratic communities which pretend to tolerate all religions, than by old Protestant monarchies. The modern Continental Liberal has no sense for the lofty yet humbling thoughts, the pure penetrating emotions, which are present in the souls of believers, and dispose the best of them to the practice of the evangelical counsels—chastity, voluntary poverty, and obedience. He considers that it is the duty of every man or woman to contribute to the advance of civilization, understood as he understands it; and all mental or bodily exercise which does not so contribute he looks upon as so much wasted force. This waste, if he has power to prevent it, he will not permit; he will therefore disperse religious communities, forbid the taking of vows, and generally, assume control in the last resort over religious society. The Radical Government of France, with nothing but toleration and enlightenment on its lips, is as vigilant in repressing the free development of Catholic life within the republic as the Czars are in Russia or Queen Elizabeth was in England.

The doctrine that the civil power has the right to control the ecclesiastical, even in purely religious matters, is generally attributed to Erastus, a German divine of the sixteenth century [see ERASTIANISM]; traces of it, however, may be found in the writings of Marsilius of Padua and other mediæval writers. Cranmer, and afterwards Hooker, espoused it; it is indeed the fundamental tenet of the Church of England as such; Grotius and Hobbes argued on the same side.[2] On the other hand, all Catholic theologians maintain the independence and supremacy of the Church within her own sphere. This independence is of course implied in the very fact of canon law; for precepts which may be lawfully set aside at the bidding of some power claiming to be superior to the authority which framed them are strictly speaking not laws at all, but only regulations or monitions. [See CANON LAW; JURISDICTION; FORUM ECCLESIASTICUM.]

[1] Anglican bidding prayer.
[2] Hallam, *Lit. Hist.* ii. 436.

The doctrine of the royal supremacy was carried out more consistently in England than in any other Protestant country. It was one of the main causes of the civil war in the seventeenth century; the King, as head of the Church, insisting on ecclesiastical arrangements which the conscience of the more advanced Protestants condemned. The Puritan republic, since it maintained the penal laws against Catholics, practically claimed the right of excluding Catholicism from the country, but it conceded to all Protestant sects the free management of their ecclesiastical concerns without state interference. At the Restoration the old state of things reappeared; but the Revolution of 1688 enforced the toleration of the sects, and withdrew, so far as they were concerned, the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown. The liberty thus given has been taken advantage of more and more in the two centuries which have since intervened, and at the present day the supremacy is admitted only by one-half of English Protestantism. In Scotland the Erastian doctrine was rejected from the first. The Presbyterian conception of the Church has no solid basis in Scripture, history, or general reason; but of this Church the Scotch always stoutly upheld the independence as against the State; and the record of their struggles and sacrifices in this cause, from the date of the First General Assembly in 1560 to the disruption of 1843, forms the most attractive feature in the history of Presbyterianism. [See PRESBYTERIANS, SCOTTISH.]

In Sweden and Denmark the sovereigns appoint the bishops; Lutheranism is the national religion, and till within the last few years no other has been tolerated. The Calvinism of Holland is more accommodating; the battle of toleration was fought out there in the seventeenth century, and practically won. The established religion is professed only by about one half of the people, and Catholics form nearly 40 per cent. of the whole population. In Russia the Czar appoints the bishops, and is practically supreme in religious matters. The sufferings which the exercise of this supremacy has entailed on the Catholics of Poland, Podolia, and Lithuania are matter of recent experience. In France religious affairs were regulated by a concordat or solemn treaty concluded (1801) between the civil power and the Catholic Church. Many other countries [CONCORDAT] have followed this example. The French concordat was repudiated by the government in 1905. Of course all Powers having concordats with Rome implicitly admit her spiritual independence. The British State does not make concordats *with*, but laws *for*, the Church of England, justly regarding it as its own creature and subject. (See ENGLISH CHURCH,

Reformation Period; Tarquini, "Juris Eccl. Publici Institutiones.")

SUPPRESSION OF MONASTERIES. In every country of Europe there have been *hostile* suppressions of monastic societies; there have been also, from time to time, *friendly*, or ecclesiastical, suppressions carried out with the approbation of the Holy See. The first and most memorable instance of the former class is the closing of the religious houses in England (1535–1540); the particulars are exhibited in the following table:—

Monasteries with yearly revenue under 200*l.*	374
Monasteries with yearly revenue above that sum	186
Small Monasteries	52
Friaries—Augustinians	32
„ Carmelites	52
„ Dominicans	58
„ Franciscans[1]	65
Total	819

In Italy a great suppression of religious houses and ecclesiastical foundations, commenced by the Sardinian Government in 1855, has seriously changed the moral aspect of the country. Between 1855 and 1873 there were suppressed 3037 houses for men and 1027 for women, and small pensions were granted to a large proportion of their inmates, amounting to nearly 54,000 persons. Up to the end of 1877, Church and monastic lands representing a capital value of nearly 34,000,000*l.* had been confiscated by the state, which, to disarm local opposition, grants to the communes in which any such property was situated a certain proportion of the proceeds of its sale. The establishments spared for the present are compelled to submit to the forced sale of all their immovable property, the purchase money being entered by the Government to their credit in the Italian *rentes*. ("Encyc. Brit." *Italy*, 1881.)

The *Culturkampf* in Germany, commenced very soon after the Franco-German war (1870-1), employed the suppression of religious societies as one of its most effectual weapons. The Jesuits, and many other orders and congregations, were at that time expelled from all the territories of Prussia.

In France, a law passed during the Revolution (February 1790) enacted the suppression of all orders and regular congregations in which solemn vows were taken, and prohibited their re-establishment. This law had been long in abeyance, and a system of authorization had been followed, under which religious societies which laid their rules, statutes, and financial affairs open to the inspection of the Ministry of the Interior, were permitted to exist. Besides these authorized congregations, a large number of non-authorized societies, which for various reasons preferred a hazardous independence to the irksomeness of governmental supervision, had come into being; in 1877 there were five hundred such societies, comprising nearly 22,000 religious of both sexes. But the majority of the congregations of women were authorized. On March 29, 1880, the Government of M. Freycinet, a Protestant, issued two decrees, of which one ordered the absolute and irrevocable suppression of the Society of Jesus in every part of France; the other required that all other non-authorized corporations should within three months apply for authorization to the Government, supplying at the same time full and minute information as to all their concerns, internal and external. It was well understood that in the case of many societies the authorization, had it been applied for, would have been refused. In fact, it was in very few instances applied for, and when the prescribed period had passed by, the Government resorted to the various executive means at its disposal for suspending the common life of the non-authorized societies, causing closed doors to be broken open, seizing on property, and forcibly dispersing the religious. Some years later, however, though the decrees had not been withdrawn, the various religious orders found their way back and resumed their labours. But in 1905 a fresh persecution broke out, and the same harsh measures have been resorted to as before. [See FRANCE, CHURCH OF, p. 362.]

Ecclesiastical suppressions have been made for various reasons: either for the promotion of learning and education, or in the interest of discipline, or for the removal of presumed abuses and evils. Thus a monastery was suppressed by Bishop Alcock (1497) in order that he might transfer its revenues to his new foundation of Jesus College at Cambridge, and two others were closed at the request of the Countess Margaret, mother of Henry VII., and her executors (1505-1508), to aid in the foundation of Christ's and St. John's Colleges at the same university. Another suppression was allowed in favour of Bishop Smith (1515), when he was founding Brasenose College, Oxford. A measure of the same kind, but on a much larger scale, was permitted by the Holy See to Cardinal Wolsey, who (1524) suppressed twenty-five small priories, and applied their revenues to Christ Church at Oxford and the college at Ipswich which he was then founding. In 1528, experience having shown that when the number of monks in any house was very small, the rule was seldom properly observed, Clement VII. granted a bull to the Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio, authorizing them to suppress houses having less than twelve monks, and transfer their revenues to the larger monasteries. (Taunton, "Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer," p. 68 *sqq.*)

A suppression far more comprehensive was effected in France a few years before

[1] There were also forty-eight suppressed houses of the Knights Hospitallers.

the Revolution through the agency of the "Commission on the Regulars," a board composed of bishops and high officials, appointed by the Crown in 1766 to inquire into the state of the religious orders. The result of their operations, which do not appear to have had at any time the sanction of the Pope, was, that all houses containing fewer than fifteen religious were closed, that monks were forbidden to take vows before the age of 21, and nuns before that of 18, and that nearly 1500 monasteries were suppressed.

(Tanner, "Notitia Monastica"; Hélyot [ed. Migne], vol. iv. See especially, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," by Cardinal Gasquet.)

SUPRALAPSARIANS. [See INFRALAPSARIANS; CALVINISM.]

SURPLICE. A garment of white linen worn over the cassock in choir and in the administration of the sacraments. It is among the most familiar, and at the same time is one of the most modern of Church vestments.

The word *superpellicium* means a dress worn over a garment of skins. Such dresses of fur (*pelliciae*) came into use among monks early in the ninth century, probably to protect them from the cold and damp during the long offices in church. The great Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817 (can. 22) ordered each monk to have two dresses of fur(*pelliciae*). Over these *peicialle* a linen garment, the *superpellicium* or surplice, was worn in choir. It is uncertain when this last custom began. The surplice is mentioned in 1050 by the Council of Coyaca, and Durandus in 1286 speaks of its use as already ancient, but by no means universal. The Spanish synod just mentioned (can. 3) requires it to be worn under the amice, alb, and the rest of the Mass vestments, and this usage is still recognized in the rubrics of the Roman Missal ("Ritus Servand." i. 2). In the twelfth century it reached to the ankles, and so the Council of Basle in the fifteenth century requires canons in choir to wear surplices "ultra medias tibias." Cardinal Bona, more than 200 years ago, speaks of surplices being already shorter than the rule of Basle required, but the pictures in Roman Pontificals of the last century show that the present form of the Italian surplice or cotta is very recent. To this day the length varies much in our English churches, but it never reaches below the knees, while in the new Italian fashion adopted by many of the English clergy the surplice does not reach nearly so far. It was not till the seventeenth century that surplices were commonly adorned with lace. (Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii. p. 174 *seq.*; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 135 *sqq.*; see also ROCHET and COTTA.)

SUSPENSION. A censure by which a cleric is forbidden to exercise his orders or his clerical office, or to administer and enjoy the fruits of his benefice. It does not, like deposition, deprive a cleric of his benefice, or make him incapable of lawfully exercising his office without formal rehabilitation; much less does it, like degradation, deprive him of his status as a clergyman. Partial suspension inhibits a man from the use of his orders, of his office—*i.e.* from exercise of orders and jurisdiction, or, again, from the enjoyment and administration of his benefice. It may prohibit from all exercise of orders or jurisdiction, or only from certain acts of order and jurisdiction—*e.g.* a bishop may be suspended from ordaining, singing Mass pontifically, &c., and yet be perfectly free to say Mass, govern his diocese, &c. Entire suspension prohibits all use of order, jurisdiction, or benefice. Suspension may be perpetual—*i.e.* without any fixed limit, or for a [redacted] time. If inflicted for a time, it ceases [redacted] when the time is over. Perpetual suspension for a fault altogether past is removed by the dispensation of the prelate who inflicted it, his superior, successor, or delegate. If inflicted as a censure[1] it may be removed by absolution given solemnly according to a form prescribed in the Rituale, if the suspension is public; or privately by absolution in a general form, if the suspension is secret. The power of absolution is sometimes held by every priest empowered to hear confessions, sometimes reserved to the bishop, sometimes to the Pope. According to the Bull "Apostolicae Sedis," October 12, 1869, a number of suspensions are incurred *ipso facto*, absolution being reserved to the Pope. They all depend upon the giving, receiving, or exercising orders or jurisdiction. (See Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." vii. p. 215 *sqq.* and 294 *sqq.*) Of course, provincial and diocesan statutes may inflict suspension to be incurred *ipso facto*, and prelates are empowered to visit the offences of clerks subject to them with suspension (xxv. De Ref. c. 14).

In the earliest times clerics were often punished, not by simple suspension, but by temporary deprivation of communion (Canon Apost. 45, Illiber. 21, Epaon. 3.) But as early as 314 (Concil. Neocaesaren. c. 1) we have an instance of suspension perpetual and from all functions (ὅλως λειτουργεῖν), and so frequently in the following centuries (Agde, c. 43, in Trullo, c. 26). In the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage (c. 68), where a bishop who breaks the law is forbidden to ordain, we have an instance of partial suspension, and in another early council an instance of suspension from Mass (3 Aurel. [Orleans] c. 7). Often clerics suspended from order and office retained their stipend (3 Concil. Aurel. A.D. 538, c. 19), while in other cases they

[1] *I.e.* not merely as punishment, but for the amendment of the offender. The common definition, to which we have adhered, treats suspension as a species of censure, but this is not always the case.

were suspended from their stipend (Concil. Narbonn. A.D. 589, c. 11 and 13). (Ferraris; Taunton; on the decrees of the councils mentioned consult Hefele-Leclercq.)

SYLLABUS. On Dec. 8, 1864, two important documents were issued at Rome—the one, an encyclical letter of Pius IX., beginning with the words *Quanta cura*, the other a "Syllabus containing the chief errors of our times which are censured in the consistorial allocutions, in the encyclicals, and in other Apostolical letters of our most holy Lord, Pius IX." In forwarding these documents to the bishops of the world, Cardinal Antonelli, the papal secretary of state, wrote as follows:—"Our Holy Father, Pius IX., being deeply anxious for the salvation of souls and for sound doctrine, has never ceased, from the beginning of his pontificate, to proscribe and condemn the chief errors and false doctrines ... chiefly of this most unhappy age, by public encyclicals and consistorial allocutions and other Apostolical letters. But as it may come to pass that all the pontifical acts do not reach each one of the Ordinaries, therefore the same sovereign Pontiff has willed that a Syllabus of the said errors should be compiled to be sent to all the bishops of the Catholic world, in order that those bishops may have before their eyes all the errors and pernicious doctrines which have been reprobated and condemned by him. He has accordingly charged me to take care that this Syllabus when printed should be sent to your [Eminence] on this occasion and at this time when the same Pontiff, from his great solicitude for the security and welfare of the Catholic Church and the whole flock divinely entrusted to him, has thought fit to write another encyclical to all the Catholic bishops. Performing, therefore, as is my duty, with all suitable zeal and submission, the commands of the said Pontiff, I send your [Eminence] the said Syllabus annexed to this letter."

The Syllabus, then, is a digest or table of the errors condemned on various occasions by Pius IX., drawn up and circulated by his orders. It contains eighty propositions arranged under ten heads. After each proposition there is a reference to the allocution or letter in which false doctrine is condemned. Thus proposition 14 "Philosophy should be treated without any regard for supernatural Revelation," is followed by a reference to the letter addressed to the Archbishop of Munich on the occasion of the congress held in that city. If the Syllabus is compared with these documents it will be found that, as a rule, the latter speak in the concrete and the former in the abstract; or, to speak logically, where the Pope enunciates a particular affirmative, the Syllabus condemns the contradictory, viz. the universal negative. Again, it will be found that some of the propositions, *e.g.* the 24th, are taken from certain books. Hence, according to the rules of interpretation, such propositions must be understood in the sense of their authors. These considerations must be borne in mind, otherwise the propositions will seem to have a wider extent than was intended in their condemnation.

While all Catholics are at one concerning the doctrinal authority of the documents from which the Syllabus is drawn, there has been much discussion as to the authority of the Syllabus *itself*. W. G. Ward held that it was "quite certainly issued *ex cathedra*," by reason of the "solidarity of Encyclical and Syllabus." He quotes the authority of the eminent Jesuit theologian Schrader. On the other hand, Bishop Fessler, secretary general of the Vatican Council, writing in 1871 ("True and False Infallibility"), says that many theologians think it may be assumed as doubtful whether the Syllabus was issued *ex cathedra*, and accordingly whether any additional obligation of assent to its teaching was imposed by the Vatican Council—until some fresh declaration is made by the Holy See. This work was warmly approved by Pius IX. Cardinal Newman accepted this view in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, &c., since republished in "Difficulties of Anglicans" (vol. ii., 1885). Some writers, while admitting that the *ex cathedra* character of the Syllabus was originally doubtful, hold that these doubts have been set at rest by subsequent declarations of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. (See "Acta SS. D.N. Pii PP. IX. ex quibus excerptus est Syllabus editus die viii. Decembris MDCCCLXIV.," Romae, 1865; Mgr. Dupanloup, "La Convention du 15 Septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 Décembre"—for which the author was thanked by Pius IX.; W. G. Ward, "Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority," p. 472 *seq.*)

SYLLABUS OF PIUS X., "LAMENTABILI," July 3, 1907. [See MODERNISM.]

SYLVESTRINES. A religious congregation following mainly the Benedictine rule, but adding many austerities beyond that rule and especially laying stress upon the observance of poverty. They were founded by St. Sylvester in 1231, and were approved by Innocent IV. Their habit is blue, and in form similar to that of the Cassinese Benedictines. They have never possessed many houses. Since 1855 they have had a flourishing mission in Ceylon, the head of which is the Abbey of St. Anthony at Kandy.

A convent of Sylvestrine nuns was founded during the lifetime of St. Sylvester at Serra San Quirico. At the present time there is only one convent, that at Perugia. (See Heimbucher, "Orden und Kongregationen"; Hélyot; Webster in "Cath. Enc.")

SYMBOLISM. 1. That an outward expression, or thing, or action may have an inward meaning is a familiar fact which is the basis of all simile and metaphor. Thus, the representation of a lion brings to our mind not

only the king of beasts, but the qualities of strength and courage. In the domain of religion, in which there is much which, by reason of its spiritual character, cannot be directly represented, the use of material outward signs to convey inward spiritual meanings is a necessity. The subject is too large to be treated here. We can only speak briefly of Christian symbolism. Over and above the natural tendency to speak and act "symbolically," there were special circumstances in the early history of Christianity which contributed to make the use of symbols general. Persecution drove the faithful to conduct their worship underground, and even there to make use of language outwardly indifferent but inwardly conveying meanings known only to the initiated, and also pictorial representations apparently of ordinary subjects, but bringing to the minds of the faithful the sacred mysteries of their religion. Thus, a picture of fish and bread was to the eyes of a pagan a perfectly natural decoration for a funeral chamber; but to the faithful it brought to mind the miraculous feeding of the multitude (Jn. vi.) and the Eucharistic Banquet. Even pagan mythology was used for this purpose. The figure of Orpheus with his lyre and charmed animals is sometimes found in the Catacombs. To the faithful this figure represented Christ, the true Orpheus, taming and subduing mankind by His doctrine and example. In this way the early Christians were edified, while the suspicions of the pagans were not aroused. In the course of time the necessity for this "economy" passed away, but the practice had become so interwoven with religious worship that it was continued and even extended. There grew up a tendency to read into ordinary utilitarian actions inward meanings which originally had nothing to do with them. To take one example. It has been proved to demonstration that the vestments now worn by the priest at Mass were originally the dress ordinarily worn by lay persons. [See VESTMENTS.] The mediaeval liturgists read all sorts of mystical meanings into the use of them. Thus, the chasuble denoted charity, because (in those days) it covered the whole of the person (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 8); the girdle, continence and self-restraint (cf. Lk. xii. 35; Eph. vi. 14). On the other hand, there have been writers in our own day who have tried to explain all liturgical practices on utilitarian grounds. Thus the gradual extinction of the candles at Tenebrae [see HOLY WEEK] is said to be due to the fact that the service took place in the very early morning, and consequently less artificial light was required as the dawn advanced.

Closely connected with this subject is the allegorical or mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture, for which the Alexandrian school was famous [see MYSTICAL SENSE OF SCRIPTURE]. (Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; Barnes, "The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments," p. 81 *sqq.*; Jenner, "Christian Symbolism"; for mediaeval Symbolism, Durandus, "Rationale Divinorum Officiorum"; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 701.)

2. The word Symbol is also used for Creed (*q.v.*). Möhler's great work on "Symbolism" takes it in this sense. "By Symbolism we understand the scientific exposition of the doctrinal differences among the various religious parties opposed to each other, in consequence of the ecclesiastical revolution of the sixteenth century, as these doctrinal differences are evidenced by the public confessions (creeds) or symbolical books of the parties" (i. 1).

SYNAXIS. [See LITURGIES.]

SYNCELLUS (a hybrid word, *σύν, cella*; one occupying the same cell). The thing signified by the term—namely, that a priest or deacon should live continually with a bishop, "propter testimonium ecclesiasticum"—was of very early institution; the "Liber Pontificalis" traces it to Pope Lucius, in the second century. The word (see Ducange) appears not to be traceable beyond the eighth century. Leo III., writing to Cenwulf of Mercia, speaks of Augustine (of Canterbury) having been the *syncellus* of Gregory the Great. *Concellus or concellita* would have been the natural Latin expression; and the latter term is actually used by Sidonius Apollinaris with reference to a monk of Lerins. The word *syncellus* must have been coined in the East; whence, probably not before the eighth century, it found its way into the Western Church. In the Eastern Church the *syncelli* were the chaplains and the confidential ministers of the metropolitans and patriarchs. At Constantinople they formed a corporation; and their chief, the *protosyncellus*, became in process of time a personage of so much importance as to take rank on public occasions next after the patriarch. Cedrenus (about 1050) says that before his time the *protosyncellus* had commonly succeeded to the patriarchal throne on its becoming vacant. (Morone, "Dizion. Eccl."; Smith and Cheetham, art. by Venables.)

SYNDIC (Gr. *σύνδικος*). In classical Greek the word was used in three senses: (1) an advocate, especially for the defendant; (2) a public orator; (3) a judge.[1] The term came into regular use in Italy during the Middle Ages; the municipal magistrates of cities were called syndics (*sindaci*). Louis of Bavaria was crowned at Rome (1328) by the four syndics of the city; again, in 1347, an official so entitled, chosen by the people for the purpose, knighted and crowned Rienzi the Tribune. At the present day it means an agent of a particular kind—"one chosen

[1] Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon*.

to take charge of the affairs of a community, of which he himself is a member." A proctor (*procurator*) may be agent either for a community or an individual; the term "syndic" is confined to agents representing communities (Morone).

SYNOD. [See COUNCIL.]

SYNOD, HOLY. [See GREEK CHURCH and RUSSIAN CHURCH.]

SYNODAL EXAMINERS. A committee of learned ecclesiastics, appointed in the diocesan synod,[1] numbering not less than six, and (as a rule) not more than twenty members, whose duty it is to ascertain and test the qualifications of candidates for benefices or other Church preferment. They hold office only from one diocesan synod to another. If the committee be reduced below six in the interval between two synods, the bishop makes provisional appointments so as to complete the prescribed number. In countries where diocesan synods cannot be held, as in North Germany, the Holy See authorizes the bishops to appoint synodal examiners with the consent of the chapters. (Ferraris, "Examinatores Synodales"; Taunton.)

SYNODALS. A small payment in the nature of a "cathedraticum" (*q.v.*), due from the incumbents of benefices to the bishop. The word occurs in the preface to the Anglican prayer-book. The name seems to have originated in the practice of making this payment on the occasions when the clergy met the bishop in synod. (Hook's "Church Dictionary.")

SYNOPTISTS. The name for the first three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. They are so called because their Gospels—differently from that of St. John—give a common outline or synopsis of our Lord's life and teaching. The "Synoptic problem"—that is, the relation between the first three Gospels, their resemblances and differences and dependences — does not fall within the scope of the present work. (See Huck, "Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien"; Camerlynck and Coppiers, "Evangeliorum secundum Matthaeum, Marcum, et Lucam Synopsis juxta Vulgatam Editionem"; Wright, "A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek"; Pasquier, "La Solution du Problème Synoptique.")

SYNTAGMA CANONUM. Besides the collection called the "Nomocanon" (see that article), Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, made, in 833, a second collection of canons, which he designated as above. It contains the canons of the first seven General Councils, and of two councils held at Constantinople by Photius himself; also a series of extracts from the Fathers, and a few civil laws.

SYRIAN CATHOLICS. The name "Syrian Catholic" would naturally apply to all those who use a Syriac liturgy, and to whom Syriac, therefore, is the sacred language. Such are the Chaldeans, or converts from Nestorianism; the Maronites, originally Monothelites; and, finally, the converts from the Jacobite or Monophysite Church in Syria. But in the recognized language of the Church the name of Syrian Catholics is given to the last body, and to no other. These Syrian Christians are subject to the Pope, and of course hold the Catholic faith, but they keep the ancient Syriac rites, which are common to the Jacobites and themselves. [See LITURGIES.]

A congregation of Jacobite Christians had been reconciled to the Church in 1546,[1] and in 1781, on the death of George III., the Jacobite Patriarch, Ignatius [2] Michael Giarve, Bishop of the Syrian Catholics at Aleppo, went, with the approval of Propaganda, to Mardin, the seat of the Jacobite Patriarch, and persuaded the Jacobite clergy of inferior rank, many laymen, four bishops, and the Archbishop of Jerusalem to seek union with the Catholic Church. Ignatius was himself chosen Patriarch by the bishops, and, after being enthroned, he and his electors begged the pallium from the Pope. He nominated the Latin Bishop of Babylon his Procurator at Rome. Meantime, the rest of the Jacobites had chosen another Patriarch. Ignatius, whose election had been confirmed by the Pope in 1783, was driven from Mardin and took refuge at Kesrevân, in the Lebanon, where he founded the monastery of Sajideh el Sharfèh (Sta Maria Liberatrix), which Pius VI. took under his protection in 1787. He died in 1800, was succeeded by Ignatius Michael Daher (resigned 1810); by Simon (resigned 1818); by Ignatius Peter Giarve, elected 1820, but not confirmed, on account of the strife which had broken out, till 1828. Progress was made owing to the conversion of the Jacobite Archbishop of Jerusalem, Gregory Hyza, and his vicar-general, Ignatius Antony Samhiri, in 1827. In 1830 a firman of the Turkish Government recognized the Catholic Patriarch, Ignatius Peter Giarve, as independent of the Jacobites. In 1854 Pius IX. preconized Ignatius Antony Sanctiri [3] as Patriarch of the Syrians, and ruled that he should reside at Mardin. The Syrian Patriarch Ignatius Philip Harcus (d. 1874) was present at the Vatican Council. The Patriarch is chosen by the bishops. He is enthroned during Mass, receives the pastoral staff, takes the oath of obedience to the Pope, and makes the profession of faith prescribed for the Orientals by Urban VIII. in 1642. He sends these formulae, subscribed and sealed, to Rome, and deputes a priest or monk to beg the pallium. He has jurisdiction over all Catholics of his rite in Syria,

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. xxiv. c. 18, De Ref.

[1] So Silbernagl, p. 309. Herzenröther (p. 5) says the Capuchins converted Achigian, Jacobite bishop of Aleppo, in 1650.

[2] So Silbernagl. Herzenröther (*loc. cit.*) calls him "Dionysius Michael Giarve."

[3] So Silbernagl. Herzenröther (p. 1010) writes the name "Samhiri."

Mesopotamia, and Egypt. He is himself immediately subject to Propaganda, and to the Vicar-Apostolic of Aleppo, as Apostolic Delegate. He is entitled Patriarch of Antioch.

The diocese of Aleppo is governed immediately by the Patriarch, who is also administrator of the diocese of Jerusalem. There are besides the archbishoprics of Bagdad, Damascus, Emessa and the dioceses of Beyrout, Diarbekir and Mardin, Gezireh, and Mosul. The Syrians have two monasteries on the Lebanon, that of El-Sharfèh, already mentioned, that of St. Ephrem, and a third, that of Mar-Behnâm, north-east of Nimrud. They are not, however, monasteries in the strict sense, but only houses for communities of unmarried secular priests. The first two serve as clerical seminaries.

(From Silbernagl, "Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämmtlicher Kirchen des Orients," 1865, with a few additions from Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," 1880, vol. ii. p. 639 *seq.*, 1010 *seq.*; "Missiones Catholicae" for 1901; Streit, "Atlas Hierat." 1914.)

T

TABERNACLE. [See RESERVATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.]

TABORITES. [See BOHEMIAN BRETHREN.]

TAMETSI. The opening words of the decree of the Council of Trent making clandestine marriages invalid (sess. xxiv. c. 1, *De Reformatione Matrimonii*). [See IMPEDIMENTS OF MARRIAGE, p. 445.]

TANTUM ERGO. [See *Pange Lingua*, under HYMNS.]

TE DEUM. A hymn in the form of a psalm, recited at the end of Matins on all feasts except Innocents' Day, and on all Sundays except during penitential seasons.

1. *Its Author and Date.*—According to the legend, given in the so-called Chronicle of Dacius, it was sung in alternate verses by Ambrose and Augustine after the baptism of the latter. Dacius, bishop of Milan, died about 555, but the Chronicle which bears his name is now known to be a late and worthless forgery, which, in important particulars, contradicts the confessions of St. Augustine himself. As late as 1695 the story was defended by an Augustinian hermit, Eustachius a S. Ubaldo, but everyone, say the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose (PL. xvi. 1410), "not utterly ignorant" (*non plane rudis*) treats it as a fable.

The rule of St. Benedict (cap. 14) orders it to be sung after the twelfth responsory; this and the rule of Tiridius, a disciple of Caesarius of Arles, being, according to Menard ("Annot. in S. Gregor. Sacram." p. 586), the earliest documents which mention it. Gavantus ("Thesaur." tom. ii. § v. xix.) found it attributed, in an ancient MS. Breviary, to St. Abundius; Ussher (see Bingham, "Antiq." xiv. ii. § 9), to Nicetius, bishop of Trèves (d. *circ.* 535). Abbo, an author of the sixth century, attributed it to St. Hilary of Poitiers. The fact is, the author is absolutely unknown, but the form "suscepturus hominem," or, rather, "suscepisti hominem," as the older texts have it, points to an early date, for this expression fell out of use after the rise of Nestorianism. Daniel, in his dissertation on the "Te Deum" (in vol. ii. of his "Thesaur. Hymnolog."), seems to have established the fact that the psalm is based on a Greek hymn, the text of which he gives from an Alexandrian MS. The Latin is an expansion of the Greek, and the very different forms in which the "Te Deum" occurs show that the hymn gradually assumed its present fixed form.

2. *Use as a Hymn of Thanksgiving.*—The "Gloria in Excelsis" used to be sung, just as the "Te Deum" is now (Chrysost. "In Cap. i. Coloss." hom. iii., PG, lxii. 321; Greg. Turon. "De Gloria Mart." i. 63; Anastas. in "In Vita Leon. III." vol. ii. p. 1215, in Migne's reprint). It was the "Te Deum," however, which was sung at the coronation of Charles the Bald, and even earlier, under Pepin, at the translation of the body of St. Germanus, bishop of Paris, if we may believe the author of the narrative in Surius (see Menard, *loc. cit.* p. 585).

3. *Use in the Office.*—This in the Roman Church came later than its use on festal occasions. When Amalarius went to Rome in 831 he found it was not sung there except "in natalicis Pontificum" (Amalar. "De Ord. Antiphon." *ad init.* p. 1246 in Migne). On the other hand, the Benedictines in the eleventh century were reproached with singing it even in Lent and Advent. (See Henry in "Cath. Enc.," who says: "In 1894 Dom Morin put forward Nicetas of Remesiana for the honour of authorship. His suggestion has been adopted by Zahn, Kattenbusch, Kirsch (in Germany); Frere, Burn (in England), while the Anglican bishop of Salisbury (Wordsworth) considers Morin's conjecture very plausible; and in France by Batiffol; Julian, "Dict. of Hymnology"; Burn, "Nicetas of Remesiana, his Life and Works.")

TEMPERANCE. The last of the cardinal virtues (see that article). In a wide sense it is equivalent to restraint or moderation; but it is commonly used for moderation in certain strong appetites which are concerned with the preservation of the individual or of the race, such as eating, drinking, and genera-

tion. These desires are lawful in themselves, but on account of their vehemence they lead to excess, and so become sinful unless they are kept within bounds. Modesty, chastity, sobriety, and similar virtues come under the head of temperance. (See St. Thomas, $2^a 2^{ae}$, qq. 141–170.)

Among us the word temperance is still further restricted to mean moderation in the use of intoxicants, and sometimes, but incorrectly, it is taken to mean total abstinence from these. The Catholic Church teaches that the use of wine is in itself perfectly lawful (see Ecclus. xxxi. 32 *seq.*; Jn. ii. 1 *seq.*; 1 Tim. v. 23). The opposite opinion was part of the Manichaean heresy (see Epiph. "Haeres." 45 et 47, PG, xli. 832, 850). [See ABSTINENCE.] At the same time, the Church holds that drunkenness is a mortal sin. Hence, all her children are bound at least to be temperate. Total abstinence is necessary to some, but only of counsel to others. Those who cannot be moderate or who know that drink, even in moderation, is a dangerous occasion of sin to them, are bound to abstain altogether. Generally speaking, we should insist more upon the advantages of abstinence than upon the obligation of it. Thus, we may abstain either to mortify ourselves, or to satisfy God for our sins, or for the benefit of our health, or for the sake of example, or to save money for our family or for charitable uses. The labours of Father Mathew and Cardinal Manning in the cause of total abstinence are well known. Leo XIII., writing to Bishop Ireland (March 27, 1887), said: "We esteem worthy of commendation the noble resolve of our pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain altogether from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is a fitting and truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil [intemperance]; and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon appetite, by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example. But greatest of all in this matter should be the zeal of priests, who, as they are called to instruct the people in the word of life and to mould them to Christian morality, should also, and above all, walk before them in the practice of virtue. Let pastors, therefore, do their best to drive the plague of intemperance from the fold of Christ by assiduous preaching and exhortation, and to shine before all as models of abstinence, and so the many calamities with which this vice threatens both Church and State may, by their strenuous endeavours, be averted." It is noteworthy that the Church has not legislated on the subject. For a long time, however, total abstinence prevailed in the monasteries of Ireland. St. Gilbert of Sempringham, the only founder of a religious order in England [see SEMPRINGHAM, ORDER OF], forbade the use, or the making, of strong drink in his houses. [See LEAGUE OF THE CROSS.] (St. Thom. $2^a 2^{ae}$, qq. 149, 150; "Discipline of Drink," by Father Bridgett. On recent temperance movements in the different countries see Liese, Joseph Keating, and Shanley "Cath. Enc.")

TEMPLARS. This military order was founded early in the twelfth century, soon after the establishment of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, by nine French knights, among whom the leading spirit seems to have been Hugo de Payens. High self-denying fervour and undoubting faith dictated the enterprise, of which the object was to levy a permanent militia, sworn to do battle for the defence and extension of that small area of Christian light and truth pent in on all sides by dark deserts of Mahometan misbelief. On the whole, the Temple—at any rate till within a short time before its dissolution—remained true to the purpose of its institution. Aspirants for knighthood joined it in great numbers; solemn forms of initiation were devised; like a religious order, it was organized into provinces, each containing so many *preceptories* and *commanderies*. The knights took the three vows of religion; wealth poured in upon them, was even thrust upon them, but it aggrandized the order, not the individual. In little more than a century the nine knights had grown into a trained army of fifteen thousand warriors. That fervour declined, that contact with Oriental manners sometimes corrupted, that the respect in which they were held engendered pride, and overflowing wealth sometimes brought luxury along with it—all this is true; but to admit it is but to say that the Templars, like other men, felt the pressure of circumstances and were subject to human frailty; it is no proof that their institute was either a mistake or a mischief. While the Christian kingdom endured, the Templars fought strenuously for its preservation; but the unfortunate rivalry between them and the Knights of St. John [HOSPITALLERS] robbed the military efforts of both orders of much of their efficacy. After the loss of Jerusalem (1187) the vassal Christian principalities carried on the struggle, with ever dwindling fortune, for a century longer; and in this struggle the swords of the Templars, though with far too little amenability to any higher control or general plan of operations, were ever wielded with distinguished bravery. At the closing scene of Christian power in Palestine—the fall of Acre in 1291—the forces of the besieged were commanded by the Master of the Temple, who was killed while fighting valiantly. The order then established itself in Cyprus, where the descendants of Guy de Lusignan still reigned, in the hope that time would

bring some opening whereby they might regain their footing in the Holy Land. But years wore on and nothing was done. The Hospitallers, who had been driven out of Palestine at the same time as the Templars, still had work cut out for them; wherever they were they could tend the sick; and their well-considered project of attacking Rhodes (in which the Templars refused to share) proved to Christendom that the Knights of St. John had no intention of abandoning the conflict with Islam which they had been waging for two hundred years. The Templars, on the other hand, took up no definite enterprise; they were so rich that they could afford to wait, and so powerful that they dreaded no attack. At once the question arose, What was the use of the Templars? Why should not the order dissolve itself, now that the cause of which they were champions had failed, and that which they had undertaken to defend was lost beyond recovery? In Spain and Portugal only did the order continue to be popular because the knights flung themselves earnestly into the national contest against the Moors. Philip the Fair, irritated at the state and splendour which the Templars observed, and coveting their wealth, laid a deep plot for their destruction. An apostate Italian Templar and a French heretic, his accomplice, informed the king that they could make fearful revelations. Charges were formulated (1307), at the head of which was that of formally denying Christ and spitting on the cross at the time of initiation into the order. They were also accused of sorcery, of idolatry, of foul and unnatural lusts, of causing parts of the Canon of the Mass to be omitted in their churches, of betraying the Christian cause in the East, &c. The King caused all the Templars throughout France to be suddenly arrested on the same day and thrown into prison. Upon their answers to the charges made against them—their denials, admissions, re-denials, and prevarications—volumes have been written, but no solid result has been obtained. Nor can it ever be, since whatever confessions individual Templars made were extorted by torture (which was applied all through this trial with horrible frequency and severity), and were invariably retracted when the victims found themselves out of the King's power. The Pope, Clement V., interfered so far as he dared, but too weakly and irresolutely to save them. Great numbers of the French knights died under the torture or from the effects of long imprisonment; about a hundred were burnt at the stake, on the ground that having retracted their confessions they should be dealt with as relapsed heretics. The Grand Master, Du Molay, after being long kept in prison and driven by torture to admit the truth of some of the charges, finally (in March 1313) retracted those admissions and was burnt at the stake. The order was dissolved in France, and all its wealth seized by the King. In England (1310) Edward II., at the request of the Pope, had caused all the Templars in the kingdom to be imprisoned, but their trial was conducted with less inhumanity, and though condemned, it was upon evidence so flimsy that in the present day a man could not be convicted on it of the most trifling offence. In Spain and Portugal the knights were put on their trial on the same charges, but honourably and enthusiastically acquitted. In Germany also they were acquitted. The Council of Vienne (1311) decreed the entire dissolution of the order.

(The chief works on the history of the Templars are by G. Dupuy, Jos. von Hammer, Havemann, Michelet (in his "Hist. of France"), Raynouard, and Wilke; Fincke, "Papstthum und Untergang des Tempelordens"; Moeller in "Cath. Enc.," who sums up the question thus: "Without taking any side in this discussion, which is not yet exhausted, we may observe that the latest documents brought to light, particularly those which Fincke extracted from the archives of the Kingdom of Aragon, tell more and more strongly in favour of the order.")

TEMPORAL POWER. [See STATES OF THE CHURCH.]

TEMPTATION. [See CONCUPISCENCE.]

TEMPUS CLAUSUM. [See LOW SUNDAY, and IMPEDIMENT OF MARRIAGES.]

TENEBRAE. [See HOLY WEEK.]

TERCE, TIERCE. [See BREVIARY.]

TERTIARIES. The status of a tertiary, that is "a member of the third order," was originated by St. Francis of Assisi. After he had founded his own order, and after the order of Minorite nuns [POOR CLARES], living under a rule prescribed by him, had been founded by St. Clare, he instituted (1221) a third order, as a sort of middle term between the world and the cloister. The members, men and women, were bound by rule to dress more soberly, fast more strictly, pray more regularly, hear Mass more frequently, and practise works of mercy more systematically than ordinary persons living in the world. He called them Brothers and Sisters of Penance. They had to undergo a year's novitiate, and to take a simple vow to observe the rule. They were also to abstain from dances and theatrical entertainments, to eschew all quarrelling and contention, not to take up arms except in defence of the Church or their native land, and to take no unnecessary oaths. An immense number of persons, anxious to sanctify their life in the world, joined the order; among these in the thirteenth century were St. Louis of France and St. Elizabeth of Hungary. Many tertiaries in course of time, as circum-

stances permitted, desired to take solemn vows and live in community, while still conforming to the rule of the Third Order. Thus arose various congregations of tertiary monks and nuns—in Lombardy, Sicily, Dalmatia, France, Spain, and Portugal. One of these congregations alone, the Sisters of St. Elizabeth, reckoned in the middle of the sixteenth century 135 convents and nearly 4000 members. The regular tertiaries were in some cases invested by the Holy See with independent jurisdiction; more commonly they were under the government of the Observant or Conventual Franciscans. The double aspect of the Third Order was noticed by Benedict XIII. in the bull "Paternae sedis," where he speaks of it as "a true and proper order, uniting in one seculars scattered all over the world and regulars living in community"; adding that it is to be distinguished from all confraternities as having its own rule, approved by the Holy See, novitiate, profession, and a habit of determinate form and material. St. Elzear and his wife, St. Delphina, St. Roch, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Bridgit of Sweden, St. Rose of Viterbo, and Anne of Austria were all members of the Third Order of St. Francis. In a rescript of the year 1883 Leo XIII. recommended this order to the careful attention of the faithful in every part of Christendom, as one most suitable to be embraced by seculars who sincerely desire to live nearer to God.

The Dominicans also had their Third Order, founded by St. Dominic himself, in what year is uncertain. These Penitents bound themselves to labour for the recovery and preservation of Church property. The glorious St. Catherine of Siena was for the greater part of her life a member of the Third Order of St. Dominic; St. Rose of Lima also belonged to it. The Augustinian Hermits established a Third Order at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The example was followed by the Minims (1501), the Servites, the Carmelites, and the Trappists, and later by other orders.

TESTAMENT. [See BIBLE, &c.]

TESTAMENT. [See WILL.]

TEUTONIC KNIGHTS. [See MISSIONS, *Thirteenth Century.*]

THEANDRIC ACTIONS. [See MONOTHELITES, p. 600.]

THEATINES. This congregation of "Regular Clerks," the first that had been so designated, derived its name from Theate, or Chieti, of which John Peter Carafa, one of its founders, was bishop. The idea of its institution arose in the mind of St. Cajetan, a native of Vicenza, who, having made his legal studies with great distinction at Padua, was appointed protonotary apostolic in the Roman Curia. He became a fervent member of the Confraternity of the Divine Love; and thirsting more and more for the salvation of souls, he resigned his office and took Holy Orders. Family affairs caused him to return to Vicenza, whence he proceeded to Venice, and laboured there for a considerable time. On the advice of his confessor he again fixed his abode at Rome. The reform of the lives of Christians, and especially of the irregularities too common at that time among the clergy, presented itself to him as the object to which God willed him to devote his life. Meeting with Bishop Carafa, who at the time was thinking of renouncing his preferments and joining the order of Camaldoli, St. Cajetan persuaded him to take part in the holy enterprise which he had matured. Two other men of piety and experience, Paul Consiglieri and Boniface de Colle, joined them; and these four, renouncing whatever benefices they had, founded the Theatine Congregation in 1524. It was approved by Clement VII. the same year, in a brief which permitted them to take the three ordinary vows, elect a superior, receive new members, and frame statutes, imparting to them at the same time the privileges of the canons of St. John Lateran. They embraced a more than Franciscan poverty, for they bound themselves not only to have no property or rents, but to abstain from asking for alms, being persuaded that the providence of God and the unsolicited charity of the faithful would sufficiently supply their wants. Carafa was elected the first superior; at the end of three years he was succeeded by St. Cajetan. By degrees the value of their services was recognized and their numbers increased. St. Cajetan died in 1547; Carafa, having been elevated to the cardinalate in 1536, was elected Pope in 1555, and took the title of Paul IV. The congregation received many favours and made signal progress during his pontificate. Besides numerous houses in Italy, they established themselves in Spain, Poland, Bavaria, and at Paris. St. Andrew Avellino, Goldwell, the last Catholic bishop of St. Asaph, the learned Cardinal Thomassi, and Father Ventura belonged to this congregation, which at the present day appears not to be found out of Italy, except at Durango, in Colorado, U.S.A. In 1909 Pius X. decreed the union of the ancient Congregation of the Regular Theatine Clergy with the youthful Spanish Congregation of the Holy Family at Barcelona. The Theatine nuns were founded by the B. Ursula Benincasa, who, having been suspected of being a visionary and a deluded *extatica*, was declared by St. Philip Neri to be a soul truly enlightened by God; she died in 1618. (Hélyot; Heimbucher, "Die Orden und Kongregationen"; Pastor, "Hist. of the Popes," tr. viii–xii.)

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA. [See NESTORIANISM; EPHESUS; and THREE CHAPTERS.]

THEODORET. [See EPHESUS; CHALCEDON; and THREE CHAPTERS.]

THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES. Faith, Hope, and Charity are called the theological virtues, because they relate immediately to God. The moral or cardinal virtues (see that article) are concerned with our duties, and so relate to Him indirectly; but the theological virtues have Him for their immediate object —it is God in Whom we believe and hope and Whom we love. These virtues are supernatural because they are beyond the reach of man's natural powers, and because they enable him to attain a supernatural end. [See FAITH, HOPE, CHARITY; St. Thomas, 1ª 2æ, q. 62, for the theological virtues generally.]

THEOLOGUS, THEOLOGAL. [See CANON THEOLOGIAN.]

THEOLOGY. [See DOGMATIC, MORAL, MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.]

THEOPASCHITE. [See TRISAGION, p. 830, and MONOPHYSITE.]

THEOPHANY. [See TRINITY, B.]

THEOTOCOS. [See MARY, p. 559.]

THERAPEUTAE. [See ASCETAE.]

THERESIANS. Discalced Carmelites of both sexes, living under the reformation of St. Theresa. [See CARMELITES.]

THIRD ORDERS. [See TERTIARIES.]

THOMAS, ST., CHRISTIANS OF. A name given to Christians on the Malabar Coast, who were once all Nestorians, then all, nominally at least, Catholics, at present partly Catholic, partly Jacobite or Monophysite. The name is supposed to come from St. Thomas the Apostle, who, according to their legendary account, led them to Christian belief; others explain it as referring to a Thomas of Cananes,[1] who is said to have come to the Malabar Coast with authority from Eustathius of Antioch. Assemani, however ("Bibliothec. Orient." tom. iii. p. 2, p. 443), puts this latter Thomas four-and-a-half centuries after Eustathius. Be their origin as it may, the Christians of Malabar (Μαλὲ, ἔνθα τὸ πέπερι γίνεται) are mentioned by Cosmas Indicopleustes ("Topograph. Christ." iii. p. 169; xi. p. 45, ed. Migne), and at that time—viz. A.D. 522—they were in communion with the Nestorian patriarch, for Cosmas says they had a bishop ordained in Persia. Our Alfred is believed to have sent the Bishop Swithelm of Sherborne on an embassy to the shrine of St. Thomas in India (Turner's "Anglo-Saxons," vol. ii. p. 145 *seq.*). Marco Polo in the thirteenth century speaks of them, and Vasco da Gama in 1498, or at all events on his second arrival in 1502, found them numbering 200,000 souls (Howard). They were Nestorians, using the Syriac language and the three Nestorian liturgies, with a fourth, that of Diodorus (Howard). The Portuguese endeavoured by very cruel means to unite them to the Church, and did produce an external submission. In 1529 Menezes, archbishop of Goa, summoned them to a synod at Diamper, a few miles S.E. of Cochin. They were allowed to retain their chief Syriac liturgy, that of SS. Adeus and Maris, but striking alterations were made after the Roman pattern—*e.g.* the elevation of the Host was introduced, and the epiclesis common to all Eastern liturgies was placed before the words of institution. At this council Papal supremacy was solemnly accepted, all allegiance to the Nestorian patriarch renounced, and Nestorius anathematised.

The episcopal see was moved from Angalamalé to Cranganore, on the coast, so as to make it more accessible to the Portuguese. Menezes ordered their books to be burnt or in certain cases expurgated, and he did his work so thoroughly that no one has succeeded in finding a copy of their liturgy as it was before the Roman alterations. Four Portuguese or Spanish bishops in succession were set over them, the first of them being Francis Roz, a Jesuit.

These poor people cared very little about Nestorius, whom they had not seen, but they hated the Portuguese, whom they had. No sooner did the Portuguese settlements pass into the hands of the Dutch, who expelled the Jesuits, than about half the Malabar churches ceased to be Catholic. At this time, in 1655, after fruitless endeavours to get a bishop from Cairo, they succeeded in obtaining a visit from the Jacobite[1] Gregory of Jerusalem, who consecrated a native metropolitan. They adopted the Syriac liturgy of St. James from the Monophysites. To judge from a very interesting tract by Philipos, a schismatic chorepiscopus of Malabar, translated and published in 1869 by his friend the Rev. G. B. Howard, they have adopted the Monophysite tenets, the opposite extreme from their old error, in good earnest. In many ways, however, the tract of this chorepiscopus witnesses to Catholic doctrine. Its statements on the sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, obligatory confession, Extreme Unction, prayer to the saints and for the dead, are entirely Catholic. The schismatics refused in 1806 to enter into communion with the Church of England on account of the uncertainty of Anglican ordinations (Howard, p. 157). The metropolitan has civil as well as ecclesiastical authority. He elects and consecrates his coadjutor and successor. The clergy are married; they say Matins and Vespers daily in the church, but are free to follow secular trades.

Soon after the Indian hierarchy was established by Leo XIII., two vicariates were

[1] So Howard. Assemani calls him Cana.

[1] Mr. Howard is at a loss to know the authority for the statement that a Jacobite bishop went to India in 696. The authority is Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarch. Alex.* The whole matter is discussed by Assemani, *Bibliothec.* iv P. 2, p. 451 *seq.*, who argues that Ethiopia, not India in our sense, is meant.

founded for the Christians of St. Thomas, each of which was made subject to a bishop of the Latin rite, whose vicar-general, however, should belong to the Syro-Malabar rite (1887). In 1896 this arrangement came to an end, and four Syriac vicariates were established, viz. Trichur, Ernakulam, Kottayam, and Changanacherry. The number of the united Christians is at present about 450,000, with 470 priests,and 360 churches and chapels. They use the Syriac liturgy. (Assemani, "Bibliothec. Orient." iv. P. 2; Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients"; the Rev. G. B. Howard (an Anglican clergyman), "The Christians of St. Thomas and their Liturgies," 1864; "The Syrian Christians of Malabar," by Edavalikel Philipos, edited by G. B. Howard, 1869; "Missiones Catholicae," 1901; "Christianity in Travancore," by G. T. Mackenzie, 1901; Streit, "Atlas-Hierarch." 1914; Fortescue, "Lesser Eastern Churches," p. 353 *sqq.*; Medlycott in "Cath. Enc.")

THOMISM. [See DOGMATIC THEOLOGY; also SCOTISTS.]

THREE CHAPTERS. The condemnation of the Three Chapters[1] means the condemnation of (1) Theodore of Mopsuestia, his person, and his writings; (2) of Theodoret's writings against Cyril and the Ephesine Council; (3) of a letter from Ibas to Maris the Persian, also against Cyril and the Council. Theodore anticipated the heresy of Nestorius. Ibas and Theodoret were indeed restored at Chalcedon, but only after they had given orthodox explanations and shown that they were free from Nestorianism. Hence, it was quite possible to condemn the Nestorian or semi-Nestorian error of the "Three Chapters" without falling into the opposite error of Eutychianism and rejecting the definitions of Chalcedon. The Emperor Justinian was led, chiefly by Theodore Ascidas, archbishop of Caesarea, and by Theodora his empress, to believe that the condemnation of the Three Chapters would serve to reconcile the Monophysites in Egypt, and strengthen the unity of the Eastern Empire. In fact, the Severian Monophysites had raised objections to the Council of Chalcedon on the ground that there Ibas and Theodoret had been declared orthodox. (Mansi, viii. 829.) Accordingly, in 544 an edict of Justinian condemned the Three Chapters, and at the same time maintained with Pope Leo the orthodox doctrine that there are two natures in Christ. This edict was accepted by the four Eastern Patriarchs, but opposed in Africa, where Facundus of Hermiane led the opposition, in Illyria, Dalmatia, and by Pope Vigilius, who was summoned that same year to Constantinople.

[1] Properly speaking, the κεφάλαια are the propositions containing the condemnations, not the condemned matter. But in later imperial edicts, the Acts of the Fifth Council, and Papal letters, the term always has the meaning given in the text. Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 1 *sqq.*

There the Pope changed his mind, and in his "Judicatum" of 548 anathematized the Three Chapters (Mansi, ix. 181).[1] This "Judicatum" excited great opposition in the West, particularly in Africa, where Pope Vigilius was excommunicated in a Council of Carthage, A.D. 550 (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 37). Besides Facundus, the Africans Fulgentius, Ferrandus, and the deacon Liberatus ("Breviar. causae Nestor. et Eutych.") wrote in defence of the three chapters. That same year Vigilius withdrew his "Judicatum" (Mansi, ix. 153), and agreed to let the matter rest till a council could meet. But, probably in 551, Justinian, without waiting for the council, published another edict against the chapters (ὁμολογία κατὰ τῶν τριῶν κεφαλαίων, Mansi, ix. 537–582), and the Pope, who would not approve it, was subjected to cruel outrage, and at last fled to the Church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. In the negotiations between Pope and Emperor, the former gave and then withdrew his consent to the meeting of a council from which the Africans were to be excluded. The council (see CONSTANTINOPLE) met in 553, and to it, on May 14, 553, Vigilius sent his "Constitutum," in which he censured sixty propositions of Theodore, but strictly forbade any personal condemnation of him, or any censure of the writings of Ibas and Theodoret (Mansi, ix. 61–106). The council did precisely what the Pope had forbidden, and on December 8, 553, the latter declared in a letter to Eutychius of Constantinople that "Christ had removed the darkness from his mind," that "it was no shame to admit and retract error" after the example of St. Augustine, and accordingly he condemned the Three Chapters, just as the council had done (Mansi, ix. 413–20). He repeated the same decision in his second "Constitutum" of February 23, 554, which ends with an anathema of the Three Chapters and those who defend them (Mansi, 457–488). Vigilius died on his way home at Syracuse in 554 or January 555. His successor, Pelagius I., also approved the acts of the Fifth Council, which, however, was bitterly opposed in Asia, North Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Britain. The Africans, except a few who were exiled or imprisoned, gave way in 559. Milan was in formal schism till the publication of the "Henoticon" (*q.v.*) by Justin II. in 571. It was in Istria that the schism was most obstinate. In 607 the Bishop of Aquileia-Grado and those of his suffragans who were in the imperial territory were reunited to the Church. On the other hand, those suffragan bishops who were subject to the Lombard king or to the Duke of Friuli set up a schismatical patriarchate at Old Aquileia. Soon after the Popes granted the title of Patriarch to the Bishop of Aquileia-Grado. The schism continued till

[1] Only fragments of this document remain in their authenticity. See Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 26.

the Council of Aquileia in 700. After the union the two Bishops of Aquileia and Aquileia-Grado were both allowed to retain the title of Patriarch. The Patriarchate of Grado was transferred to Venice in 1451, and still continues. The Patriarchs of Old Aquileia, after its destruction, transferred their see to Udine, and the title was abolished by Benedict XIV. in 1751 at the request of Austria (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. p. 923).

(Chiefly from Hefele-Leclercq, iii. The Ballerini, "De Primat." cap. xv. § x. 38, argue that Vigilius did not issue contradictory definitions on the faith, but simply changed his mind on a matter of expediency, and this of course is the only theory consistent with the definitions of the Vatican Council, and the only one admissible. Bossuet ("Def. Cler. Gall." P. iii. lib. vii. cap. xx.), though he urges the history of Vigilius as an argument against Papal infallibility, still allows that the Pope and his opponents "de summa fidei facile consentiebant"; adding, however, "omnino ad fidei causam quaestio pertinebat." The attempt of Vincenzi ("Vigil. Orig. Justin. Triumph. in Syn. V.," Romae, 1865) to deny the most patent facts and treat some of the chief documents as forgeries is unworthy of serious notice. The conduct of Vigilius is defended by Palmieri, "De Romano Pontifice," 650 *sqq.*)

THURIBLE (*θυμιατήριον, thimiamaterium, thuribulum*) must be as old as the use of incense in the Church [see that article], and Anastatius in his Life of Sylvester (n. 36) says Constantine presented two thuribles of pure gold, weighing thirty pounds, to the Lateran Church, besides one of gold set with gems for the baptistery. Evagrius ("H. E." vi. 21) mentions a thurible sent by Chosroes to the shrine of St. Sergius. But thuribles in their present form—*i.e.* with chains attached—do not occur, according to Martigny ("Dict. des Antiq. Chrét." art. *Encensoir*), before the twelfth century.

Our word "boat" for the vessel in which the incense is carried answers to the Low Latin *navicula*, which had the same meaning (Ducange, *sub voc.*), and to the French *navette*; Ital. *navicella*.

TIARA. A cylindrical head-dress pointed at the top and surrounded with three crowns, which the Pope wears as a symbol of sovereignty. The word (*τιάρα*) occurs in the classics to denote the Persian head-dress, particularly that of the "great king." In the Vulgate it is a synonym of *cidaris* and *mitra*, and is used for the turban of the high priest (מִצְנֶפֶת, Exod. xxviii. 4), or of the common priest (מִגְבָּעָה, *ib.* 40). Till late in the Middle Ages tiara was a synonym of *mitra*, a bishop's mitre, *regnum* being the word for crown (Ducange, *sub voc.*).

The whole history of the Papal Tiara is uncertain. Nicholas I. (858–867) is said to have been the first to unite the princely crown with the mitre, though the Bollandists think this was done before his time (Bollandists, "Thesaur." vol. ii. p. 323, quoted by Hefele). But Braun ("Die Liturgische Gewandung," 499) shows that the passage in the biography of the Pope refers to the decoration of the city and not to his coronation (Duchesne, "Lib. Pont." ii. 152). He adds: "Probably the papal head-covering received the circlet at the time when the mitre developed from the tiara, perhaps in the tenth century, in order to distinguish the mitre and tiara from each other. In any case the latter was provided with a circlet by about 1130. The first proven appearance of the word tiara as the designation of the papal head-covering is in the life of Paschal II. (1099–1118), in the "Liber Pontificalis." The second crown was added by Boniface VIII. (1294–1303), as is proved by statues made during his lifetime. The reason for this addition is quite in keeping with the views of this pontiff on the two-fold authority of the Holy See. [See UNAM SANCTAM, BULL.] The third crown appears for the first time on the monument of Benedict XII., fragments of which may be seen in the museum at Avignon. Since then the tiara with three crowns has been the rule, though there have been exceptions. The earliest name of the tiara, *camelaucum* (*καμελαύκιον* or *καμηλαύκιον*, made of camel's hair), points to a Byzantine origin. The tiara is placed on the Pope's head at his coronation by the second cardinal deacon in the loggia of St. Peter's, with the words "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ." [1] At ceremonies of a purely spiritual character the Pope wears the mitre, not the tiara. (Hefele, "Beiträge," vol. ii. p. 236 *seq.*; Ducange; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 498 *sqq.*; Cabrol in DACL, *Camelaucum.*)

TIERCE. [See BREVIARY.]

TITHES. Tithes are commonly defined as "the tenth part of all fruits and profits justly acquired, owed to God in recognition of His supreme dominion over man, and to be paid to the ministers of the Church" (Ferraris). They were paid by Abram (Gen. xiv.), vowed by Jacob (Gen. xxviii.), and regulated by the Mosaic law (Exod. xxii.; Lev. xxvii.; Num. xviii.). In the early Christian ages the free-will offerings of the faithful supplied what was necessary both for the divine worship and the support of the clergy; but as the conversion of the Western nations proceeded a more permanent provision was seen to be necessary. In a canon of

[1] This formula is not found in the old Roman Ordo, nor in the copy of the Caerimoniale Romanum (cf. Catalani, Comment. in Caerem. Rom. i. 119). So Thalhofer in "Kirchenlex." *Krönung.*

the Second Council of Mâcon (585) occurs the first express mention of the Christian obligation of paying tithes.[1] They began to be generally rendered in the eighth century, not earlier. In 855, Ethelwulf, king of Wessex, father of Alfred, "assigned the tenth part of his land all over his kingdom for the love of God and his own everlasting weal."[2] The tithe of the produce, not the tenth part of the land itself, is certainly here intended. Many authors, both Catholic and Protestant, have imagined that the proportion itself of 1 in 10 was fixed by a Divine precept for ever as that part of our substance which God requires to be devoted to Him; and mystical reasons have been invented to account for this. This belief is now less commonly held. Cardinal Soglia speaks of the tithe as "a certain part, not the tenth part; for it is sometimes greater, sometimes smaller, according to the custom of different places."[3]

Tithes are of two kinds, predial and personal. Predial are those receivable in respect of the annual crops, corn, wine, oil, fruit, &c., and of the increase of cattle, including milk and cheese. These last are called by some "mixed" tithes, but the distinction appears to be unnecessary. Great tithes are of corn, wine, and oil; small tithes, of vegetables and fruits. Personal tithes are receivable in respect of the profits of trade and industry. Property acquired on the title of gift, bequest, or inheritance is not itself tithable; but its annual increase, so far as it is produced by nature or human industry, is so.

Tithes were originally paid to the bishops, but with the erection of separate benefices the right to them passed to the parish priests, in whom it is now vested by the common law of the Church. Predial tithes are due to the parish in which the farm lies, or in which the animals are ordinarily fed; personal, to that in which the tithe-payer is bound to receive sacraments.

Exemption from tithe may be obtained by Papal privilege, by prescription, by custom, or by convention. The Popes in former times often granted the tithes of certain places or districts to princes or nobles who had rendered eminent services to the Church, and allowed them to transmit the same to their successors. Bishops used to grant tithes to laymen for similar reasons; but this was restrained by the Third Council of Lateran (1179), which ordered that no alienation of tithe be made by a bishop without the consent of the Pope. Prescription can only confer exemption, as against a parish church, if it be proved to have existed forty years, and to rest on some title, or if—without a title—it can be shown to be immemorial. Against other churches (monasteries, chapters, &c.) a shorter prescription is sufficient. [PRESCRIPTION.] Custom differs from prescription in that it regards places or countries, while prescription affects persons. By custom, "personal and mixed tithes have almost everywhere become obsolete, and praedial also, in many places, especially where competent revenues of a different kind have been assigned to the parish churches." On the other hand, "the law of tithes can never be abrogated by prescription or custom if the minister of the church have no suitable and sufficient provision from other sources; because then the natural and Divine law,[1] which can neither be abrogated nor antiquated, commands that the tithe be paid."[2] (Spelman, "Of Tythes," Eng. Works, 1723; Ferraris, *Decimae*; Soglia, "Inst. Can.")

TITLE TO ORDERS. According to the ancient law, no secular cleric could be admitted to Holy Orders except *titulo beneficii*; that is, he was required to show that he had been nominated to a benefice (of which he would have undisputed possession) sufficient for his decent maintenance (Conc. Tr. xxi. De Ref. c. 2). The same decree of the Council of Trent which lays down this general principle names two other titles to ordination as exceptionally admissible—that which consists in the possession of sufficient private property (*titulus patrimonii*), and that which depends on a guarantee to the ordinand by some solvent person or persons of an annual sum sufficient to maintain him, in the event of the failure or withdrawal of ecclesiastical resources (*titulus pensionis*). A fourth title to orders (*titulus paupertatis*) was, and is, the poverty professed by those who have taken solemn vows in any religious order; since this poverty (as was shown in the article PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS), while it debars the professed from possessing any private income, guarantees to him a maintenance for life on the part of the religious house or order of which he is a member. Benefices having now ceased to exist over a large part of Europe, one of the other titles noticed by the Council is now, under the name of *titulus mensae*, generally required in German countries. The *titulus mensae* is the legal undertaking of a third person to provide for the sufficient maintenance of a clerk in major orders, in case of, and during, his incapacity to discharge his functions.

Again, the pupils of certain seminaries—*e.g.* the College of Propaganda at Rome—and candidates for holy orders in countries where the Catholic Church is circumstanced as in Great Britain and Ireland, may be ordained *titulo seminarii*, or *missionis*, now denominated *titulus servitii Ecclesiae*. The acceptance of this last-named title imposes on the bishop the responsibility of providing for the support of the ordinand if he shall become

[1] Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xxxiv.
[2] *Sax. Chron.* [3] *Inst. Can.* vol. ii. 8.

[1] Namely, that "they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. ix. 14.)
[2] Soglia, vol. ii. 12.

incapable of discharging his functions, whether it be without fault (*emeritus*) or through his own fault (*demeritus*). (Ferraris, *Titulus*, § 31; Taunton; "Kirchenlex.")

TITULAR BISHOP. [See BISHOP IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM.]

TITULAR OF CHURCH. [See PATRON AND TITULAR.]

TITULI. A name given to the parish churches of Rome, as distinct on the one hand from the patriarchal churches, such as St. John Lateran, St. Peter's, St. Mary Major, St. Laurence in Agro Verano, St. Paul's, which belonged especially to the Pope, and on the other from the Diaconia and Oratories. Each titular church was under a cardinal presbyter, had a district attached to it, and a font for baptism in case of necessity. A Roman synod under Pope Symmachus, in 499, enumerates thirty tituli served by sixty-six priests. (Mabillon, "Comm. in Ord. Rom." c. 3.)

Baronius (An. 112, n. 5) supposes the name to be derived from the sign of the cross, which "title" marked them as belonging to Christ. Bingham ("Antiq." vii. 1, 10), with far greater probability, explains the name from the fact that these churches gave a "title of cure or denomination" to the presbyters who were set over them.

TONSURE. The shaving of the crown in a circle, which is a distinguishing mark of clerics. Among some of the monastic orders and friars the tonsure leaves only a circle of hair round the head; the tonsure of secular clerks, on the other hand, is small. The first tonsure is made by the bishop, in a form prescribed by the Pontifical, and the person receiving it is thereby admitted to the state and privileges of a cleric. [See CLERGY, CLERICAL STATE.] The bishop may confer it at any place or time. Mitred abbots may give it to their own subjects, cardinal priests to the clergy of their titles, and it may also be conferred by other priests with special privileges.

The clerical tonsure, it is scarcely necessary to say, was unknown in the first ages of the Church. Christians were simply expected to avoid vanity in dressing their hair (Tertull. "De Cult. Fem." ii., PL, i. 1322), or at most to keep it short ("Const. Apost." i. 3). Ascetics and clergymen were thus naturally led to make a point of cutting their hair close. Jerome ("In Ezech." xliv.) deprecates eccentricity in this respect, and expresses his dislike both of long hair and shaven heads. The so-called Fourth Council of Carthage (c. 44) simply forbids clerics to wear long hair: "nec comam nutriat, nec barbam."

We have, however, clear proof that the clerical tonsure was familiar at least in Gaul during the latter part of the fifth and in the sixth century. For Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. iv. Ep. 13) says the bishop Germanicus had his hair cut "in the shape of a wheel" ("in rotae speciem"), and St. Gregory of Tours ("Vit. Patr." 17) relates that Nicetius was miraculously designated from birth for the clerical state, being born with a fringe of hair like a "corona clerici."

The Fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633, c. 41) requires all clerics to shave their heads, leaving only a rim of hair behind, and reprobates the fashion of making only a small tonsure, prevalent among heretics.

Writers of the seventh and eighth centuries distinguish three kinds of tonsure: (1) The Roman tonsure, known as St. Peter's, which consisted in shaving the whole head, leaving only a circle of hair. It prevailed in France and Spain (*vide supra*) and in Rome (Joann. Diac. "Vit. Greg. Magn." iv. 83). It was only late in the Middle Ages that this tonsure was lessened, and the present distinction between the tonsure of clerics and of monks or friars arose. Chardon shows that the large clerical tonsure continued, at least in some places, down even to the fifteenth century. But as early as 1240 a synod of Worcester (Wilkins, "Concil." tom. i. p. 670) refers to a difference of size in tonsures, the tonsure being increased in size with each step in the sacred ministry.

(2) The tonsure of St. Paul, usual among the Easterns, was entire. When the Greek Theodore came to the see of Canterbury in 668, he had to wait four months and let his hair grow that he might receive the Roman tonsure.

(3) The Celtic tonsure, called St. John's, and by its Anglo-Saxon enemies that of Simon Magus, consisted in shaving the head in front of a line drawn from ear to ear. It was adopted by the British and Irish churches and the disciples of St. Columbanus on the Continent. No question on the comparative merits of the Roman and Celtic tonsures was raised by St. Augustine either at the Oak or at Bangor; but the matter became the subject of violent controversy in the seventh and eighth centuries—*e.g.* at the Council of Whitby, A.D. 663. (Bede, "H. Angl." iii. 25, 26.)

Even after the tonsure was introduced it was never given separately, but always with the order of reader. Nobody could belong to the clerical state without at least a minor order, and children dedicated to God were not simply tonsured, but made readers, since nothing short of ordination to some grade of the ecclesiastical ministry placed a person in the clerical state. (Isidore, "Ecclesiast. Off." ii. 1.) Then, from the seventh century, according to Chardon, children were tonsured without ordination; and in an ancient Ordo Romanus there is an office "ad puerum tonsurandum"; and lastly, very much later, adults anxious to be free from the secular courts, &c., were tonsured without any ordination. This last custom was of course an abuse.

It was only gradually that the right to tonsure was limited to bishops, abbots, &c. Till the tenth century it was given by simple priests, or even by laymen, to each other. (Mabillon, "Annal. Benedict." Praef. ad Sacc. iii. Chiefly from Chardon, 755 *sqq.*; Taunton.)

TRACT. Verses of Scripture said after the Gradual (not "a form which the Gradual assumes," as Hammond supposes, "Ancient Liturgies," p. 385), instead of the Alleluia in all Masses from Septuagesima till Holy Saturday. Le Brun ("Explic. de la Messe," tom. i. p. 205) says the name means something sung *tractim—i.e.* without break or interruption of other voices, as in responsories and antiphons—by the cantor alone, and that the theory of Durandus—viz. that the tract is something sung *tractim, i.e.* in a slow or sad voice—arose by mistake in the tenth century. (Fortescue, "The Mass," 271-2.)

TRADITION (*παράδοσις*) means properly the act of handing down, and thus the doctrine so handed down. In its widest sense it includes all truths or supposed truths handed down from one generation to another; and in all societies which have no literature tradition is, with all its manifold imperfections, the great bond between the present and the past, and one of the great distinguishing marks between man and the brutes, which latter have no tradition, and therefore no history. Among the Hebrews, as among all other nations, tradition was the only history till an historical literature arose, but among the later Jews the word assumed another and a much more restricted sense. The early Hebrew tradition arose naturally before there was any written law or history; the later Jewish tradition interpreted the written law and added to it.[1] To a certain extent such a tradition arose of necessity, for the Pentateuch is a "Corpus Juris," and no system of law can remain absolutely unchanged. Additions and alterations are inevitable, as the conditions of society change in the course of ages, and the Rabbinical traditions were as defensible as the "fictions" of the Roman lawyers. The danger, however, lay in this, that the law of Moses determined the relation of man to God, the relation of love and kindness between man and man, and in such a sphere the legal spirit is sure to be dangerous, and even pernicious. Hence the charge which Christ makes against the Pharisees, "Ye have made void the law of God by your tradition" (Mt. xv. 6). They used the same "fictions" which lawyers employ to preserve the letter of a law which can no longer be really observed, in treating of God's eternal law. Again, just as a human legislator rightly and necessarily contents himself with regulating the external actions of man, so the Jewish Scribes were apt to make much of outward things, little comparatively of justice and mercy and truth. But we do not mean to discuss the merits and demerits or the unhistorical[1] character of Jewish tradition here. We will only add that Josephus uses the same word, *παράδοσις*, which was adopted in the N.T. and in ecclesiastical writers. The Pharisees, he says ("Antiq." xiii. 10, 6), imposed many "enactments" (*νόμιμα*) on the people, not to be found in the written law; the Sadducees, on the other hand, rejected the "tradition of the Fathers" (*τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως πατέρων*). Jewish tradition in the strict sense never invaded the Church. In the Judaizing homilies which go under the name of Clement a false tradition is exalted at the expense of the Scriptural text, which is said to have been corrupted by irreligious interpretations (C. Hom. ii. 38-39, PG, ii. 104 *sqq.*). But this, of course, is quite opposed to the Rabbinical idea of tradition. In the Clementine Recognitions, on the other hand, tradition is only put forward as determining the sense of Scripture ("Recog." i. 21, cf. ii. 45), a notion which is neither Rabbinical nor heretical, but Catholic.

This brings us naturally to speak of tradition in the Church. So far from setting tradition, as such, aside, Christ left His Church with no written books, and with nothing but tradition to guide it. St. Paul insists on the necessity of holding to the Christian tradition (1 Cor. xi. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15). Even when the Scriptures of the N.T. were written, tradition did not fall out of sight, for the early Christians were well aware that it was tradition which settled the canon of Scripture, and they were not unreasonable enough to reject tradition for Scripture, since the authority of Scripture itself was based on tradition. They knew very well that many barbarous nations furnished converts to the faith although they had no translations of the Bible as yet in their own languages, and could not therefore learn the truth from it. They were convinced, moreover, that though human tradition is in its own nature shifting and uncertain, the Holy Spirit preserved the tradition of truth in the Church. Add to all this the obscurity of Scripture, the fact that it is a collection of books which never professes to contain the sum of Christian truth, and the appeal of the Fathers to tradition becomes quite intelligible. Hence Heresippus (*apud* Euseb. "H.E." iii. 32) appeals to the "wholesome canon of saving preaching"; Irenaeus and Clement of

[1] The Halakah is legal (from הָלַךְ, to go); the Haggadah (from הִגִּיד, to relate) legendary; the Kabbala (from קִבֵּל to receive) mystical; the Massora (from מָסַר, to deliver) is textual tradition. The last of these has a very real value.

[1] The common account is given in *Pirke Avoth, ad init.* "Moses received the law [*i.e.* the secret and oral law, the תּוֹרָה שֶׁבְּעַל־פֶּה. See Buxtorf, *Lex. sub voc.* מָסַר], from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the great synagogue."

Alexandria to the "canon of the truth" ("Adv. Haer." i. 9, 4, ii. 27, 1, PG, vii. 549, 802; Clem. Al. "Strom." iv. 1, p. 564, ed. Potter), and the "Canon of the Church" (*ib.* i. 19, p. 375[1]). The latter will have doubtful questions decided by an appeal to the Apostolic churches, and considers that tradition would have been a sufficient guide, even if the Church had been left without any Scriptures at all (iii. 4, 1). Just in the same way Tertullian invokes the decision of the Apostolic churches ("Praescr. 17 *et passim*, PL, ii. 30, and "De Corona," 3, ib. 78), asserts the decisive authority of unwritten tradition, in favour, it is true, of matters of custom and ritual, but of custom and ritual which involved questions of doctrine, such, *e.g.*, as "oblations for the dead." Tertullian speaks for Africa and Rome, Irenaeus for Asia Minor and Gaul. Origen, the great representative of the early Alexandrian church, holds the same language. Since, he says ("De Princip." i. 2, PG, xi. 116), there are differences among Christians, "let the ecclesiastical teaching handed down by order of succession from the Apostles, and abiding till now in the churches, be observed; that only is to be believed the truth which no way differs from ecclesiastical and Apostolic tradition."

The following are some of the testimonies of later Fathers: "It is enough," says Gregory Nyssen ("Contr. Eunom." iv., PG, xlv. 653), "for the demonstration of our position to have the tradition which comes to us from the Fathers transmitted as an inheritance by succession from the Apostles through the saints that followed them." St. Basil ("De Spir. S." § 663, PG, xxxii. 188): "Of the doctrines and decrees [κηρυγμάτων = canons and decrees on discipline, &c.], we have some from written teaching; others we have received, apportioned to us from the tradition of the Apostles in a mysterious manner, both of which [*i.e.* Scripture and tradition] have the same force." St. Chrysostom ("In 2 Thess." Hom. iv. § 14, PG, lxii. 488), after saying that the Apostles did not hand down all by epistles, but much also without writing (πολλὰ καὶ ἀγράφως), adds: "The one and the other are worthy of belief, so that we consider the tradition of the Church also worthy of belief. It is a tradition: ask no more." St. Epiphanius ("Haer." lxi. 6, PG, xli. 1048): "We must also use tradition, since all cannot be got from the divine Scripture, wherefore the divine Apostles handed down some things in writings, others in tradition." So, much later, St. John of Damascus ("De Fid. Orthodox." iv. 16, PG, xciv. 1172) supports the received doctrine on images by a reference to "unwritten tradition." We have passed over one Greek Father, St. Gregory Nazianzen, because he attributes an exaggerated importance to tradition, and speaks as if the tradition of the Church had added new truths, not clearly taught even by the Apostles. The N.T., he thinks (Orat. xxxi. § 26, PG, xxxvi. 161), only hinted at (ὑπέδειξε) the divinity of the Holy Ghost: "Now the Holy Ghost dwells with us (ἐμπολιτεύεται), making the manifestation of Himself more plain." If we turn to the later Fathers of the Latin Church, we meet with the same appreciation of tradition. St. Augustine, treating of the dispute about the validity of heretical baptism ("Contr. Bapt. Donat." ii. 7, PL, xliii. 133), writes: "I believe it [*i.e.* the Roman rule of accepting such baptism as valid] comes from tradition of the Apostles, like many things which are not found in their letters, nor in earlier councils, and yet because observed by the whole Church are believed to have been handed down and commended by no others than by them" (the Apostles; see also *ib.* iv. 24, v. 23). Vincent, in his first "Commonitorium" (cap. 2), the classical work on the subject, argues for the necessity of tradition from the fact that the Bible may be understood in many different ways, although the canon of Scripture is perfect, and "in itself sufficient, and more than sufficient, for all." Here the reader may observe a difference. Other Fathers, and especially Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, look on Scripture and tradition as two co-ordinate authorities, each divine. To Vincent the authority is single, tradition not completing but merely determining the sense of Scripture. Cardinal Newman ("Via Media," i. p. 327) points out that even modern "Catholic controversialists, while insisting that they need not prove their doctrine from Scripture, always do so prove it." In other words, they would have no objection to admit that all Catholic doctrine is in some implicit way contained in Scripture, and to grant with Vincent the sufficiency of Scripture illustrated by tradition. There is, on the contrary, a radical difference between the Catholic belief on the necessity of tradition and the opinion of Protestants pure and simple that no doctrine can be an article of faith unless it can be clearly deduced without the aid of tradition from the sacred text. Of such a theory there is no trace in antiquity, except perhaps that Stephen Gobaras the Tritheist ("Phot. Bibliothec." Cod. 132) laboured to set Father against Father, apparently with the view of sapping the authority of tradition. Therefore the Council of Trent (sess. iv. De Canon. Script.), when it teaches that the truth of Christ is contained partly in the Bible, partly in unwritten tradition received by the Apostles from Christ or from the Holy Ghost, and entrusted by them

[1] Clement has also the idea of a secret and esoteric tradition, which is a very different thing, and has its true analogon in Judaism. *Strom.* vi. 7, p. 771. See also Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1.

to the Church, that Scripture and tradition (the latter of course only when proved Apostolic) are to be reverenced alike, follows the express teaching of many of the earliest and greatest Fathers, the spirit of all. The advocate of private judgment, on the other hand, is committed to the conclusion that the Church was left for a generation without any true and complete rule of faith; that when this rule was given nobody, not even the holiest and wisest, understood its purpose or use; and that when, after fifteen centuries, this use was understood, the rule intended to secure unity in faith became the most fertile source of strife and division.

In conclusion, the difficulties which arise from the statements of some Fathers who seem to make Scripture the sole guide are only apparent. St. Augustine ("De Doctr. Christ." ii. 9, PL, xxxiv. 42) no doubt allows that the things "openly stated in Scripture" contain the whole sum of faith and morals. We have seen already what St. Augustine thought of tradition, and in this place he adds, "namely, faith and hope," meaning that a Christian may find in the Bible all that he needs to know explicitly in order to be saved, a fact which is undeniable. Optatus ("Schism. Donat." v. 3, PL, xi. 1048) is contrasting Scripture, not with Apostolic, but with human tradition. St. Cyril of Jerusalem ("Cat." iv. 17, PG, xxxiii. 476) tells his catechumens that he will have them believe nothing he tells them except he can prove it out of Scripture. But (1) he refers to the articles of the Apostles' Creed, which can certainly be proved from the Bible; (2) he is contrasting Scripture, not with tradition, but with "probabilities," "ingenious arguments" (λόγων κατασκεύαις), "inventions" of his own (εὑρεσιλογίαις). (The modern dogmatic theologians, especially since the Council of Trent, have a special treatise "De Traditione" or under some similar title: *e.g.* Franzelin, "De Traditione"; Scheeben, "Theologische Erkentnisslehre"; Bainvel, "De Magisterio Vivo et Traditione." Among earlier writers: Stapleton, "De Principiis Fidei Doctrinalibus," the best refutation of the Protestant rule of faith; Bellarmine, "Controversia," i. 1, 3, and 4; Bossuet, "Défense de la Tradition.")

TRADITIONALISM. A system of philosophy in which intellectual cognition, so far as the human mind is concerned, is reduced to belief in truth communicated by a revelation from God, and received by traditional instruction through the medium of language, which was originally itself a supernatural gift. This system is also called *Fideism*, and is a reaction from the extreme of rationalism into an opposite extreme of anti-rationalism. De Bonald (†1840) is regarded as its author. In its strictest form this system reduces the intellect to a merely receptive faculty, capable of acquiring knowledge by instruction, which comes originally from God by a primitive revelation given to the first progenitors of the human race. In its modified and milder form it restricts the absolute necessity of a traditional instruction derived from revelation to metaphysical, religious, and moral truth, admitting the capacity of the human mind to discover other intellectual truths by its innate power. M. Bonnetty was the most conspicuous advocate of this modified traditionalism, which for a time obtained numerous adherents among Catholics, especially in France and Belgium. It has been partially adopted by some advocates of ontologism and combined with that philosophical theory. There are, besides, other thinkers and writers whose tendency is to minimize the rational and elevate towards the *maximum* the traditional element in the highest departments of human knowledge, but who cannot be classed as advocates of traditionalism properly so called. The best Catholic theologians and philosophers have always recognized the *moral* and practical need of revelation and traditional instruction, for the easy acquisition of complete and certain knowledge of the highest truths within the scope of the natural intelligence and rational faculty of man, by men in general. The reason of this need is accidental, extrinsic, and to be ascribed to the actual condition and environment of mankind in its present state. The specific difference which places the system of traditionalism in opposition to this common doctrine consists in this: to wit, that it makes this need to be a *physical necessity* arising from the *intrinsic essence and nature* of the human intellect. The former doctrine has been explicitly formulated and promulgated by the Council of the Vatican in the Constitution "Dei Filius," with an exclusion of the latter opinion. This is a condemnation of traditionalism proper. It had been already condemned by a decree of the Congregation of the Index bearing the date of June 11, 1855, and approved by Pius IX., which set forth four theses to be subscribed by M. Bonnetty. These theses are the contradictories of several propositions extracted from his writings. It may suffice to cite the second and third:

"II. Ratiocination can prove with certitude the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, the liberty of man. Faith is posterior to Revelation, and cannot therefore suitably be alleged for proving the existence of God against an atheist, or for proving the spirituality and liberty of the rational soul against a follower of naturalism and fatalism.

"III. The use of reason precedes Faith and conducts man to it, by the aid of Revelation and of Grace."

The judgments of the supreme authority

in the Church have been submitted to with docility by those Catholics who had adopted the theory of traditionalism, and the controversy respecting this matter has come to an end. For a very full historical and doctrinal exposition of the main points in this controversy see the works of Cardinal Dechamps, vol. vii. "Opuscules."

TRADITION OF INSTRUMENTS. [See ORDER, HOLY, p. 628.]

TRADITORES. A name given to Christians who, in the persecution of Diocletian, gave up to the officers of the law "the Holy Scriptures or the vessels of the Lord, or the names of their brethren" (Concil. 1 Arel. A.D. 314, c. 13). The first edict of Diocletian, A.D. 303, ordered the churches and the sacred books of the Christians to be burnt. Hence the surrender of sacred books (to be burnt), and of vessels (*ad fiscum*). The edict also deprived Christians of honours and civil rights, and made them, if slaves, incapable of freedom. Hence perhaps bishops, &c., were asked for the list of their flocks, though others think that the *traditio nominum* was a consequence of Diocletian's second edict, condemning all ecclesiastics to prison, and requiring them to sacrifice. The canon already quoted orders the deposition of all clerical traditores, but allowed persons ordained by traditores to remain in office. (See DONATISTS; Hefele-Leclercq, i. 289.)

TRADUCIANISM. [See SOUL.]

TRANSEPT. In architecture the part of the church which forms the short arms of the cross on which the plan is laid. It extends on the north and south side of the area between the nave and the choir.

TRANSFIGURATION, FEAST OF (ἡ ἁγία μεταμόρφωσις τοῦ K. I. X.). With the Greeks, who, like the Latins, keep it on August 6, it is one of the twelve greater feasts which come next after Easter in dignity (Daniel, "Cod. Lit." iv. p. 239). It is mentioned in the Constitution of Manuel Comnenus, and, of course in the Menologies (Thomassin, "Traité des Festes," p. 406).

In the West its institution is commonly attributed to Calixtus III. (1455–58). But Thomassin (*loc. cit.*) shows that the feast is mentioned in the Martyrology of Vandelbert (said to have lived about 850); by Ildefonsus in 845, who says it was kept the sixth day before the Calends of August, and was among the chief solemnities; and by Peter the Venerable in the Statutes of Clugny. Gregory IX. (see Bened. XIV. "De Fest.") speaks of it as celebrated on the present day—viz. August 6. Calixtus, however, promoted the observance, in order to obtain the help of God against the Turks, by granting indulgences. He also instituted an Office for the day, which was afterwards altered, in the hymns and lessons of the first two nocturns, by Pius V. (Gavant. "De Fest. Aug." § 7, 10, 6.)

TRANSLATION OF FEASTS. [See FEASTS.]

TRANSUBSTANTIATION. [See EUCHARIST, p. 323.]

TRAPPISTS. A branch of the Cistercian order; see that article. The founder, Armand Jean de Bouthillier de Rancé, born in 1626, was of a noble family. According to an abuse common in that age, the child, being destined to be a priest, was loaded by his father with preferment from his early years. Though only ten or eleven, he was commendatory abbot of La Trappe and two other abbeys, prior of two priories, and canon of Notre Dame of Paris; his ecclesiastical income was from 15,000 to 20,000 livres. He was ordained priest in 1651 by his uncle, the Archbishop of Tours, whose coadjutor he hoped one day to become. His youthful worldliness was gradually shaken by a series of striking incidents; the death of a cousin, a remarkable escape from death, a disappointment to his ambition in the assembly of the clergy, were among the occasions of his entering into himself, and recognizing the nothingness of all for which he had hitherto lived. In 1660 he resigned all his benefices except the abbacy of La Trappe; disposed of his patrimony for 300,000 livres; and gave the greater part of the money to the Hôtel Dieu, or great hospital at Paris. He then repaired to La Trappe, and told the monks that they would thenceforth have to live by the rule of what was called the "Strict Observance" of the Cistercian order. La Trappe was an ancient monastery lying in the heart of La Perche, not far from Séez, founded as a Cistercian house in 1140 by Rotrou, count of Perche. It suffered much during the long wars with England, but its discipline was still more fatally injured in later times by the system of commendation, which gave the name and emoluments of abbot to some non-resident layman or ecclesiastic. When de Rancé came there in 1662, the state of things was deplorable; the monks had ceased to live in community, and if they met at all it was for pleasure parties; the buildings were going to ruin, and persons from without were suffered to live in them. With much difficulty de Rancé succeeded in bringing from a neighbouring monastery some monks of the Strict Observance and in restoring regularity at La Trappe. Still he was not satisfied; an ideal had been for some time floating before his eyes in which were blended the union with God through contemplation and prayer, bodily mortification, and severance from causes of distraction. The final result was the discipline of La Trappe, of which we take an abridged account from Hélyot. "In summer the religious go to rest at eight, in winter at seven. They get up at two o'clock in the night to go to Matins, which usually last till half-past four, because they add the Office of the Blessed Virgin to the regular Office, and between the two make half an hour's medita-

tion. . . . After Matins, in summer time, they may go and rest in their cells till Prime; in winter they go into a common room near the stove, where each reads to himself . . . . At half-past five they say Prime, and then go to chapter," which usually takes up half-an-hour. "At seven they go to work; the cowl is put off, and the under garment tucked up; some dig, others riddle [sift], others carry stones—each according to the task assigned to him, for they are not free to choose the kind of work which they like best. The abbot himself works, and often takes up the most abject sort of employment." Their indoor employments, when the weather does not allow of outdoor labour, include carpentry, joinery, copying, binding, sweeping, and many other useful toils. "When they have worked an hour and a half they go to office; Tierce is said, followed by Mass; then Sext; after which an interval of reading in their own cells is allowed." None is said at half-past eleven; on fast days a little later. They go to the refectory, a very large room with a long row of tables on each side. The abbot's table is laid for six; guests are entertained at it if they offer themselves, but this does not often happen. There are no table-cloths, but the tables are kept very clean. Each monk has his napkin, his mug, his knife, his wooden fork and spoon, which remain always in the same place. The repast consists of coarse brown bread, some vegetable soup made without butter or oil, a mess of carrots, or lentils, two apples or pears, and a little cider. "At or about one o'clock they return to work. . . . This second period of work lasts from an hour and a half to two hours. The recall being sounded, every monk takes off his 'sabots,' puts away his tools, puts on his cowl, and goes into his cell, where he reads and meditates till Vespers, at four o'clock." At five a collation, consisting of dry bread and some fruit, with a little cider, is taken in the refectory. After collation there is a short interval in the cells; then the monks go to chapter and listen to spiritual reading till six, when Compline is said. At seven a bell rings and they go to their dormitories; they sleep on straw palliasses, and in their ordinary dress. Probably the most trying part of all the discipline is the silence, no monk being allowed to speak to his brother on any occasion. The abbot and the guest-master are the only persons in the convent who are permitted to speak to strangers.

The monks of La Trappe for the most part resisted the sophistries of Jansenism. The local authorities in 1790 petitioned that so useful a body of men might be exempted from the general suppression; and when questioned individually as to their desire to change their mode of life, out of fifty-three monks forty-two declared that they wished to live and die in the monastery, in the observance of their rule. After the suppression, an energetic monk named Dom Augustin succeeded in finding a retreat for himself and a score of his brethren in the canton Fribourg, where they occupied the deserted monastery of Val Sainte. From this centre Trappist filiations spread the austere rule of the order into Spain, Belgium, Piedmont, England, and Ireland. Mount St. Bernard in Leicestershire and the Trappistine [1] convent of Stapehill in Dorset are their houses in this country; in Ireland they have flourishing monasteries at Mount Melleray and Roscrea. They have also houses in the United States, Canada, Syria, etc. (Hélyot; "The Cistercian Order, its Object, its Rule," Cambridge, 1895; Obrecht, in "Cath. Enc.")

TREASURE OF MERITS. [See INDULGENCE, p. 451.]

TRENT, COUNCIL OF. The general councils of the fifteenth century succeeded on the whole in one of the principal objects for which they were convened, that of restoring or maintaining the unity of Christendom. At Constance the great schism was closed; at Basle the difficulty with the Hussites was arranged; at Ferrara-Florence East and West were momentarily reunited. [See CONSTANCE, BASLE, COUNCILS OF.] Hence it was natural, that when religious dissension and disturbance broke out in the sixteenth century, a general council should be confi dently looked to as the remedy. And yet, as Pallavicini remarks,[2] the remembrance that the Nicene Council did not put down Arianism, nor the Council of Chalcedon Eutychianism, with other like instances, might have served to moderate expectation and check disappointment. The great Oecumenical Council of the sixteenth century, though inferior in no respect to any, even the very greatest of its predecessors, nevertheless, far from suppressing Protestantism, ushered in a long period of strife between Catholics and the various heterodox bodies in every land—a strife of which the end appears to be still distant.

When Leo X. by the bull "Exsurge Domine" (1520) condemned the doctrine of Luther, the latter appealed from the judgment of the Pope to that of a general council. The Diet of Spires (1529) insisted on the convocation of a council, and the Recess of Augsburg (1530), while forbidding religious innovation, promised that the case of the reforming party should be laid before the Council, which the Emperor would induce the Pope to convene. With most of the Protestant leaders this appeal was merely a device of controversy. Luther wrote to Melanchthon: "We must admit the council in this sense, that our doctrine is true apart from the council, that the angels in heaven can change no part of it, and that the angel

[1] The Trappistine nuns were instituted by Dom Augustin († 1827).
[2] *Historia*, Apparatus.

who should attempt to do so ought to be put under anathema and excommunicated; much more, then, is it inadmissible that the Emperor, the bishops, or the Pope should judge of it." [1]

During the troubled pontificate of Clement VII. (1523-1534) it was impossible to hold the Council; but Paul III. (Farnese) from the time that he was elected Pope bent all his energies to this end. He issued letters to the bishops and the sovereigns in 1537, proposing Mantua as the place of meeting. Various difficulties arose, especially on the part of the Protestants; and after long negotiation it was agreed between Charles V. and the Pope that the place of meeting should be Trent, the ancient Tridentum, an imperial and episcopal city on the Adige, where Italy borders upon Germany, so that the Protestants could not say that the council, being held in an Italian city, would of necessity be unduly influenced by the Pope. The Papal legates were at Trent in 1542, but the war which had just broken out between France and the Empire rendered any large gathering of bishops impossible. The Treaty of Crespy (1544) restored peace to Europe, and the Pope immediately announced his intention of holding the Council. The Emperor gave his consent, and his brother Ferdinand, meeting the German Protestant Princes at the Diet of Worms (May 1545), endeavoured to induce them to accede to the general desire of Christendom. But they pleaded that the Pope, by whom the Council was convened, and who would preside in it through his legates, had already pronounced against them, so that they would only go to Trent to hear their own condemnation pronounced. Yet how could they expect that the Pope and the Catholics would leave the authority of the see of Peter an open question? To do so would have been tantamount to admitting that the Protestants had been justified in separating themselves from the unity of the Church. It was therefore clear from the first that no considerable body of Protestants would submit to the Council; still the Pope hoped, and with good reason, that the firmer definition of Catholic doctrine, and the reform of discipline, which might be expected from the deliberations of the synod, would strengthen the position of all the Catholic rulers of states, and help them to arrest or undo innovation wherever the mischief had not grown to an incurable height.

The first session was held on December 13, 1545. The Pope was represented by three legates, the Cardinals Del Monte (afterwards Julius III.), Cervino, and Reginald Pole. There were present four archbishops, twenty-two bishops, five generals of orders, and envoys from the Emperor and the King of the Romans. The Prince-Bishop of Trent named Count Sigismund von Arco guardian of the council; its secretary was the able Angelo Massarelli. Cardinal Del Monte, addressing the assembly, said: "Is it your will, for the praise and glory of the undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the increase and exaltation of the faith and religion of Christ, for the extirpation of heresies, the peace and union of the Church, the reformation of the Christian clergy and people, and the putting down and extinction of the enemies of the Christian name, to decree and declare that the sacred General Council of Trent begins and has begun?" The Fathers answered, "*Placet.*" The next session was fixed for January 7, 1546.

Three points of great importance were settled soon after the opening of the Council. First, that the bishops should vote, as in the ancient synods, individually, and not, as had been done at Constance, by nations. Secondly, that the work of the definition of doctrine, and that of the reformation of discipline, should be carried on simultaneously. Thirdly, that the *style* of the conciliar decree should bear the impress of the Papal authority and presidency from the outset. Several bishops desired that, as at Constance, the Council should describe itself as "representing the universal Church." To this the legates would not consent, and it was determined that the style should run thus: "The sacrosanct Synod of Trent, legitimately gathered together in the Holy Ghost, the three legates of the Apostolic See therein presiding . . . decrees," &c.

In the second session the Council regulated various matters of procedure. In the third (Feb. 4, 1546), the Fathers present expressed their adhesion to the Creed of Nicaea and Constantinople, and caused it to be recited before them. New arrivals gradually added to their numbers, and at the fourth session (April 8, 1546), the important decree on Scripture and tradition, rendered signally opportune by the irrational or fanatical opinions on the subject which the Protestant press had been pouring forth for many years, was brought forward and adopted. It declared that the truth and teaching of Christ were contained "in the written word and in unwritten traditions" (*in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus*), defined the canon of Scripture as embracing all those books, and those only, which we find in the Latin Vulgate (and the Douay Bible), and ordained that the Vulgate translation should be accepted everywhere as "authentic." In the fifth session (June 17, 1546), at which nine archbishops and fifty bishops were present, the doctrine of Original Sin was defined, an important part having been taken in the previous discussions by the Jesuits Laynez and Salmeron, who had come to the Council as papal theologians. The usual method of procedure was this: the projects of decrees

[1] Art. "Trient," by Udinck, in old edition of *Kirchenlex.*

on doctrine or discipline, proposed by the legates, were discussed point by point in private conferences of theologians and canonists, and moulded into shape; they were then laid before general congregations, in which each bishop had the right of speaking to them in his turn, and their form was finally settled; lastly, they were adopted and promulgated in public session. After a long interval, in the course of which the disturbed state of Germany nearly led to a prorogation of the Council, the celebrated decree on Justification, prepared in numberless conferences and a long series of general congregations, was adopted at the sixth session (Jan. 13, 1547). By this decree the Lutheran errors, that man is justified by faith only, and that his justice consists in the imputation to him of the merits of Christ, were solidly confuted and demolished. It is generally agreed that the records of no former general council contain a theological statement which for completeness, depth, and solidity of view, for careful and precise expression, and for general impressiveness and cogency, surpasses this Tridentine decree. Thirty-three canons, sanctioned by anathemas, were appended to it, in the twenty-third of which the Council condemns the tenet that man can avoid all, even venial, sins throughout his life, "unless by special Divine privilege, as the Church holds concerning the Blessed Virgin," thus paving the way for the definition of the absolute sinlessness of our Lady promulgated at Rome three hundred years afterwards. The decree on reform passed at this session renewed the ancient canons requiring the residence of bishops, and enacted new rules to the same end.[1]

The doctrine of Justification having been unanimously defined, the means by which the soul receives grace, or recovers it when forfeited, presented themselves for consideration. Accordingly, in the seventh session (March 3, 1547), the prevailing errors on the doctrine of the Sacraments in general were condemned in thirteen canons; fourteen others guarded and elucidated the doctrine of Baptism, three that of Confirmation. The necessity of intention on the part of the priest, at least to do what the Church does in a sacrament, was asserted in the eleventh canon, "De Sacramentis in Genere." [See SACRAMENTS.] A decree of reform in fifteen chapters was also adopted.

An epidemic now broke out at Trent; a bishop and the general of the Franciscans died of it; and the alarm was so great that ten or twelve bishops abandoned the Council and went home. The legates deemed it expedient to transfer the assembly to Bologna, and this view was adopted by the majority of the bishops; a minority, being chiefly those who were devoted to the Emperor, voted for remaining at Trent. Charles V. was strongly opposed to the removal of the Council, and regarded the alleged epidemic as a mere pretext; from that time there was no more cordiality between him and the Pope. There was much danger of a schism, for the imperial bishops would not leave Trent; but the danger was averted by the prudence of the Pope, who, though the labours in conference and congregation went steadily forward at Bologna, would allow nothing to be published while the circumstances were so critical. Sessions viii., ix., x. relate merely to this business of the translation. On September 14, 1547, in a general congregation held at Bologna, the next session, which was to have been on the following day, was postponed *sine die*. In the following May the Emperor published the Interim, *q.v.* (a system of doctrine substantially Catholic, but containing several important concessions to the Protestants), which was to be observed in all the German States until the General Council had completed its work.

Paul III. died in Nov. 1549. His successor, Julius III., lost no time in recalling the bishops to Trent, and the second period of the Council commenced with the eleventh session, held on May 1, 1551, under the presidency of the legate, Cardinal Crescenzio. The Council was formally resumed, and the next session fixed for September 1, on which day the business was further postponed to October 11, with an intimation that the Sacrament of the Eucharist would then be treated of. In session xiii. (Oct. 11, 1551), a decree on the Blessed Sacrament of the altar in eight chapters, with eleven canons appended to it, was adopted. The orthodox and primitive belief as to the nature of the gift of His Body and Blood left by Jesus Christ to His Church was re-stated, and the Council (chap. iv.) adopted the term "transubstantiation," as fitly expressing the change which takes place in the elements upon consecration. The Protestants, though their various sects propounded doctrines of every shade on the Eucharistic gift, naturally all fell short in their definitions of the stupendous reality; and this decree has consequently furnished ever since a ready touchstone to distinguish truth and error. In England, down to the date of Catholic emancipation, no one could sit in Parliament without first signing a declaration against transubstantiation.

The Council also resolved in the thirteenth session to postpone the discussion on four points of Eucharistic doctrine,[1] on which it was understood the German Protestants desired to be heard, to January 25, 1552, and meantime to publish a safe-conduct, pledging the public faith that all persons of the German

[1] Before this session it was long debated whether the residence of bishops was obligatory *jure divino* or *jure ecclesiastico*. As the obligation was the same in either case, the Pope was of opinion that the question need not be decided.

[1] Three of these related to receiving under both species, and the fourth to the communion of infants.

nation, of what status or rank soever, should be free to come to the Council, confer with the Fathers there, and leave it again, without molestation or interference of any kind.

In the fourteenth session (Nov. 25, 1551), the doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance and that of Extreme Unction were defined. A decree of reform was also passed in thirteen chapters.

By the middle of January, 1552, a considerable number of deputies from Protestant states and cities had come to Trent, and they were received by the Council in a general congregation on the 24th of January. Their demands, presented in writing, were found to be of an impracticable character. One was that their theologians should have an equal consultative and deliberative voice in the Council with the bishops; but to grant this would have been to revolutionize what had been the unbroken ecclesiastical practice from the time of the Apostles. A new safe-conduct, expressed in more ample terms, was read at the fifteenth session. But there was no other fruit of all these negotiations with the Protestants except to prove the earnest desire of the Pope and the bishops to leave the breakers of Church unity without excuse.

At the fifteenth session (January 25, 1552) the business which had been announced was postponed to March 19. But before that day Maurice of Saxony had commenced his march from Thuringia, Germany was full of confusion and alarm, and at the sixteenth session (April 28, 1552) the Fathers present adopted a decree suspending the Council for two years. In May the Emperor was nearly surprised by Maurice at Innsbruck; not long afterwards, disheartened and weary of of life, he abdicated the throne, and retired to the monastery of San Yuste. Thus ended the second period of the Council.

Paul IV. (Carafa), who sat in the chair of Peter between 1555 and 1559, took no step to reassemble the Council; but on the accession of Pius IV. (Medici) it was evident that the Church had received a ruler whose energy in her cause no difficulties could tire, no resistance overcome. He published a bull on November 29, 1560, convening "a sacred general and oecumenical council" to meet at Trent on Easter Day, 1561. It was not expressly said in the bull that this was a continuation of the former Council. That it should ultimately so be deemed was the firm resolution of the Pope, and in this he was altogether supported by Spanish opinion. But the King of France and the Emperor Ferdinand, fearing to exasperate their Protestant subjects, whose opinions had been condemned in the former sessions, were unwilling to consent to the present Council's being regarded as a continuation of the last; they wished it to appear that all debated questions were still open, and might be discussed *de novo*. Pius made two distinct efforts to interest Queen Elizabeth in the Council. Of the first we have spoken in a former article [ENGLISH CHURCH]; the second was made in 1561, when the Abbot Martinenghi was sent to Belgium, and application made on his behalf for leave to cross to England and lay before the Queen the Pope's entreaty that she would join the Council. The reply [1] to the application was an absolute refusal, based upon grounds some of which were flimsy enough, but such on the whole as the logic of the Anglican position required. The real drift of the document was that England had done with the Pope, and therefore it was useless, and might be mischievous, for her rulers to confer with his emissaries on any subject whatever. Froude thinks this attitude very grand; Catholics may allow that—assuming for a moment the Protestant contention as to the Papacy to have been true—it was consistent and sagacious. But what if England, in rejecting the Papacy, was rejecting an integral part of Christianity? In that case these proceedings were no matter of gratulation, and eventually could not but lead to evil results.

But in spite of the hostility of the English Government, England was not entirely unrepresented at the Council. At some of the earlier sessions Cardinal Pole and Pate, Bishop of Worcester, had been present; now, in 1562, Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph, proceeding to Trent after his deprivation by Elizabeth, defined with the assembled Fathers that ancient Catholic faith which his countrymen had received more than eight hundred years before. Ireland was represented by three bishops, Thomas O'Herlaghy of Ross, Eugene O'Hart of Achonry, and Donald McCongail of Raphoe. Mary of Scotland wrote a Latin letter [2] in 1563 to the "Sacrosanct Synod of Trent," in which she referred the Fathers to her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, for an explanation of her position. The Cardinal spoke on the matter at considerable length,[3] unfolding the ruinous state of religion in Scotland, and showing that the few Catholic bishops could not be spared from their task of watching over the feeble relics of Catholicity. The Council replied [4] in terms of feeling and lofty courtesy. They accepted the Queen's excuses, condoled with her on the state of her kingdom, admitted the Cardinal of Lorraine as her envoy and representative, and declared that, among the princes and rulers who in those evil times had been bold in the cause of the Church of God, "assuredly the illustrious name of Mary, Queen of Scotland, would be commended to the undying remembrance of mankind."

The Council was reopened in the seven-

[1] See it in Dodd (ed. Tierney), ii. cccxxii.
[2] Le Plat, vi. 48.
[3] See the abstract of his speech in the diary of Mendoza, a Spanish bishop (Döllinger, *Sammlung*, &c.).
[4] Le Plat, *loc. cit.*

teenth session (January 18, 1562) by the Papal legates, Cardinal Gonzaga of Mantua and four others, and immediately adjourned to February 26. On that day a decree was adopted relating to the censorship of books; a committee was appointed; ultimately the matter was referred to the Pope; and the result was seen at last in the erection of the Sacred Congregation of the Index [INDEX, &c.]. A fresh safe-conduct, addressed not to the German nation only, but to all those, whether nations or individuals, "who have not communion with us in the things which are of faith," guaranteeing their safety, and entreating them to come to Trent, was soon afterwards published.

Sessions nineteen and twenty were formal only. In the twenty-first (July 16, 1562), the four questions on Eucharistic doctrine, postponed at the thirteenth session, were dealt with. In the twenty-second (September 17, 1562) the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass was defined in nine chapters; things to be observed or avoided in the celebration of the same were noted; and the demand for the concession of the chalice to the laity (on which Ferdinand, pressed by his Bohemian and Hungarian subjects, and also the Duke of Bavaria, had much insisted) was referred to the judgment of the Pope.

Disciplinary questions of great difficulty and complexity, the satisfactory settlement of which required an active and patient interchange of views among the bishops and theologians of various countries, caused the next session to be deferred till July, 1563.[1] In the previous March the Cardinal of Mantua died, and was succeeded as legate by the able Cardinal Morone, under whose prudent management the remaining deliberations of the Council were swiftly and successfully carried through.

In January, 1563, the Anglican bishops had met in convocation at London, and adopted a code of Thirty-nine Articles to regulate the religious belief and practice of the English people. It can hardly be doubted that these articles came to the knowledge of the Fathers of Trent, and that several statements contained in them were included among the "errores nostri temporis," against which the dogmatic decree of the twenty-third session (the first held after the publication of the London symbol) was especially directed. Thus the twenty-fifth article denies "Orders" to be a "sacrament of the Gospel," and classes it among "those five commonly called sacraments," which "have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures." On the other hand, the Council defines: "If anyone shall say that Order or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord .... let him be anathema." A similar opposition of view will come under our notice in other instances.

The decree of Reformation, in eighteen chapters, adopted at the twenty-third session, contained a number of important provisions on the residence of bishops and priests, on ordinations, on the qualifications for the priesthood, and on the erection of seminaries for the training of clergy.

At the twenty-fourth session (November 11, 1563) the doctrine of Christian marriage was defined, and anathema pronounced on whoever should deny it to be truly and properly a sacrament. Here again the conciliar decree is in precise contradiction to the teaching of the Anglican bishops in their twenty-fifth article. A decree in ten chapters on the reformation of marriage was added.

In the twenty-fifth and last session (December 3 and 4, 1563) the Council adopted decrees on Purgatory, on the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of Saints and Holy Images, and on Indulgences. The Anglican twenty-second article, by a singular choice of words, describes the doctrine of the Holy See on these various and, in part, dissimilar subjects as "a fond thing vainly invented." The Council states what is necessary to be believed upon them all, neither confining the liberty of theologians by an over-preciseness of definition nor leaving any essential point obscure. In the section on Holy Images, reference is naturally made to the decrees of the Second Council of Nicaea against the Iconoclasts. A number of important regulations affecting the religious orders were embodied in the decree "De Regularibus et Monialibus" (on the regular clergy and nuns).

Since the commencement of the third period of the Council, the opposition of the Emperor and the King of France to the view that it was a continuation of the former Council had gradually become weaker, and now the fact of continuity was assumed without disguise, and agreed to by all. The Fathers, arrived at the termination of their labours, agreed to request the confirmation of the Council in all its three phases from the Supreme Pontiff. This confirmation was given on January 26, 1564. It was also determined that all the decrees of the Council which affected ecclesiastical discipline and

[1] About the time of the arrival of the Cardinal of Lorraine and the French prelates (Nov. 1562), stormy discussions took place on the jurisdiction of bishops; did it come immediately from God, or from God through the Pope? The Spanish bishops generally held the former opinion. Mendoza's speech is interesting (Döllinger, ii. 98). That episcopal *order* was *jure divino*, all, he said, were agreed; on the second point, relating to jurisdiction, "my view is that we receive it from the Supreme Pontiff." Next day the Spanish bishop of Guadix spoke vehemently on the other side; Cardinal Simoneta said he wondered at the speaker's language; there was great excitement. The Archbishop of Granada took part with the Bishop of Guadix, and protested against his being interrupted. But many bishops, with whom was the Cardinal of Lorraine, thought that at a time when the Protestants were denying the authority of bishops altogether the point in dispute might stand over; and this view at last prevailed.

modified positive law should be considered as coming into force on May 1, 1564.

Besides the ambassadors, the names of nine cardinals, three patriarchs, thirty-three archbishops, two hundred and thirty-seven bishops, eight abbots, eight generals of orders, and a hundred and fifty theologians and canonists were inscribed on the attendance-roll of the Council, as having been present at one or more of the sessions. As regards nationality, the Italian prelates, numbering 187, constituted more than half the Council.

Among the prelates at Trent distinguished for their virtue and learning were the Cardinals Del Monte, Cervino, and Seripando, Bartholomew de Martyribus, archbishop of Braga, Paulus Jovius, bishop of Nocera, Diego Covarruvias, bishop of Segovia, Vida, bishop of Alba, and Lipomani, bishop of Modon. Among the more eminent theologians were Peter de Soto and Melchior Canus, Dominicans; Salmeron, Laynez, Le Jay, and Turriani, Jesuits; Michael Baius, Jansenius, Ramirez, Fernandez, &c. The counsel of his holy nephew, St. Charles Borromeo, was a source of strength and enlightenment to Pius IV. during the whole third period of the Council.

(The literature of the Council is given in Cardinal Hergenröther's "Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengeschichte," iii. 232 (ed. 3). Among the most important sources are: Sforza Pallavicini,[1] "History, &c.," in Italian, 1656, in Latin, 1673; Le Plat, "Monumenta, &c.," 1786; Theiner, "Diary of Angelo Massarelli," 1874; Mendham, "Acta Concilii Trid." 1842; Döllinger, "Sammlung von Urkunden, &c." 1876; Druffel-Brandi, "Monumenta Tridentina," 1884–1897. The histories of Raynaldus, Gieseler, Menzel, Alzog, and Rohrbacher, and the critical work of Brischar, may also be consulted. Paul Sarpi's[2] "History of the Council of Trent," first published in Italian at London in 1619, under the feigned name of Polano, is quite unworthy of trust. The Görres Gesellschaft has undertaken the publication of a series of original documents relating to the Council: "Concil. Trid. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatuum Nova Collectio," vols. i. and ii., ed. by Merkle and Ehses.)

The martyr Edmund Campion (†1580) wrote in the following terms of the Council of Trent: "The Synod of Trent, the older it waxeth, the more it will flourish. Good God! what variety of nations! what choice of bishops of the whole world, what splendour of kings and commonwealths, what marrow of theologues, what sanctity, what weepings, what fasts, what academical flowers, what languages, what subtilties, what labour, what infinite reading, what riches of virtues and studies, did fill up that majestical sacred place!" (Quoted in Brent's English version of Sarpi's history, London, 1640.)

TRENTAL. *Trentale, trentuale, trentena, trentenarium, tricenarium, trigesimale, trigintale,* are different names for the same thing, viz. an office of thirty Masses for the dead. (Ducange.)

TRICERION AND DICERION. Candlesticks with three and two lights signifying respectively the Trinity and the two natures of Christ, used by Greek bishops in blessing the people. (Daniel, "Thesaurus Liturg." tom. iv. p. 382.)

TRIDUUM (a space of three days). It is a pious custom to make preparation for great feasts by spending the previous three days in prayer or other devout practices. The selection of this number is probably due to the frequent mention of it in Scripture. *Triduum sacrum* is the liturgical name for the last three days of Holy Week. The Rogation days (*q.v.*) are another instance of the practice of three days' prayer (St. John, "Raccolta").

TRINITARIANS. This order was founded at Rome in 1198 by St. John of Matha, a native of Provence, and an aged French hermit, Felix of Valois, in order to redeem Christian captives out of the hands of the infidels. Affairs in the East had taken an unfortunate turn; Jerusalem had fallen into Saladin's hands, and great numbers of Christian soldiers were in captivity, which, with Mahometans, was equivalent to slavery. The dangers of every kind which beset these unfortunates were what moved the holy founder to make a great organized effort for their relief. The order was sanctioned by Innocent III.; the rule was that of St. Augustine with particular statutes; the diet was of great austerity; the habit, at least in France, was a soutane and scapular of white serge, with a red and blue cross on the right breast. The first monastery was at Cerfroy, in France; this continued to be the mother house till the French Revolution. The work was begun with great energy; John the Englishman and William the Scot, two of the earliest followers of St. John, were sent to Morocco, where they negotiated (1200) the ransom of 186 captives, and restored them to their friends. It was a fundamental rule of the order that at least one-third of its revenues should be set apart for the work of redemption. At Tunis, a short time after the success in Morocco, the saint, having redeemed 120 captives, embarked with them in a ship bound for Ostia. Some Mahometans boarded the vessel, took away the rudder, and tore the sails to ribands; but St. John is said to have

[1] Pallavicini, a Jesuit, and afterwards cardinal, wrote his history expressly to confute Sarpi; he had access to all the sources of information contained in the Roman archives.

[2] Sarpi was a Servite friar and theologian to the Republic of Venice; but under the frock and outward demeanour of a religious secretly intrigued to introduce Protestantism into the Republic. Pallavicini gives a list of 361 falsifications or misrepresentations of fact in his history, of which Bossuet wrote that it was the work not so much of the historian as of the open enemy of the Council.

hung his cloak and those of his companions from the yard, and to have obtained by prayer such effectual aid from heaven that the vessel was wafted after a few days into the harbour of Ostia.

The Trinitarians had at one time as many as two hundred and fifty houses. It was estimated in the seventeenth century that since its foundation the order had rescued 30,720 Christian captives.

St. John of Matha died in 1213. Five years later, the military order of Our Lady of Mercy (Ransom) for the redemption of captives, commonly called the Order of Mercy, was founded at Barcelona by James I., king of Aragon, and St. Peter Nolasco, with the same general object as that pursued by the Trinitarians. [See RANSOM.]

At the dissolution there were eleven Trinitarian houses in England, five in Scotland,[1] and one (Adare, co. Limerick) in Ireland. Though in fact regular canons, these religious were often called in England Red or Maturin friars, from the colour of the cross on the habit, and because they had a famous house at Paris built near the chapel of St. Maturin.

A reformation make by Father Juan Baptista was approved by the Holy See in 1599, and resulted in the erection of the congregation of "Discalced Trinitarians" in Spain. Their houses, as well as those of the unreformed portion of the order, were suppressed in Spain in the reign of the late Queen, Isabella II.

From the very beginning a number of pious ladies were associated with the order, and in 1236 were admitted to take vows. Their days were spent in prayer for the same pious object, in the education of young girls, and in the care of the sick. They do not seem to have had any houses in England before the Reformation. Some years ago (1886) they came to this country and settled at Bromley, Kent. More than thirty convents of the order have been established in Algiers since the French conquest, where the nuns are engaged in the schools and hospitals.

(Hélyot; Henryon; Latomy, "Hist. de la Fondation de l'Ordre de N.D. de la Merey," 1618; Tanner; M. Walcott, "Scotimonasticon"; Deslandres, "L'Ordre des Trinitaires.")

This order is sometimes confounded with that of the CRUTCHED, CROUCHED, or CROSSED FRIARS (*q.v.*).

TRINITY, FEAST OF. A decretal attributed to Alexander III. in the "Corpus Juris," but really of Alexander II., informs us that some churches kept this feast on the Sunday after Pentecost, others on the Sunday before Advent, while the Roman Church did not keep it at all, since every day the Trinity was praised and worshipped. Very early in the tenth century the feast was kept at Liége, in the twelfth the Abbot Rupert speaks of it as generally observed, and in 1334 John XXII. ordered its observance by the whole Church on the Sunday next after Pentecost. It was formerly kept as a double of the second class, but in 1911 Pius X. raised it to the first class. (Kellner, "Heortology," 116; Benedict XIV. "De Fest.")

TRINITY, HOLY. The mystery of the Trinity consists in this, that God, being numerically and individually one, exists in three Persons, or, in other words, that the Divine essence, which is one and the same in the strictest and most absolute sense, exists in three Persons, really distinct from each other, and yet each really identical with the same Divine essence. The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son. Each Person is really distinct from the other, each is the true, eternal God, and yet there is only one God. We can understand how three individual men are distinct from each other and yet possess humanity in common. The unity of the three Divine Persons is altogether different. When we speak of them as one God, we mean not only that each is God, but that each is one and the same God, and herein is the mystery, incomprehensible to any created intelligence. The word Trinity (τριὰς) first occurs in Theophilus of Antioch ("Ad Autol." ii. 15, PG, vi. 1078; cf. Tertullian "De Pud." 21, PL, ii. 1026), who wrote about 180, but the doctrine which the word expresses appears in the New and has its roots in the Old Testament.

(A) *The Doctrine in the Old Testament.*—(*a*) Catholics, from the Fathers downwards, full of faith in the Holy Trinity, and knowing that the author of the New Testament is also the author of the Old, have naturally been prepared to find traces of the doctrine in the ancient Scriptures, and have often satisfied themselves that such traces exist in cases where scholarship proves the possibility or even the correctness of another interpretation. In what follows, we have kept constantly in view the least an adversary must admit, the least which grammatical and historical considerations require us to see in any particular text.

Passages there are, quoted by the Fathers, in which God speaks of Himself in the plural. Such are Gen. i. 26, iii. 22, xi. 7; Is. vi. 8. In the first two the Fathers generally see an allusion to the Trinity, most of them do so in the third, a few only in the fourth, which is generally understood as addressed to the

[1] Donnington (Berks)
Eston (Wilts)
Hounslow
Knaresborough
Modenden (Kent)
Thelesford (Warw.)
Thusfield (Oxf.)
Totnes (Little)
Walknoll (Northumberland)
Werland (Devon)
Worcester

In Scotland:
Aberdeen
Dornoch
Fail
Peebles
Scotlandwell

seraphim who are mentioned in the context (references in Petavius, "De Trin." ii. 7). Let us take the first passage from Genesis, the strongest, as Petavius thinks, among them all. "And God said, Let us make man in our image." The New Testament gives no exposition of the words. The oldest explanation is found in Philo, and adopted in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, which paraphrases the words thus: "Jehovah said to the angels, ministering before Him, who were created on the second day of the creation of the world, 'Let us make man in our image.'" This view has met with the approval of some modern scholars, but there is no mention of angels in the context, and the notion of angelic agency in creation is Babylonian and Persian, but not Biblical. Another very popular view in modern times is that God uses the plural, just as kings do, as a mark of dignity (the so-called "plural of majesty"), but it is only late in Jewish history that such a form of speech occurs, and then it is used by Persian and Greek rulers (Esdr. iv. 18; 1 Macc. x. 19). Nor can the plural be regarded as merely indicating the way in which God summons Himself to energy, for the use of the language is against this (Gen. ii. 18; Is. xxxiii. 10). The most recent explanation is that of Dillmann (*ad loc.*), who thinks that God, in the solemn moment of man's creation, addresses Himself as the complex of Divine energies and powers. Akin to the arguments drawn from the above texts is that from the fact that the Hebrew word for God is plural, while it is usually construed with a singular verb. The real origin of this plural form is obscure, but anyhow Petavius most rightly refuses to see in it any allusion to a plurality of Divine Persons. The word for a human master is also often plural, and the same plural form of the word God with a singular verb is used of Dagon (Jud. xvi. 23). Lastly, under this head we may mention the "Holy, holy, holy" of Is. vi., the triple blessing in Num. vi. 24, and the apparent distinction between God and God in Gen. xix. 24: "And Jehovah rained on Sodom and Gomorrah sulphur and fire from Jehovah from the heavens." The first two places may only show that three, like seven and ten, was a favourite (cf. Jer. vii. 4) and perhaps a sacred number among the Hebrews; in Gen. xix. 24, the repetition of the words "from Jehovah" is perhaps merely an old and emphatic equivalent for "from Himself." Its meaning is much the same as that of the words which follow it—viz. from "the heavens," just as ἐκ Διὸς = ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

(β) *The so-called "Theophanies."* — God, whom no man can see and live, is represented as appearing to the Patriarchs without indication of time or mode, Gen. xii. 7, xxvi. 2, xxxv. 9, by night, xxvi. 24: "the word of Jehovah is said to have come in a vision, xv. 1. God spake to Adam (Gen. iii. 8), but it is not said that He appeared, and an angel (מַלְאָךְ, "legatus," but properly "legatio") who appears in God's name is alternately distinguished from and identified with God Himself (see, *e.g.*, Gen. xvi. 7 *seq.*, xviii., xxxi. 11 *seq.*; Jud. vi. 11 *seq.*; Zach. i. 19). The LXX (see Keil on Genesis, p. 128) regarded these cases as apparitions of a created angel, and it appears to us that the view is confirmed by various passages in the New Testament (*e.g.* Acts vii. 30; cf. Heb. ii. 2, 3; Gal. iii. 19; Acts vii. 53). In the early Church, Scripture was interpreted in another way, and the Fathers, down to St. Augustine's time (references in Petavius "De Trin." viii. 2), believed that "the angel of the Lord" was the Word of God, taking the form of an angel, and alleged such apparitions as a powerful argument against Jews and heretics for a distinction of Persons in God. The interpretation, however, was used by Arians to prove a difference of nature between Father and Son, the former being invisible, the latter visible. St. Augustine's view is expressed in his treatise on the Trinity, and finally prevailed. He argues that God in any Person cannot be seen corporeally, and that a creature, such as the angel who appeared to Abraham, &c., might represent any one of the three Persons. (Augustine, "De Trin." ii. 18, PL, xlii. 866; cf. Jerome, "In Gal." iii. 19, PL, xxvi. 366, who regards the appearances as of created angels representing the Mediator.) This, as it seems to us, is the reasonable view, or rather we should prefer to say that the angel represents God quite independently of His existence in one or more Persons. At the same time, we may fairly look on such apparitions as preparing the way for a belief in the Incarnation, especially when we remember that the "angel of Jehovah" is a title given to the Messiah (Mal. iii. 2). Again, the angel who led the Israelites is called the angel of God's "face or presence" (Is. lxiii. 9), which has a resemblance, though a very imperfect one, to the New Testament doctrine that God is manifested in Christ. So understood, the Theophanies would have an indirect connection with the doctrine of the Trinity.

(γ) *Word, Wisdom, Spirit.*—The personification of God's word and wisdom in the Old Testament brings us far closer to the doctrine of the Trinity. Even in Gen. i. God is represented as creating by His spoken command, and in Ps. xxxiii. 6 the creative energy of God is summed up in a single term—viz. His word: "By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made" (cf. Ps. cvii. 20, cxlvii. 15). Elsewhere we meet with another form of the same idea—viz. the wisdom of God, which is personified [1] in Job xxviii. 12 *seq.*; Prov. viii.

[1] It is, of course, hard to draw a clear line between poetical personification and doctrinal statement of hypostatical existence. The beautiful passage in Job, and the reflection of it in Baruch, are clear instances of the former

ix.; Ecclus. i. 1–10, xxiv. 8; Baruch iii. 27–iv. 4. In the Alexandrian Book of Wisdom we get beyond mere personification, and a real personal existence is attributed to Wisdom (vii. 7–xi.). This Wisdom is "the effulgence of eternal light," "the image of God's goodness"; the spirit in her is "intelligent, holy, only-begotten" (vii. 22). On the other hand, though the book speaks of God's "almighty word" (xvii. 5) "leaping down from His royal throne" to take vengeance on the Egyptians, this seems to be no more than a figure of speech, and the conception of the Word of God falls into the background behind that of Wisdom. It is often difficult to decide whether the attributes ascribed to Wisdom answer most closely to those of the Λόγος in the New Testament, or to those of the Holy Ghost. On the one hand, it is through her that all things are made; on the other, she dwells in the hearts of the just. It can hardly be said that the Old Testament certainly expresses the hypostatical existence of the Holy Spirit, natural as it is for a believer in the Catholic doctrine to interpret various passages of the Old Testament in this way. The Spirit of God works in nature; it endows men with skill of various kinds (Exod. xxxi. 3–6), and particularly with moral virtues, whence it is called the Holy Spirit (Ps. li. 13); it is to rest specially on the Messiah and the people of the Messianic period (Is. xi. 2 *seq.*, xxxii. 15, xliv. 3; Ezech. xxxix. 29; Joel iii. 1, 2). There is indeed one passage in the Vulgate which expressly attributes hypostatic existence to the Spirit of God—viz. Is. xlviii. 16: "The Lord God and his Spirit have sent me" (Is. xlviii. 16: "Dominus Deus misit me et Spiritus ejus"). But in the Hebrew "Spirit" may be, and probably is, the accusative: "The Lord God hath sent me and his Spirit"—*i.e.* His Spirit to dwell in and guide me.

(δ) In a few passages the Old Testament ascribes Divine attributes to the Messiah, and this, as the Messiah is sent by and is distinct from God (the Father), implies a duality of Persons in God. Some places often adduced, although their true sense and reference to our Lord are certain to us from the light of the New Testament, are scarcely conclusive in and by themselves. Thus in Ps. ii. 7, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," the sonship does not of itself imply divinity. Israel collectively was God's first-born (Exod. iv. 23), and Solomon as king of Israel was the son of God (2 Sam. vii. 14: "I shall be to him for a Father and he shall be to me for a son"), and the "day" might well be the day of coronation, for the Hebrew Bible never speaks of a mere private individual as a child of God. Sonship belongs to the people collectively or to their representative. In Ps. cx. 1, "Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand," the word translated Lord (אֲדֹנָי, not אֲדֹנָי) is simply the common term for any lord or master (1 Sam. (1 Kings) xxii. 12); and in 1 Chron. xxix. 23 we read "Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah, as king." In Ps. xlv. 7, 8, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," the interpretation of the Hebrew words, on mere philological grounds and apart from New Testament authority, is very doubtful. "Thy divine throne" is a rendering to which there is no grammatical objection, and certainly the Psalm in its natural and literal meaning seems to celebrate a royal marriage of the ordinary kind. "This is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah-[is]-our-justice," says Jeremiah (xxiii. 6), speaking of the Messiah. Such a name does not necessarily imply divinity, and we must remember that the prophet says the city of Jerusalem will be called by the very same name. "And this is the name which they shall call her [לָהּ fem., not masc. as in Vulg.], Jehovah-[is]-our-justice." In Mic. v. 1, where the origin of Messiah from Bethlehem is predicted, the Vulgate has "his going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity." It would be at least equally fair to translate, "from of old, from ancient days," for the word which answers to "initium" in the Vulgate is used by Micheas (vii. 20) of the oath made to the Patriarchs, in Isaiah (xxiii. 7) of the Tyrian commerce, and the word translated "eternity" is used of the ruined walls of Jerusalem at the time of the exile (Is. lviii. 12). There is nothing which compels us to see more in the words than a statement that the Messiah would spring from the ancient house of David. Much more weight must be given to Is. ix. 5, 6: "A child is born to us, a son is given to us, and the princedom is on his shoulder, and they have called his name—Wonderful-Counsellor, God-the-Mighty, Father-for-ever, Prince-of-Peace." "God the mighty one," though not an absolutely certain, is still the most probable rendering (x. 21, to which Gesenius, *ad loc.*, appeals for his rendering "Strong hero," tells quite the other way; cf., however, Ezech. xxxii. 21). The force of the phrase is quite lost in the Septuagint (where, however, it was interpolated—*θεὸς ἰσχυρός*; see Field, "Orig. Hexapl." vol. ii. p. 4 8), as well as in the other Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Field, *loc. cit.*), and this may account for its not being quoted in the New Testament. It is true that such an expression does not mean as much in the Old Testament, where the name of God is used far more freely (see, *e.g.*, Zach. xii. 8, "the house of David will be as God," and Chron. *loc. cit.*), as it would in the New, though it is of course very startling and remarkable. In the Book of Daniel the language falls far short of the strength and sublimity which characterize Isaiah. But the doctrine on the personality of the Messiah is, as we should expect, more definite and full. The seer beholds one "like the Son of man" brought before the ancient of

days, who gives him eternal dominion over the earth (Dan. vii. 13 *seq.*). Here the pre-existence and superhuman personality of the Messiah are clearly taught.

To sum up. Here and there the Old Testament clearly and by itself indicates portions of the doctrine, in more the New Testament helps us to discover certain or probable traces of it in the Old, while it is generally held by Catholic divines that some favoured saints of the old law had a knowledge more or less complete of the mystery.

(B) *Ancient Jewish Tradition.*—We have seen how the conception of the Divine Wisdom stands out in the Old Testament, while the "Word of God" is scarcely more than a metaphor, and the idea remains undeveloped. But in the Targums or Chaldee translations and paraphrases of the Old Testament the "word of Jehovah" is very prominent, and fills a definite position. The oldest of the Targums—that of Onkelos, on the Pentateuch—cannot be earlier than the latter half of the first century after Christ, and that of Jonathan, on the Prophets, belongs to about the same time. But it is admitted by all, even by scholars who put these Targums much later, that they preserve a very old exegetical and theological tradition; and this is the case to a certain extent even with those which, like that of the Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch, were compiled in the seventh century of our era or even later. In the Targums the Word of Jehovah or of God [1] appears in the main for two reasons. First, anthropomorphical expressions used in the Hebrew of God are applied in the Targums to his Word. Thus, for "they heard the voice of Jehovah walking in the garden" (Gen. iii. 8), the Targum of Onkelos has "the voice of the word of God;" for "Jehovah smelt a sweet savour, and said," &c. (Gen. viii. 21), "Jehovah received his offering with favour, and said by his Word;" for "God came to Balaam by night, and said," &c., "the word from before Jehovah came to Balaam," &c.; and where God is said to have "repented," the Targums qualify the expression, "God repented in his word" (Onk. Ben. vi. 6; Jon. 1 Sam. xv. 11). Next, the "Word" represents God, and is the instrument through which he acts in relation to the world. "I by my word made the earth" (Jon. Is. xlv. 12); "Israel is redeemed by the word of Jehovah" (Jon. Is. xlvi. 17, for "Israel is saved in Jehovah"); "I will place my word for thee there" (Onk. Exod. xxv. 22, instead of "I will make myself known to thee there"). We see no proof that personal existence was attributed to this "Word," [1] and it was certainly not identified either with the "angel of the face" or with the Messiah (Jon. Is. ix. 5, 6; Is. lxiii. 8, 9; Onk. Gen. xvi. 7). In later Jewish theology the "Word" falls into the background, and is replaced by the "Shechinah" (שְׁכִינָה), which denotes the presence of God among his people. It manifested itself specially in the Temple, but if ten persons pray together, if even a man and his wife live piously, the Shechinah is in their midst (Talmudical references in Levy *sub voc.*). Prominent, too, is the "Mitatron" (מִיטַטְרוֹן, perhaps from *μετὰ τύραννον* or *μετὰ θρόνον*), the "angel of the presence," whose name is like that of God. (With reference to Exod. xxiii. 21: the numeral value of the letters is equal, omitting the י, to those in the name of God.)

The theology of the Word is much more complete in Philo, who was born about 20 B.C. His position differed widely from that of the Targumists. Though he knew some Hebrew, he used the LXX, not the original text, and he was deeply imbued with Greek philosophy. The notions of Heraclitus, Plato, and the Stoics, as well as of Jewish tradition, contribute to his conception of the Word. This Word, or Λόγος, is the "idea of ideas" ("De Migrat. Abr." tom. i. p. 452, ed. Mangey); through him the world was made ("De Monarch." lib. ii. tom. ii. p. 225); he is the image of God and the brightness which reflects his essence ("De Somn." lib. i. tom. 1, p. 656); he is God, yet distinct from the Supreme God (Θεὸς, but not ὁ Θεὸς, "De Somn." lib. i. tom. i. 655); he is also the "oldest" or "supreme angel" (*πρεσβύτατον ἄγγελον*, "De Confus. Ling." tom. i. p. 427); "the first-begotten Son" ("De Agricult." tom. i. p. 308); "high-priest" (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς λόγος, "De Gigant." tom. i. p. 653). "The Λόγος of Philo" says Siegfried ("Philo von Alexandria" p. 223) "is a thesaurus of all that had been thought out in the O.T. and in Palestinian Judaism on the 'face of God,' the 'angel of Jehovah,' 'Wisdom,' the 'Word,' the 'Name,' on σοφία among the Alexandrian Jews, on the Λόγος among the Greeks." It has been asked whether the "Word" of Philo was personal, and the question has received opposite answers. The truth seems to be that Philo often and distinctly affirms the personality of the Word, but that his language on the point is not consistent with itself. His theory requires him to believe in a personal Word, for he postulates the existence of the Logos on this ground—that the Supreme God could not come into immediate contact with matter, and here, plainly, the conception of the Word as a mere attribute would not have availed. This account of the matter seems to be now generally accepted by scholars (see Soulier, "Doctrine du Logos

[1] מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ generally, דִּבּוּרָא in the Jerusalem Targum (Jer. ii.). The Peshito has adopted a third Semitic word to express the Λόγος of St. John—viz. ܡܸܠܬܵܐ. It is worth noticing that this Syriac term can only mean "word," so that the authors of this early version show what sense they attached to Λόγος.

[1] Weber's references to the Targum on the Prophets in proof that the "Word" was the object of prayer are false.

chez Philon," where there is a complete *résumé* of opinions). Most certainly, near as Philo comes to the language of the fourth Gospel, he would have utterly rejected the idea of an incarnate Word. Nothing could be more opposed to his whole view of matter, and he does not even "place the Logos in connection with the Messiah" (Westcott, on St. John, p. xvii.)

(C) *The Trinity in the New Testament.*—The absolute unity of God was and is the great article of Israel's faith, and it is asserted with equal emphasis throughout the New Testament (Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 15 *seq.*; John xvii. 3). If, then, the New Testament teaches the real, distinct, and divine personality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, this comes to teaching the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.

1. *The Son or Word of God*—The first three Gospels and the Acts describe Jesus as the "Son of God," a title which primarily implies this Messianic office. Because He is the Christ, death cannot bind Him (Acts ii. 24); He is "the prince of life" (iii. 15). After His resurrection, He "receives all power in heaven and earth" (Mt. xxviii. 18). Nowhere, however, is His pre-existence, much less His eternal generation, asserted in terms, but Christ in the Synoptic Gospels certainly claims attributes which can hardly be less than divine (see, particularly, Mt. xi. 27). In the earlier Epistles of St. Paul, His pre-existence is clearly affirmed. Through Him "are all things" (1 Cor. viii. 6); He is "the image of God" (2 Cor. iv. 4); He is "the Lord" (1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9); He is absolutely sinless (2 Cor. v. 21); He is "the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17)—*i.e.* the Holy Spirit is His Spirit, the living principle of His working and indwelling. In Rom. ix. 5, as commonly translated, we have the strongest statement of Christ's divinity in St. Paul, and, indeed, in the N.T.: "Whose are the Fathers, and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh, who is the God over all blessed for ever, Amen." We cannot enter on a discussion of the rendering here. In any case, the text cannot be conclusively urged against an opponent. There is no reason in grammar or in the context which forbids us to translate "God who is over all, be blessed for ever, Amen"—a doxology suddenly introduced, but quite in St. Paul's manner (Gal. i. 5; cf. Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31).

In the Apocalypse we find the term "Logos" peculiar in the N.T. to the Johannic writings (xix. 13, "Word of God;" not, however, ὁ λόγος, as in the Gospel). He is the "beginning of the creation of God" (iii. 14), though this phrase seems to imply priority in dignity rather than in existence.[1] He is "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end" (xxi. 6), the same phrase which is used (i. 11) of the "Almighty." In the Epistle to the Hebrews the "Logos" is not used as a personal name, but the ideas prominent in the Book of Wisdom recur here, are applied to Christ, and united to the doctrine of his generation as the Son of God before the world was made. Thus, Wisdom (vii. 26) is the "effulgence (ἀπαύγασμα) of eternal light," "the unstained mirror of the working of God," and "the image of his goodness"; and so (Heb. i.) the Son is the "effulgence" (ἀπαύγασμα) of God's glory, the "stamp" or expressed image of "his substance." As Wisdom is the "artificer of all things" (Wisd. vii. 21), so through the Son all things were made, and He upholds all things by the "word of his power" (ῥήματι, not λόγῳ). Not only is the Son, because Son, raised above the angels, but He is addressed as God (v. 8), and the description of God's majesty (Ps. cii. 26-28) is applied to Him. Somewhat similar is the aspect which the doctrine assumes in the later Pauline Epistles, particularly in that to the Colossians, in which Christ is "the centre of the universe, of the spiritual and corporeal world" (the words are Hilgenfeld's). The Pastoral Epistles occupy themselves chiefly with discipline and morals, and supply little matter for our purpose. In Titus ii. 13—"the manifestation of the glory of the great God and [of] our Saviour, Christ Jesus"—a Unitarian could not be expected to admit that Jesus Christ is called "the great God," for the words will certainly bear the interpretation, "the manifestation of the glory of the great God and the manifestation of the glory of our Saviour," &c.—viz. at the second coming. In 1 Tim. iii. 16, ὃς, not Θεὸς, is the true reading. (So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort. Even Scrivener—"Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T." p. 556—considers it "highly probable" that "Θεὸς of the more recent many must yield place to ὃς of the ancient few.")

The divinity and distinct existence of the Word are most clearly taught in St. John's Gospel. The Word (absolutely only in i. 1 and i. 14) existed before all time; "in the beginning," before things were made, He was. This existence was a personal one, for the Word is no mere attribute, like the reason or wisdom of God, but was πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν—*i.e.* in active communication with God. (For the force of πρὸς compare Mk. vi. 3, ix. 19; Mt. xiii. 56, xxvi. 55; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; Gal. i. 18, iv. 18.) As the spoken word is distinct from him who utters it, so was the Word distinct from God the Father (ὁ Θεός). Yet in nature or essence He is one with the Father—"the Word was God" (Θεός); "all things came into being through Him," and this without any exception. And the continuance of things, no less than their origin, depends on Him—"That which was made was life in Him,"

[1] See Job xl. 19.

As He is the Word or perfect expression of God the Father's being before creation, so, after it, He is the source of all spiritual illumination (i. 9); and lastly, He "became flesh and tabernacled among us," replacing the partial revelations of the past by one which was full and perfect. He is Son as well as Word, but His sonship is different from that which is common to believers. He is Son in the strict sense, with the same nature as His Father; whence He is "the only-begotten from the Father," "the only-begotten Son" (or, perhaps, "the only-begotten God"; so Westcott and Hort, i. 14, iii. 16, 18; see also 1 Jn. iv. 9). He and the Father "are one" (x. 30); to have seen Him is to have seen the Father (xiv. 9). All that had been previously revealed in the Bible, all the results of extra-biblical speculation in the Jewish Church, are here combined—the "Word" of the Hebrew Bible and of the Targums; the λόγος or "reason" of Philo, the creative Wisdom of Proverbs and the Deutero-Canonical books. And the Bible, in one of its latest books, is the exposition of an idea which can be traced back to the words with which the Bible, as we have it, begins: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and God *said*, Let there be light, and there was light."

2. *The Spirit of God.*—On the whole, the New Testament, like the Old, speaks of the Spirit as a divine energy or power particularly in the heart of man. The Spirit rests on Christ, and is a power within Him distinct from Himself (Mt. iii. 16, xii. 28; Lk. iv. 1-14; Jn. i. 32), having first caused His miraculous conception (Lk. i., &c.) The Spirit is imparted to Christ's disciples, the citizens of the Messianic kingdom, and is their guide (1 Pet. i. 12; Acts ii. 4 *seq.*, xv. 28; cf. v. 2). This divine Spirit is clearly distinguished from the Spirit or conscience of man (Rom. viii. 16), and the authority of the Spirit is identified with that of God Himself (Mt. xii. 31; Acts v. 3, 9; 1 Cor. iii. 16; but cf. Exod. xvi. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 8). But is a personal existence clearly attributed to the Spirit? No doubt, all through the N.T. his action is described as personal. He speaks (Mk. xiii. 11; Acts viii. 29), bears witness (Rom. viii. 16; 1 Jn. v. 6), searches (1 Cor. ii. 10), decides (Acts xv. 28), helps and intercedes (Rom. viii. 26), apportions the gifts of grace (1 Cor. xii. 11). Most of these places furnish no cogent proof of personality. The spirit of God and Christ (Gal. iv. 6) may be said to do what He operates through man; and again, we must not forget that the N.T. personifies mere attributes such as love (1 Cor. xiii. 4), and sin (Rom. vii. 11), nay, even abstract and lifeless things, such as the law (Rom. iii. 19), the water and the blood (1 Jn. v. 8). However, if we look well to the passage above quoted from St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 11), we find that the Spirit is distinguished from the gifts of the Spirit, and that personal action is predicated of Him: "All these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to each separately, as He [the Spirit] wills." Poetical personification would be quite out of place here, and Meyer rightly treats the words as decisive. In the fourth Gospel, however, this personal existence is stated more fully and plainly (ch. xiv.). Even the author of the article on the Trinity in Schenkel's "Dictionary of the Bible" ("Bibel-Lexicon," art. *Dreieinigkeit*), though he writes to show that the doctrine of the Trinity is not Biblical, admits that the hypostatical existence of the Holy Spirit is taught here. "I will ask the Father and He will give you another advocate, that He may be with you for ever, the Spirit of truth. . . . I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you" (v. 16–18). "Advocate" is the same name given in 1 Jn. to Christ Himself, our advocate with the Father, and in each case the name is a personal one. In essence He is one with Christ, so that when He comes, Christ comes too. But He is not, as the writer just quoted thinks, represented as one in person with the glorified Christ; on the contrary, He is "another advocate."

3. Trinitarian formulae occur throughout the N.T. books. Baptism is to be given "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt. xxviii. 19; cf. 1 Cor. i. 13–15, x. 2), which indicates the prevalent idea of baptism, as bringing the baptized into relation with living persons. The persons of the Trinity are further mentioned together by St. Paul (2 Cor. xiii. 13) and by St. Peter (1 Ep. i. 1–2). Considering the strict Monotheism of the N.T., such language implies the divinity, as well as the personality, of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and they are sufficient warrant for refusing to believe that N.T. writers did not know the doctrine, because they did not, like St. John, state it explicitly.

(D) *The Development of the Doctrine in the Church.*—1. The Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, as a whole, is neither expanded nor reduced to system in the Apostolic Fathers. Clement of Rome follows closely the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ is the "sceptre of God's majesty" (1 Ep. 46), "the effulgence of his majesty" (36, PG, i. 281). The Logos is not used as a personal name (see 27, PG, i. 268; and cf. Heb. i. 3). The uncanonical but early Epistle of Barnabas speaks of Christ as the Son, not of man, but of God (12, PG, ii. 764). Ignatius, on the other hand, is familiar with the technical sense of Logos. Christ is God's "word proceeding from silence" [1] (Magnes.

[1] This is the correct reading, as has been shown by Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1875, p. 357 *seq.*

8, PG, iii. 669). He is God (Ep. 1 and 7); He is, "God having become in flesh" "from Mary and from God, first impassible, then passible," &c., so that His divine and human natures are distinguished. Among the earliest writers generally, "Spirit" is the term for Christ's pre-existent nature (Hermas, "Sim." ix. 1; "2 Ep. Clem." 9), and this use, which may be traced back even to the O.T. (Is. xxxi. 3: "The Egyptians are man and not God, and their horses flesh and not Spirit"), survived in writers much later than the Apostolic Fathers (Theoph. "Ad Autol." ii. 10; Tertull. "Adv. Marc." iii. 16, PL, ii. 343).

Passing to the middle of the second century after Christ we find much fuller statements, and an approach to a definite theology on the three divine Persons. All the Fathers between the Sub-Apostolic and Nicene age are permeated by the teaching of the fourth Gospel. Justin Martyr is the single exception, and even he is familiar with the doctrine of the Logos. All these writers recognize the divinity of the Word, and in many we meet with statements that the Son is one in substance with the Father, that He is in the Father and the Father in Him, that there are three divine Persons, each answering to the idea of God. Thus, Christ is said to be God by Justin ("Trypho," 126, PG, vi. 769), by Tatian ("Orat. ad Graec." 21, p. 90), by Theophilus ("Ad Autol." ii. 22, p. 120). Justin speaks of Christ as Son of God in the strict sense (1 Apol. 23, p. 60) as begotten like fire from fire ("Trypho," 128, p. 432), and Tatian expresses himself in like manner ("Orat. ad Graec." 5, p. 20); Tertullian ("Adv. Marc." iv. 25, PL, ii. 422) asserts Christ's equality with the Father, and His unity with Him in substance ("Adv. Prax." 2). Athenagoras confesses the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be each God ("Leg." 10, p. 44 *seq.*, PL, ii. 422), their distinct personal existence, and their union in power ("Leg." 24, p. 124). These early Fathers reconcile the unity of God with the Trinity of persons by their doctrine of the monarchia or priority in nature of God the Father. Just as in later theology the Father is acknowledged to be the "fountain of Godhead" (*πήγη θεότητος*), because the one divine essence is communicated from Him to the Son and the Spirit, so the Ante-Nicene Fathers call the Father "the God" (*ὁ Θεός*) or God absolutely (*ὄντως Θεός*), the Son only "God" (*Θεὸς* without the article). This distinction is made explicitly by Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." iii. 12, p. 548; "Quis Dives," 6, p. 939), and usually observed by Justin, though in three places ("Trypho," 56, p. 184; 86, p. 300; 113, p. 180), as the text now stands, he calls Christ *ὁ Θεός*. Tertullian, writing in a language which has no article, makes an equivalent distinction. To him the Father is "ipse Deus," the Son "hactenus Deus, quatenus ex ipsius Dei substantia" ("Adv. Prax." 26, PL, ii. 189).

2. But in two ways the teaching of many Ante-Nicene Fathers was imperfect and inconsistent with itself. First, their belief on the *principatus* and on the Theophanies, the mediatorial work of Christ, &c., led them to speak as if the nature of the Son were inferior to that of the Father. Justin, *e.g.*, describes the Word as a "God under the maker of the universe," as a God different in number from the God who made all" ("Trypho," 56, p. 180, p. 184). Clement of Alexandria attributes to the Son a "nature most near to the sole Almighty" Father ("Strom." vii. 2, p. 831). The word *φύσις* cannot be pressed, still it is noteworthy that in the message quoted he is exalting the Son's sanctity, which, of course, belongs to His nature in the proper sense. Tertullian ("Adv. Prax." 9, PL, ii. 164) declares that the whole substance of the divinity is in the Father, a "portion" of it only in the Son; Origen, that the Son is worthy of a "secondary honour" (*τιμῆς δευτερευούσης*) after the God of all ("C. Cels." vii. 57, PG. xi, 1501), that he is "different in essence" from the Father (*ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν*, "De Orat." 15), and in a passage, which can scarcely refer to Christ as man, that the Son perhaps foreknows the actions of all creatures.

Next, though in a sense the Ante-Nicene Fathers generally hold the eternity of the Logos, many of them affirm that His generation as Son happened in time. Logos may mean either reason or the Word. Now God, of course, was never without Logos or intellect, and Theophilus ("Ad Autol." ii. 10, p. 80 *seq.*, ii. 22, p. 118) distinguishes between the *Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, the immanent reason of God, and the *Λόγος προφορικός*, which came forth from God, as a spoken word at the creation. This temporal generation of the Son is also held by Justin (2 "Apol." 6; PG, vi. 453), Tatian ("Orat. ad Graec." 5, p. 20 *seq.*), Hippolyt. ("Contr. Noet." 10), the author of the "Philosophumena" (x. 32-33), Tertullian ("Adv. Prax." 5, PL, ii. 160; "Adv. Hermog." 3), Novatian ("De Trin." 30), Lactant. ("Instit." ii. 9, PL, vi. 294, 461; iv. 6, PL, vi. 294, 461). On the other hand, the eternal generation of the Son was maintained by Irenaeus ("Adv. Haer." iv. 20, 3, PG, vii. 1033), and, as Cardinal Newman thinks, by the Alexandrian school. Certainly, this is true of Clem. Al. ("Strom." vii. 1, p. 829), of Origen ("De Princip." iv. 28, i. 2, p. 2; cf. Athanas. "De Decret. Syn. Nicaen." 25), if the Latin translation of Rufinus and the quotation of Athanasius are to be trusted. Moreover, we have a clear statement of the eternity of the Son by Dionysius, bishop of Rome, in the middle of the third century

(Routh, "Rell. Sacr." tom. iii. p. 375). Enough has been said in previous articles on the Arian and Sabellian heresies. Here, however, we may remark that the Catholic doctrine unites the positive elements in two opposite systems, each of which errs, not by assertion, but by denial. Catholics agree with Sabellians in holding that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, and with Arians in maintaining that He is a distinct Person.

3. The full and perfect divinity of the Son and His eternal existence were defined once and for all in the Nicene Creed. True, the eternity of His Sonship was not defined, and for many years after the Council a few even of the orthodox continued to deny it. Cardinal Newman ("Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical," p. 244 *seq.*) shows that this was the case with St. Zeno of Verona (consecrated 362), with his contemporary Victorinus and, for a time, with St. Hilary. But shortly after the Arian Councils of Seleucia and Ariminum this inconsistent opinion died out, and it is mentioned indeed by St. Augustine, but only mentioned as a heresy. (See Newman, *loc. cit.*)

4. The Nicene Creed in its original form ends with the words, "and [I believe] in the Holy Spirit," and the very fact that belief in the Holy Ghost is placed on the same level with belief in the Father and the Son implies the divinity of all three. Indeed, so much is involved in the very confession of a Trinity, as St. Athanasius points out ("Ep. I, ad Serap." n. 2,[1] PG, xxvi. 433). This inference, however, was not pressed home by the Council. Some even of those who were orthodox on the divinity of the Son feared to call the Holy Ghost God, partly because they doubted whether Scripture justified such use of language, partly because they feared seeming to confess three Gods (Greg. Nazianz. "Orat." xxxi. n. 1, n. 13, PG, xxxvi. 133). St. Gregory Nazianzen believed that the divinity of the Holy Ghost was to be taught gradually, with great caution, and not to all ("Orat." xli. n. 6, PG, xxxvi. 437), and he defended St. Basil the Great for his prudent reserve on this point. Basil believed that the Holy Ghost was God, but did not at the time say so openly in set terms (Greg. Naz. "Ep." lviii., PG, xxxvii, 116). But it became plain that the matter could not rest here. The Semi-Arians, who thought it enough to admit the Son's likeness to the Father, but would not allow the second Person to be equal to or consubstantial with the first, were driven by the force of logic to make the Holy Ghost a creature. To them, difference in order implied difference in nature, and hence, if the second Person, because second, was only like the Father, the third, because third, could not be even like, with the same exclusive likeness which belonged to the Son. And so Macedonius admitted that "the Son was God, both in all things and in essence like the Father, but he declared that the Holy Ghost had no part in the same prerogatives, calling Him servant and minister" (Sozomen, "H. E." iv. 27). The true divinity of the third Person was asserted at a Council of Alexandria in 362, by two synods at Rome under Pope Damasus, and finally by the Council of Constantinople of 381, in a decree accepted by the whole Church. (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 1–48.)

5. One great question still remained—viz. the nature of the unity in essence between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The heresy of Tritheism was maintained by Ascusnages (Assemani, "Bibl. Or." ii. p. 327), and by Philoponus (d. after 610). As he identified hypostasis or person with individual nature, he argued that, as in Christ there is but one Person, therefore also one nature only, and that as in the Trinity there are three Persons, therefore also three individual natures. On this view the unity of essence is specific, not numerical, and the three Persons are God, only so far as three individual human beings are each man. Such a theory overthrows the unity of God, which is a primary truth of religion, and it contradicts the περιχώρησις or inhesion of one Divine Person in another, which our Lord teaches when He says that the Father is in Him, and He in the Father. Petavius discusses the history of opinion on the point with that fulness of learning, acuteness, and impartiality which are his characteristic gifts, and we can only give his conclusions here. Many Fathers in their contest with Arians, who held a specific difference, wrote as if they believed merely in a specific unity of the Divine Persons. Of this Tritheistic theory, "certain seeds," says Petavius, "may seem to have been cast in the old Fathers, not only in such as lived before Arius, but also in those who lived in the very midst of the Arian controversy" (Petav. "De Trin." lib. iv. cap. 13, n. 3; see also cap. 9, and 14–16). The same Tritheistic error was revived in the West by the Abbot Joachim and condemned by the Fourth Lateran Council (cap. 2, Def. contr. Abb. Joachim) in 1215. The Council defines the distinction of the Persons from each other and the absolute identity of each with the one "individual essence" of God. Another theological principle is involved in the Lateran definition. The Council speaks of the Incarnation as effected "by the whole Trinity in common." Of course the second Person only was incarnate, but all works exterior to the Trinity itself are effected by the three Persons. They are distinct only in virtue of their relations to each other. The Father alone generates, the Father and Son alone breathe the Holy

[1] Ποία οὖν αὕτη θεολογία ἐκ δημιουργοῦ καὶ κτίσματος συγκειμένη;

Ghost. But all three have one single nature, and therefore one indivisible operation with respect to the outer world. We do indeed appropriate certain external actions to one of the Persons. We speak, *e.g.*, of the Holy Ghost as the sanctifier because that work of love is attributed with special fitness to Him who proceeds from the mutual love of the Father and Son. In reality the renewal of man's heart is the work of all three Persons equally. It cannot, however, be said that all three Persons are sent, because mission consists in the procession of one Person from another with the production of a temporal effect, visible or invisible ("processio cum habitudine seu connatione temporalis effectus," Suarez, "De Trin." lib. xii. De Missione). All three Persons enter a soul which loves God, but the second and third Persons alone are sent, because they come by an impulse which is one with the nature which they receive, the Son from the Father, the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son. Suarez (*loc. cit.*) limits mission to cases where a supernatural effect is produced, because in these only God is present in a new way, so present that He would be there even if not already there by His omnipresence.

(E) *The Trinity and Natural Reason.*—All Catholic theologians are agreed that the existence of the Trinity cannot be proved by reason, and although they add that the doctrine is above but not contrary to reason, still Billuart at least ("De Trin." Prooem. a. 4) admits that we cannot prove "positively and evidently" that the doctrine does not involve a contradiction. The obvious objection presents itself that we cannot believe what is absolutely unintelligible, and again it may be said that a revelation which tells us nothing of God's character brings us no closer to Him, in no way affects our own life, is not a revelation at all.

We reply, that each single proposition held by Catholics concerning the Trinity is quite intelligible, and may, therefore, be the object of real assent, little as we can understand the consistency of these propositions with each other. Further, it is easy to see that the long contest on the Godhead of the Son and the Spirit had a most important meaning. Given, that the Son was the object of worship, then, unless His unity of essence with the Father had been established, Christianity, instead of perfecting the Jewish revelation, would have been a relapse into polytheism. As it was, the Trinitarian doctrine was a safeguard to the belief in the one God; it revealed an inner and eternal life of God which made all Pantheistic confusion between the life of God and the life of the world, all representations of God as the soul of the world, a sheer impossibility. Moreover, every other article of the Christian belief is affected by the faith in the Trinity. It is one thing to regard our Lord as the most perfect of human teachers or even of creatures, quite another to adore Him as the God-man. The daily life of Christians assumed a new sanctity when they came to believe that every good impulse within them came from God the Holy Ghost, that their very bodies are His temple. Nor is it without a special significance that God proclaims Himself as the Father of individual souls, that He teaches us to address Him as our Father in heaven, just when He reveals Himself as the Father from all eternity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(The Fathers who have treated of the Trinity have been mentioned in the course of the above article. St. Augustine's great work "De Trinitate" goes into the subject much more deeply than his predecessors, and is the foundation of the speculations of the Schoolmen. He was followed by St. Anselm, lib. I., "De Fide Trinitatis"; St. Thomas, 1ª, qq. 27–43. After the Council of Trent the best works are Ruiz, "De Trinitate"; Petavius, "De Trinitate"; Thomassin, "Dogmata Theologica, Tract. De Trinitate." In recent times: Franzelin, "De Trinitate"; Lebreton, "Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité"; Scheeben, "Dogmatik," i. 743 *sqq.*; Wilhelm and Scannell, "Cath. Theol." i. 257–354. Among Protestants should be mentioned Bull, "Defensio Fidei Nicaenae.")

TRIPLE CANDLESTICK. The rubric for the blessing of the Paschal Candle on Holy Saturday speaks of "a reed with three candles fixed on the top of it." It does not seem to be considered as a permanent piece of furniture. Nevertheless it has come to be such, and is often constructed of brass (HOLY WEEK, *Holy Saturday*). Bishops in the Greek Church use a triple and double candlestick in blessing the people. (See TRICERION; Thurston, "Lent and Holy Week," 414.)

TRISAGION. ("O holy God, holy and strong, holy and immortal, have mercy on us"; ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς), a brief hymn so named from the triple ascription of holiness to God. It is sung in the liturgy of Constantinople in the Mass at the "little entrance"—*i.e.* when the book of the Gospels is solemnly carried from the prothesis to the altar. It occurs more than once in the Syriac liturgy, and probably is identical with the "ajus" mentioned in the "Expositio Brevis" attributed to St. Germanus. This "ajus" was sung in the Gallican rite before the Old Testament lesson and before and after the Gospel. In our liturgy the Trisagion is said by the celebrant during the "adoration" of the Cross by the people on Good Friday. (Hammond, "Ancient

Lit." p. 381.) It is also said in the ferial prayers at Prime for penitential days.

The legendary account of its origin is given by St. John of Damascus ("De Fid. Orthodox." iii. 10, PG, xciv. 1017). He says Proclus, bishop of Constantinople in the middle of the fifth century, was leading the prayers during a tempest, when a boy was caught up into the air (*συνέβη ἁρπαγῆναι*) and taught the Trisagion by the angels. Towards the end of the fifth century Peter the Fuller inserted the clause, "who wast crucified for us" (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 869), in the interest of the Monophysite heresy, though the addition was capable of a good sense and was defended by some Catholics (Petav. "De Incarnat." v. 4). Calendius, who replaced Peter the Fuller at Antioch, added the other words "O King Christ," so as to remove the heretical taint. But the addition was generally rejected in the West, and in the East except among the Monophysites, who made it a watchword and were thence called Theopaschites. It was bitterly opposed by the monks called Acoemetae [see the article] who, however, fell into the heresy at the opposite pole—*i.e.* Nestorianism. The addition was also rejected by Acacius in a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* at Constantinople, A.D. 478 (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 914), and by the Synod in Trullo (c. 81). Gregory VII. ordered the Armenians who were re-united to the Church to abandon it as an occasion of scandal, and the prohibition was repeated by Propaganda in 1635 (Benedict XIV. "De Fest." cccxxx.).

TRIVIUM. [See UNIVERSITY, p. 834.]

TROPE, TROPARION, &c. In the Latin Church tropes were additional clauses, introduced to fill up the long neums sung at High Mass before or after and sometimes in the middle of the Kyrie, Introit, &c. This practice was called "farcing." They were introduced as early at least as 1000 by the monks, but entirely removed at the revision of the Missal under Pius V. The Troperion, Troparion, Troper, &c., *i.e.* the book containing the tropes, is often mentioned in Church inventories, though the word seems to have been also used for Sequentialis or Book of Sequences. The Bodleian contains a fine MS. Troperium. After Kyries and hymns written on the first few pages comes the title "Incipiunt Tropi de adventu Domini Nostri Jesu Christi." Then follow the other parts of the liturgy which were sung. (Maskell, "Mon. Rit." I. p. xliii. *seq.*)

In the Greek Church *τροπάριον* is the generic name for the short hymns with which the Offices of that Church abound. (Neale, "Introduction to History of Holy Eastern Church," p. 832, note *b*; Blume in "Cath. Enc.")

TRUCE OF GOD (Lat. *treuga Dei*, or *treua Dei*, from German *Treue*, faith). An institution of the Middle Ages, designed to mitigate the violence of private war by prohibiting hostilities from Thursday evening to Sunday evening of each week, also during the entire season of Advent and Lent, and on certain festival days. Respect was shown to Thursday as the day of Christ's ascension; to Friday as that of His Passion; to Saturday because on that day He lay in the grave; and to Sunday because it was the day of His resurrection. The truce was first proposed in the Council of Charroux in 989. St. Odo, or Odon, sixth abbot of Cluny, and Blessed Richard, abbot of St. Vannes, did much to extend it among the Neustrians. A synod at Roussillon in 1027 ordered that it should be observed from none of Saturday to prime of Monday. After the great famine of 1028–30 the bishops of Aquitaine proclaimed a universal peace, but were unable to enforce it, and then limited it to certain days. The right of sanctuary was denied to violators of it. Soon the regulation spread all over France. In 1041 the bishops of Aquitaine ordered that no private feuds should be prosecuted from sunset on Wednesday to sunrise on the following Monday, and this the Council of Clermont extended to the time from Advent to the Epiphany, from Lent to the octave of Pentecost, and afterwards to the feasts and vigils of the Blessed Virgin, of St. John the Baptist, of Sts. Peter and Paul, and All Saints. In 1042 England and Italy adopted it. At the Council of Rheims in 1119 Calixtus II. renewed the truce of God for the above-named seasons, pronouncing excommunication against violators, and commanding that, unless they or their children made satisfaction, they should be deprived of Christian burial. The Second and Third Councils of Lateran (1139 and 1179) confirmed the truce, and gradually the necessity for it wore away. (Hefele-Leclercq, v. 400, 582, 728; Semichon, "La Paix et la Trève de Dieu.")

TRULLO, COUNCIL IN. The word "trullus" (*τρούλλος*, *τρούλλα*) is base Greek for *θόλος*, or dome, and the Council in Trullo takes its name from the domical hall in the imperial palace at Constantinople which was the place of meeting. It is also known as *πενθέκτη*, or "quinisexta," because it was regarded as a supplement to the fifth and sixth councils, which passed no disciplinary decrees. It was convoked by Justinian II. in 692, and its decrees were subscribed by the Eastern Patriarchs, and by other bishops and episcopal proxies (211 in all, but all Easterns). In some of the 102 canons on discipline which the Council passed, the enmity against Rome and the West which at last led to the schism clearly betrays itself. Thus (c. 2), 85 apostolic canons are admitted as authentic, though corrupted by heretics, whereas Rome only

accepted 50; and in a long list of canonical authorities there is no reference to Papal decrees or to any Western council except Sardica, and a synod of Cyprian, the latter being evidently mentioned only out of opposition to Rome. In canon 13, priests and deacons are allowed to continue in the married state, and the rule of Rome is contrasted with that of the Apostolic canons. Canon 55 strictly forbids the Roman custom of fasting on the Saturdays of Lent; can. 36 renews in defiance of Rome the 28th canon of Chalcedon on the patriarchal rank of Constantinople;[1] canon 67 condemns the eating of blood, permitted long before in the West, as unscriptural. Pope Sergius I. naturally refused to accept these decrees, and an insurrection prevented Justinian from forcing him to subscribe them. John VIII. accepted the Trullan canons, so far as they are consistent with sound morals and "earlier canons and decrees" of the Popes. Hadrian I. looked on the Council in Trullo as a continuation of the Sixth General Council, and accepted the canons "which were promulgated lawfully and by Divine help" in the first six councils, including that in Trullo (Mansi, xii. 982). Hefele-Leclercq (iii. 348) take the clause as qualifying the Papal acceptance. To the schismatic Greeks the Council in Trullo is a continuation of the sixth and therefore oecumenical. (Hefele-Leclercq, iii. 560–581.)

TUNIC (*tunica* or *tunicella*). A vestment proper to subdeacons, who are clothed in it by the bishop at ordination, and exactly like the dalmatic except that, according to Gavantus ("Thesaur." P. 1, tit. xix.), it is rather smaller. Even this distinction is not, so far as we know, generally observed. It is also worn by bishops under the dalmatic when they pontificate. Gregory the Great (Ep. ix. 12) says one of his predecessors had given the subdeacons linen tunics, and that some other churches had adopted this usage, but he himself had restored the old fashion, and left his subdeacons without any special vestment. There is no notice of the tunicella in the Gregorian Sacramentary. But the first (§ 6) and the fifth (§ 1) of the Roman Ordines distinguish between a greater and less dalmatic, and the latter probably is our tunicle. Amalarius expressly marks ("Eccles. Offic." ii. 21, 22) the difference between dalmatic and tunicle, and tells us that some bishops wore one, some the other, some, as now, both. He says the tunic was also called "subucula," and was, when worn as an episcopal vestment, purple (*hyacinthina*). Honorius of Autun calls the tunicle ("Gemma," i. 229) "subtile," and "tunica stricta" (*i.e.* narrow); Innocent III. ("De Altar. Myster." i. 39 and 55), "tunica poderes." (Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung," 247 *sqq.*)

[1] It is to "enjoy the same privileges" as Old Rome.

TRUTH SOCIETY, CATHOLIC. Founded in 1884 by Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Vaughan. The objects of the society are: To spread among Catholics small devotional works; to assist the uneducated poor to a better knowledge of their religion; to spread among Protestants information regarding Catholic faith and practice; and to promote the circulation of good and cheap literature. The Society is mainly supported by subscriptions, little profit being made out of the sale of publications. The original Catholic Truth Society was founded in England, but similar independent societies have been established in Ireland, Australia, and the United States. (Britten, in "Cath. Enc.")

TUTIORISM. [See MORAL THEOLOGY, p. 603.]

TWELFTH DAY. Another name for the Epiphany [*v.*], it being the twelfth day after Christmas.

TYPE. Types, according to St. Thomas (1ª q. 1, a. 10), are persons, things, actions, and events of the Old Testament ordained by God to foreshadow the future. The existence of types is expressly set forth in both the Old and the New Testament. The term "type," which originally means model, form, or figure, is taken from the New Testament. St. Paul says that the first Adam was "a figure of Him that was to come" (τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος), inasmuch as his carnal paternity is an image of the spiritual paternity of Christ (Rom. v. 14). The things which happened to the Israelites in the desert "happened to them in figure (τυπικῶς), and were written for our correction" (1 Cor. x. 11). The correlative term anti-type (ἀντί-τυπος) is used 1 Pet. iii. 21, where baptism is called the anti-type of the flood and the ark. The notions of type and anti-type are sometimes inverted. Thus the holy places made with hands are termed the patterns (ἀντίτυπα) of heaven, the true holy place (Heb. ix. 24). And in Gal. iv. 22 the two sons of Abraham are set forth as an "allegory" of the two Testaments—allegory being here used for type, as St. John Chrysostom observes. The tabernacle and the sacrifice of Abraham are a "parable" (παραβολή) of the present time (Heb. ix. 9, xi. 19). The priests who served in the tabernacle served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things" (ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ, Heb. viii. 5). Feasts, "new moons, sabbaths" are a shadow of the things to come, but the body (= the reality) is Christ's (τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, Colos. ii. 16, 17). "For the law had a shadow of the things to come, not the very image (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) of the things" (Heb. x. 1). The typical character of the Old Testament is due to Divine ordination: "The end of the law is Christ" (Rom. x. 4). This doctrine is implied in all passages of the New Testament in which occurs the formula "that it might be fulfilled" (Mt.

ii. 15, xiii. 35; Jn. xix. 36), or "then was fulfilled," *e.g.* Mt. ii. 17, xxvii. 9, &c. Types or figures, then, are symbolical prophecies. Their object, like that of symbols, is to impart supersensible notions through the agency of things that strike the senses. They may refer to the present, as *e.g.* the wooden or iron yokes worn by Jeremiah; or to the past, as *e.g.* the veiling of the head to the sin of Adam; or to the future, as the paschal lamb to the sacrificial death of Christ. (Maas in "Cath. Enc."; Gigot, "General Introd. to H. Script." p. 387.)

TYPUS or TYPE. [See MONOTHELITES.]

U

UBIQUITARIANS. Ubiquity, or omnipresence, is a natural property of God, and the Apollinarists and Eutychians, who confused the two natures in Christ, taught that Christ, as man, was everywhere. Some taught that this confusion, by which divine attributes became proper to Christ as man, took place at the incarnation, others only after His death and resurrection. This theory is, of course, directly contrary to the definition of Chalcedon (Petav. "De Incarn." x. 7).

The Eutychian doctrine on the omnipresence of Christ's body was revived by Luther in his controversy with the Zwinglians. The latter denied that God Himself could cause a body to exist in more than one place at the same time; Luther, in a sermon of 1527 ("Quod Verba Stent"), and in the "Confessio Major" of 1528, replied that Christ's body was not only in heaven and in the Eucharist, but everywhere, and this of necessity. The humanity, he argued, is united to the divinity; the latter is omnipresent, therefore the former also. Again, Christ as man is at the right hand of God; God's right hand is everywhere, therefore also Christ as man (Bossuet, "Hist. des Variations," liv. ii. n. xliii.). Not only Calvinists and Zwinglians, but Melanchthon opposed this doctrine. He pointed out that it led to a confusion of the two natures, and also to a denial of that very mystery of the Real Presence which it was intended to support. Christ would not be more truly present in the Eucharist than in any piece of wood or stone (Bossuet, *loc. cit.* viii. n. xxxvii.). The belief in the ubiquity, however, became a mark of the Lutheran orthodoxy, and was inserted in the famous "Formula of Concord," A.D. 1577,[1] although the doctrine had been silently omitted in the Augsburg Confession, A.D. 1530 (Bossuet, *ib.* n. xlvi.).

UNAM SANCTAM (one, holy, Catholic Church). The bull on papal supremacy published by Boniface VIII. in 1302. Attempts have been made to disprove its genuineness, but this is established beyond all doubt by the entry of it in the official registers of papal briefs, and its incorporation in the canon law ("Corpus Jur Can." 1, I., tit. v. viii., *Extrav. Comm. de majoritate et obedientia*, c. 1). After proving from Scripture that the Church is one and can have only one Shepherd, the bull goes on to the famous metaphor of the two swords: "The Gospel teaches us that there are two swords in the hand of this Shepherd, the spiritual sword and the temporal sword. When the apostles said 'Behold, here are two swords' (that is, in the Church), the Lord did not answer 'It is too many,' but 'It is enough.' He who would deny that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter misunderstands the word of the Lord: 'Put up again thy sword into its place.' The two swords, spiritual and temporal, are then in the Church's power; the first to be wielded (*exercendus*) by the Church, the other for the Church; the first by the priests, the other by kings and soldiers, but at the beck and permission of the priest (*ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*). Now the one sword must be under the other, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual . . . That the spiritual power surpasses the temporal in honour and dignity must be acknowledged, all the more clearly seeing that spiritual things generally surpass temporal . . . 'The spiritual man judgeth all things, but he is judged by no man' (1 Cor. ii. 15). Although a man has received and exercises this power, it is no human power, but rather a divine power, given to Peter and his successors by the mouth of God: 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind,' &c. Whoso resisteth this power ordained by God resisteth the ordinance of God . . . Wherefore we declare, say, define, and pronounce that to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is for every human creature a necessity of salvation. (*Porro subesse Romano pontifici omni creaturae humanae declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.*)" As Cardinal Hergenröther remarks: "In this bull it is only defined that all must give due religious obedience to the Pope, not obedience in purely temporal matters. One sentence alone is marked out as a definition of the Church by the words 'We declare, define, &c.' All the rest of the bull is no definition." ("Catholic Church and Christian State," i. 31.) The Church has never declared it to be an article of faith that

[1] But this *Concordienformel* was not received among all the Lutherans. It was drawn up by Andreä, chancellor of Tübingen, assisted by Chemnitz. Strange to say, the second part of this *Concordia*, known as *solida declaratio*, professes to be a mere repetition and explanation of the Confession of Augsburg.

temporal princes, as such, are in temporal matters subject to the Pope, though individual theologians have indeed held them to be so in certain cases. (On the bull generally see Hefele-Leclercq, vi. 425 *sqq.*; Hemmer in DThC, *Boniface* VIII.; Newman, "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" in "Anglican Difficulties," ii.; Tarquini, "Juris Eccl. Publici Institutiones.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF FATHERS. [See BIBLE and TRADITION.]

UNBAPTIZED INFANTS. [See BAPTISM, p. 64.]

UNCTION. [See EXTREME UNCTION; CONFIRMATION; OILS, HOLY, &c.]

UNIATS. [See UNITED GREEKS.]

UNIGENITUS. [See JANSENISM.]

UNION, LA SAINTE. The religious congregation of the Sisters of La Sainte Union des Sacrés Cœurs was founded at Douai by the Abbé Debrabant. The rule and constitutions are chiefly taken from the mild rule prescribed by St. Francis of Sales to the nuns of the Visitation. [VISITATION, ORDER OF THE.] The object of the institute is the education of girls in every rank of society. Before the suppression of religious houses in France in 1905 these sisters had many convents there. They have also many in Belgium, England, North and South America, &c.

UNITED GREEKS. The name includes all who follow the Greek rite and, at the same time, acknowledge the authority of the Pope —*i.e.* the United Melchites in the East; the Ruthenian Catholics, who use the Greek liturgy in a Slavonic version; the Greek Catholics of Italy; and the Catholics of the Greco-Roumaic rite in Hungary and Siebenbürgen. Of the Melchites and Ruthenians an account has been given already.

(1) *The Greeks in Italy.*—Many Greeks came thither from Albania about 1468, and the Greek settlements became more and more numerous after Soliman (1538–40) drove the Venetians from the Archipelago; after the conquest of Cyprus by Selim II. in 1571; and after 1718, when Venice lost the last remnant of her possessions in the Morea. In the eighteenth century there were about 100,000 Greeks in Italy, especially in Calabria and Sicily, and they obtained various privileges from Leo X., Paul III., and Julius III. Pius IV. withdrew these concessions in 1564, and placed the Greeks under Latin bishops, allowing them, however, to retain their rites. Their position was finally determined by the bull of Benedict XIV., "Etsi Pastoralis" (May 26, 1742). According to the rules there laid down, they have their own clergy, who may marry when in minor orders and continue in the married state after they are priests. They are forbidden, however, under pain of deposition, to contract a second marriage. They have three seminaries—viz. the Greek College of St. Athanasius at Rome, erected in 1577 by Gregory XIII.; the College at Palermo, erected in 1715; the College of S. Benedetto di Ullano, in the Calabrian diocese of Bisignano, erected by Clement XII. in 1732, and transferred to the Basilian monastery of St. Adrian in 1820. Each college has a bishop of the Greek rite residing in it, for the ordination of candidates; and the bishops at Palermo and in the seminary of S. Benedetto have to visit the Greek churches and see that the rite is duly observed. Otherwise, the Greeks in Italy are entirely subject to the bishop of the diocese in which they live. This bishop, however, must appoint a Greek as well as a Latin vicar-general; and the Metropolitan must appoint a Greek judge, if Greek cases come to the Metropolitan court of appeal. The number of Greeks in Italy is about 50,000. There are colonies at Ancona, Leghorn, Pianino in the diocese of Aquapendente, Naples, Villabadessa in the diocese of Atrie Penne, Barletta in the diocese of Trani, Lecce, Carghese in the Corsican diocese of Ajaccio. Further, in Calabria the diocese of Cassano has eight colonies, Rossano five, Bisignano two, Anglona four. Sicily has Greek colonies at Palermo, where there is also a Basilian monastery founded in 1609, at Monreale, Girgenti, Contessa, and Messina.

For an account of the Greeks in the United States see the art. RUTHENIAN CATHOLICS.

(2) *Greco-Roumaic Church.*—In the thirteenth century many Roumanians belonging to the Greek schismatic church found a refuge in Siebenbürgen and Hungary. In 1690 a few conversions were made, with the help of the Jesuits, by the imperial commissary Tullus Miglio, when two priors of Greek monasteries and six parish priests abjured the schism in the Jesuit church at Fünfkirchen. Nine years later, the efforts of Cardinal Kolonitsch and of the Jesuits Hevenes and Bárány were rewarded with much greater success. The Greek bishop of Siebenbürgen, Theophilus II., became Catholic; and on February 16, 1699, the diploma of union from the Emperor Leopold I. was solemnly read at the Landtag. The united Greeks of Hungary and Siebenbürgen number about 1,100,000, and form an ecclesiastical province. The Archbishop of Fogaras (see erected 1721; made head of a province, 1850) is Metropolitan; his suffragans are the Bishops of Grosswardein (erected 1776), Lugos (in 1853) and Szamos-Ujvar (erected 1865). The secular priests are married. There is a clerical seminary and a small Basilian monastery at Balasfalva. (Silbernagl, "Kirchen des Orients"; "Missiones Catholicae," 1901, Streit, "Atlas"; Fortescue in "Cath. Enc.")

UNIVERSITY. The Museum of the Ptolemies (on which see Cardinal Newman's sketch in "The Office and Work of Universities"), the philosophic schools of Athens, the

institute of Gondisapor under the Abbasside Caliphs, and perhaps Cordova under the Moors, were all eminent examples of schools for higher education, existing apart from Christianity. With regard to the matter of instruction, the universities of modern times, in which "arts" hold the chief place, stand in a direct line with the Roman imperial schools. On the other hand, their historical institution, machinery, and terminology are Christian, and are traceable to the activity of the Catholic clergy in the Middle Ages.

A great medical school arose at Salerno in the eleventh century, but Döllinger seems to be hardly justified in describing it as a university.[1] The first institution in Europe to deserve that name was undoubtedly the School of Paris, which passed through the stages of "High School" and "Studium Generale," and, favoured by its situation at the capital and the patronage of the bishops of the see, became, towards the end of the eleventh century, the University of Paris. That it was ecclesiastical in its origin is manifest. It grew up out of a concourse of able men, attracted to Paris partly by the encouragement and protection which they received from the authorities, partly by the intellectual sympathy which they were sure to find among an increasing body of students of mixed nationalities.[2] These men could not lecture until licensed by the Chancellor of the diocese, who thus gradually came to be considered the Chancellor of the University also. By the end of the twelfth century, instead of the Chancellor licensing anyone whom he chose at his own discretion, we find the teachers in the schools *recommending* to him those of their pupils whom they judge fit to receive the licence. By the end of the thirteenth century, the prestige and privileges of the university continually increasing, the Chancellor's right to license has disappeared; that right is now in the hands of the Faculties, and is given upon examination.

Regarded from the intellectual side, the university, when its organization was complete, consisted of four groups of teachers and students—viz. the Faculties[3] of Arts, Theology, Jurisprudence, and Medicine. Arts had the pre-eminence; the university was always said to "have its foundation in arts"; for these were the branches of learning and science which were the development and continuation of the old Trivium and Quadrivium. The Masters of Arts, strictly speaking, were the "Universitas"; the teachers in the other faculties were long regarded as more or less outsiders. At the same time, the theological school, especially after it took into itself the study of canon law, rapidly attained to a world-wide celebrity. The professorial campaigns of the great lecturers of the twelfth century—Abelard, St. Bernard, William of Champeaux, Saint Amour, Roscelin, &c.—are the very romance of education. The Church encouraged the free play of mind, which, as such, can never be otherwise than favourable to her; at the same time, she watched carefully that no heretical teaching should mar the soundness of that foundation of Catholic faith without which neither university nor any other teaching is of much value. The Popes were lavish of privileges to the rising institute; Gregory IX. gave to the teachers (*magistri, doctores*) the right of scholastic legislation—*i.e.* of settling all that concerned the manner and time of lecturing; another Pope authorized Paris masters to open a school anywhere. So great was the fame of the theological school that, according to Thomassin,[1] several universities were erected under Papal sanction without a theological faculty, on the understanding that students who wished to proceed in that branch should go to Paris. As the Church of Rheims was esteemed a model of discipline for other Churches, so the University of Paris was regarded as the model and rule for other universities in learning. For two centuries, says Döllinger, Germany sought learning at Paris or Bologna. The efforts of a rival school set up in the abbey of Ste. Geneviève, which was outside the jurisdiction of the see of Paris and appointed its own Chancellor to license teachers, served eventually to enhance the glory of the one great university, in which the singular phenomenon of *two* Chancellors, preserved to the end of its existence, survived as the only monument of a once formidable opposition. The degree of Bachelor (the origin of the word is doubtful) grew out of the scholastic disputations. That of Master originally depended on the licence to teach given by the Chancellor. When this came to be given by the teachers themselves, it became an honour—a dignity—a degree; and many competed for it who had no intention of opening a school. A *pilcus* or hat was conferred as the symbol of admission *inter magistros*. From the circumstance that a body of masters who did not teach was thus gradually formed arose the distinction between Regentes and non-Regentes.

Thus far we have considered the University of Paris from the intellectual side. But the aggregation of large numbers of students presented an important disciplinary problem also, and to this we must devote a few words. "Outside the lecture-room the scholars fell into clans, based on community of language and manners, and technically called 'nations.'"[2] These assumed spontaneously an independent organisation. Each of the four "nations" at Paris —the French, the Picards, the Normans, and

[1] P. 1; see end of article.

[2] Ordericus Vitalis speaks of Normans being sent for instruction to the "schools of France" (Paris is probably meant), though he does not distinctly name the University. —*Eccl. Hist.* viii. 17.

[3] "Faculty" probably meant ability to teach.

[1] II. f. 101.

[2] Huber, i. 24.

the English—elected a Proctor as its ruler and representative; collectively they chose a Rector, who was head of the whole "Corpus Scholarium," and in time appears as the ruler of the teaching body as well as of the "nations." The student's life outside the lecture-room was the affair partly of the Rector and Proctors, partly of the authorities of the various colleges—if he happened to belong to one of them—of the Sorbonne [SORBONNE], of Navarre, Des Dix-Huit, of St. Thomas of the Louvre, Des Bernardins, of Cluny, of Prémontré, of Bayeux, &c.—which, in course of time, were founded within the university. But the Popes, "even in the fullest power of the universities," [1] claimed to and did interfere if the interests of morality and order demanded it.

The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were founded in imitation of that of Paris, and arose not long afterwards. The schools of Oxford began to be largely frequented in the reign of Stephen. About 1134, Robert Pullus or Pulleyn, educated at Paris, is said to have lectured on Scripture. In the conflict of jurisdiction between Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, the Papal Legate, and Archbishop Theobald, difficult questions of law were involved, and a general wish arose that the learning of the great Italian jurists should be made available in England. The Lombard Vacarius was summoned over, and "taught law at Oxford," [2] about 1149. The place was central, relatively to the then distribution of the population; it was also neutral ground—a long way both from Canterbury and Winchester. The students were divided into two "nations," the Northern and the Southern English, each with its proctor; hence the discipline of Oxford is to this day in the hands of two proctors. The supreme authority in the university was the Chancellor, originally appointed by the Bishop of Lincoln, in whose diocese Oxford was situated; afterwards elected by the Masters and confirmed by the Bishop. In the thirteenth century both Oxford and Cambridge were in high repute; Paris and Bologna also were at the height of their prosperity. At Bologna, in 1262, there were 20,000 students; [3] at Oxford, in 1231, there are said (à Wood) to have been 30,000. Halls (*hospitia, aulæ*), presided over by masters of arts, provided the necessary accommodation. The first collegiate foundation within Oxford ("University") dates from 1249; the oldest collegiate buildings ("Merton") from about 1270. Gradually the great majority of the students were drawn within the colleges, in which discipline was more easily maintained.

Germany came into the field in the fourteenth century. Charles IV., taking Paris for his model, founded the University of Prague in 1348; that of Vienna dates from 1365. Salamanca in Spain and Coimbra in Portugal were founded in the thirteenth century. Nine universities were founded in Germany in the course of the fifteenth century, besides five already existing. In this central land, owing to the plurality of independent states, the solicitudes which beset a unified ambitious nationality, such as France or England, were absent; and it fell to Teutonic thinkers, pondering deeply on the philosophy of the matter, to develop the modern notion of a university, as a place where all sciences and all liberal arts are prosecuted and taught, with the aid of the best appliances, by the most competent persons anywhere to be found; [1] the learners being all those students, and no others, who willingly come to the professors to be taught. If to this notion the conception of the pastoral oversight of the Catholic Church be added as a postulate, nothing will be wanting to our ideal of a perfect *Academe*.

The Revolution destroyed the University of Paris; in its place the first Napoleon erected the huge examining machine which he called the "University of France."

(Thomassin; Huber, "The English Universities," ed. by F. Newman, 1843; à Wood, "Hist. and Antiq. of the Univ. of Oxford," ed. by Gutch, 1792; Bulaeus, "Hist. Univ. Parisiensis," 1665; Döllinger, "Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt," 1867; Newman, "Ideal of a University, Historical Sketches," iii.; Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars"; Denifle, "Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400"; Rashdall, "The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.")

UNLEAVENED BREAD. [See ALTAR BREADS and EUCHARIST, p. 323.]

URBAN COLLEGE. [See PROPAGANDA.]

URBANISTS. [See POOR CLARES.]

URBI ET ORBI. [See PROMULGATION.]

URSULINES. This teaching order was founded by St. Angela Merici, of Brescia, in 1537. Angela was born at Desenzano, on the Lake of Garda, in 1470. Her life was one long endeavour after perfection; she joined the third order of St. Francis, practised the greatest austerities, made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Rome, and on her return settled at Brescia, where she obtained a great influence among the piously disposed of her own sex, and gradually matured the plan of a new institute. She seems to have desired a freedom of action and of movement for herself and her associates, which would not have been compatible with enclosure and solemn vows. A fervent company of seventy-three women

[1] Huber, i. 37.

[2] Gervase of Cant. (Rolls ed.), ii. 387; Robert de Monte, a. 1149; PL, clx.

[3] Döllinger, p. 2.

[1] The professoriate of the University of Berlin, founded in 1810, would have consisted of foreigners in the proportion of two to one if all the invitations sent out had been accepted (Döllinger, p. 16).

met together in the kitchen of Angela's house, at Brescia, in 1537; the objects of their institution—nursing the sick, teaching young girls, and sanctifying their own lives—were known to them all; the rules by which Angela endeavoured to conciliate a certain community of work and worship with the routine of domestic life in the world were considered and approved; and she was elected superior—foundress she would not be called—of the "Company of St. Ursula." A young girl from twelve years and upwards might join the company; at entrance each was to express the firm resolution of living chastely in the society, without taking the vow of chastity; they were to hear Mass daily; on the first Friday in each month they were to meet in some church in the city previously fixed upon, and all receive Communion; on the last Sunday of the month they were to assemble in the oratory belonging to the company to hear the rule read; their dress was to be always plain in texture, and sober in hue and make, but a distinctive habit was not at first adopted. St. Angela died in 1540. A bull of Paul III. (1544) confirmed her foundation under the title which she had given to it. The work of teaching was from the first the chief employment of the society; and as their success and popularity increased, the need of greater stability than was furnished by the original rule would naturally be felt. A uniform costume, with a leathern girdle, was introduced soon after the appearance of the Papal bull. St. Charles Borromeo brought the Ursulines to Milan in 1568, and favoured them in every way, advising all his suffragan bishops to introduce them in all the large towns in the North of Italy. In the Milanese alone there were eighteen Ursuline houses at the death of St. Charles. The excellent César de Bus assisted a lady of Avignon, Françoise de Bermont, to establish there a colony of Ursulines, on the original plan, in 1594. Françoise was a person of great energy; she travelled from city to city in the South of France, and planted Ursulines at Aix, Marseilles, and Lyons. She adhered to the design of St. Angela, except that, in obedience to a suggestion of César de Bus, she substituted the common life for dispersion in various homes. The conversion of the society into a religious order was chiefly the work of a French lady, Mme. de Ste.-Beuve, who built and endowed a monastery for Ursulines in the Rue St. Jacques at Paris in 1610, and obtained from Paul V., two years later, a bull, by which her foundation was subjected to the rule of St. Augustine, under the invocation of St. Ursula; the nuns were to be strictly enclosed; they were to take solemn vows, and were to add a fourth, that of instructing the young. This was the commencement of the Ursuline congregation of Paris, which soon numbered forty-five houses. The followers of St. Angela who preferred still to abide by her original plan were called "congregated" Ursulines—*Ursulines congrégées*; but the "religious" Ursulines, who observed enclosure and took solemn vows, appear to have better suited the prevalent mode of thought in the seventeenth century, and they were multiplied in every direction.

Several distinct congregations, each numbering many convents, were formed. Of the congregation of Paris we have spoken; that of Bordeaux was founded in 1606 by the Cardinal-Archbishop de Sourdis, with the aid of Mother Madeleine de la Croix, and approved by the Holy See in 1618; before long it had eighty-nine affiliated houses. The congregation of Dijon (1619) owed its existence to the zeal of Françoise de Xaintonge; the vows in it were simple, not solemn, and a fourth vow, of perseverance in the society, was taken. The congregation of Lyons, of which the commencement was the house founded by Françoise de Bermont in 1610 for *Ursulines congrégées*, adopted enclosure and solemn vows in 1620. The order was introduced into Canada, through the zealous exertions of Mme. de la Peltrie, in 1639. The site at Quebec which they still occupy was soon obtained for them, and till 1850 might be seen within the convent precinct a venerable ash tree, sole relic of the ancient forest, under which the first Ursulines used to teach the catechism to little Indian children. Having belonged to different congregations in Europe, the Ursulines of Quebec had for some years no determinate constitution, but in 1682 they affiliated themselves to the congregation of Paris. The services rendered by this community, during the two centuries and a half of its existence, in preserving a religious spirit among the French population and humanizing and instructing the Indians and half-castes, are beyond all estimation. In the chapel of their convent may be seen the tomb of the brave Marquis de Montcalm, slain in the unequal combat on the heights of Abraham (1759), which decided the fate of Canada.

The Irish Ursulines owe their establishment at Cork in 1771 to Miss Nano Nagle, the foundress of the Presentation Order (see that article). They regard themselves as a filiation of the convent of St. Jacques at Paris.

In 1900 a congress of Ursulines from all parts of the world met in Rome at the bidding of Leo XIII. for the purpose of bringing about a closer union between the different convents. Over one hundred communities joined the Roman Union of Ursulines, and others are continually being aggregated. "The united communities are divided into eight (*sic*) provinces, as follows: Italy, Austria-Hungary, Hungary, the East of France, the West of France, Holland-Belgium, England-Germany,

the North of the United States, the South of the United States, Spain and Portugal. Many large and important communities still retain their independent organisation." "In Europe and America alike the Ursulines make it a point to secure state approval, and avail themselves of every advantage offered by the public institutions" (M. Mary Fidelis in "Cath. Enc."; O'Reilly, "Life of St. Ursula"; Heimbucher, in "Kirchenlex.").

USURY. Usury, in its wider signification, means all gain made by lending. This is a sense which usury often has in the classics, and, so understood, usury occurs whenever a man lends capital at interest. Now, however, usury signifies unjust gain on a loan, unjust because not justified by the loss, risk, &c., of the lender or the advantage to the borrower,[1] or because the amount of gain is exorbitant. In this latter case usury is forbidden both by the natural law and by the Bible. It is always unjust, and its wickedness is aggravated when advantage is taken of the needs of the poor to secure usurious interest. But we shall see presently that both in the Old Testament and for a long time in Christian legislation little distinction was made between the two kinds of interest. The laws of the Old Testament on the subject had a most important influence on Christian feeling, so that something must be said about the former here.

(1) *Usury in the Bible.*—Public loans and the humane spirit of the law in Christian nations have taught us to draw a clear line between lawful and usurious interest; but in the ancient world, as it is in the East at this day, interest was always usurious. The Egyptian law contented itself with prohibiting interest which was more than cent. per cent. (Diodor. Sic. i. 79); the laws of Menu permitted an interest of 18 or even 24 per cent. (see the reference in Smith's "Bible Dictionary," article *Usury*), and 12 per cent. is, or was till quite lately, a minimum rate in the East. Partly, no doubt, for this reason, partly because in an agricultural nation like Israel loans were only asked by those whose need put them at the creditor's mercy, partly to encourage kindness towards the poor, the Mosaic law prohibits lending at interest. The most ancient code (Exod. xxi.–xxiii.) prohibits lending at interest (נֶשֶׁךְ) to poor Hebrews. Deut. xxiii. 20 forbids interest to be taken from Hebrews generally; Levit. xxv. 35–37 repeats the precept of Exodus, forbidding also interest in kind (תַּרְבִּית, also מַרְבִּית). Lending at interest generally is reprobated in the strongest terms in Ps. xv. 5, Prov. xxviii. 8. Nehemiah, after the exile, restored the observance of the law against taking interest from Hebrews, and made the usurers restore the "hundredth part" of the money (*i.e.* "centesimae usurae," 1 per cent. a month =12 per cent. a year; 2 Esdr. v. 11). The New Testament gives no definite rule on the subject, though of course the spirit of Christ's words, "Give to him that asketh thee" (Mt. v. 42) excludes lending at interest.

(2) *Usury in the Pagan World.*—Both Plato ("Laws," v. 742) and Aristotle ("Politics," i. 10, 11) condemned the putting out of money at interest. The latter says: "The most hated sort of money-making, and with the greatest reason, is usury, which makes a gain out of money itself, and not from the natural use of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest. And this term usury (τόκος), which means the birth of money from money, is applied to the breeding of money because the offspring resembles the parent. Wherefore of all modes of making money this is the most unnatural." The money-lender's trade presented much the same aspect in the Roman State as in the old Eastern world. Loans were still usually made to the needy who could not protect themselves. The "usura centesima" (12 per cent.) was under the later Republic and the Empire the legal rate of interest, which was due every month (*i.e.* 1 per cent. a month), so that Ovid very naturally calls the Calends "swift," and Horace "sad" ("Sat." i. 3, 87).

(3) *Usury in the Church.*—These views of the Greek philosophers and Roman lawyers account for the feeling of the Church on the matter down to modern times.

(*a*) *The Fathers* are unanimous in regarding all interest as usury, and, therefore, as a species of robbery. Their general opinion was that the prohibitions in the Old Testament bound Christians, and that in a more stringent form, since the taking of interest from strangers had only been tolerated among the Jews for the hardness of their hearts. Tertullian ("Adv. Marc." iv. 24, 25, PL, ii. 419, 424), Cyprian ("Testimon." iii. 48, ed. Hartel, 153), Ambrose ("De Tobia" throughout, PL, xiv. 777; see especially 14 and 15), Basil (in Ps. xiv.), Jerome (in Ezech. xviii. Ezech.), Chrysostom (in Matt. Hom. lvi. al. lvii, PG, lviii. 558), Augustine ("De Bapt. contr. Donat." iv. 9, in Ps. xxxvi.), Theodoret (in Ps. xiv. 5, PL, xl. their condemnation of interest, ap- least add a reference, to the Old Other Fathers, probably from me and for the sake of brevity, omit any appeal—*e.g.* Apollonius (*apud* Euseb. "H v. 18), Commodian ("Adv. Gent. Deos," 65), Lactantius ("Inst." vi. 18), Epiphanius (in

[1] *I.e.* the ordinary worth which money has to the borrower; for it is, of course, unjust to take advantage of the borrower's necessity in order to exact exceptional interest.

[1] Clem. Al. (ii. 18, p. 473) explains the word "brother," from whom interest may not be taken, as meaning not only one of the same kin, but anyone who "shares in the same doctrine."

the "Exposit. Fid." at the end of the "Haer." n. 24). Augustine (Ep. 153, PL, xxxiii. 664). These passages are all explicit. *E.g.* Tertullian ("foeneris sc. redundantiam, quod est usura"), Ambrose ("quodcunque sorti accidit"), Jerome ("usuram appellari et superabundantiam quicquid illud est, si ab eo quod dederit, plus acceperint"), define usury as taking interest; the word Epiphanius employs is τοκολῃψία, "taking interest"; "it is unjust," says Lactantius, "to take more than one gave."

(β) *Conciliar and Papal Laws.*—From early times the clergy were forbidden, under penalty, to take interest. So Canon. Apost. 44, Council of Arles A.D. 314 (c. 12), of Nicaea (c. 17), Laodicea (c. 4), Leo I. (Ep. 5, "Ad Episc. Campan."), Council in Trullo (c. 10). Not that taking interest was considered by these authorities permissible in laymen; such a thing, says Leo, is lamentable in the case of any Christian, and so of course specially reprehensible in clergymen. The mediaeval canon law extended the penalties to laymen. Thus the second Lateran Council, A.D. 1139 (c. 13, lib. v. Decret. tit. 19, c. 3, cf. c. 7), condemns usurers to excommunication and deprives them of Christian burial. Clement V. in the Council of Vienne (Clem. lib. v. tit. 5, De Usuris. c. Ex gravi) declares it heresy to maintain pertinaciously that usury is no sin. It is plain from St. Thomas (2^a 2^{ae}, q. 78) that all taking of interest was still regarded as usury. Further, Alexander III. (lib. v. Decret. tit. 19, c. 6) decides a case proposed by the Bishop of Genoa. The merchants of that city used to sell spice above the market value, agreeing to wait a stated time for payment. The Pope replies that such a contract, unless there was some doubt whether the market price might not rise or fall in the meantime, though not strictly speaking usurious,[1] was sinful.

(γ) *The Modern View.*—It became more and more evident that commerce could not exist without a rate of interest, and reflection showed many just grounds on which a moderate rate could be exacted. Such are the risk to the lender, the loss to which he is put by the want of capital with which he might trade, the fruit which the money yields, &c. The law can remove many of the dangers of usury by fixing a legal rate, and the poor are now just the persons who ... Ter most, were all interest pro- ... It was long, however, before ... pted itself to new circumstances. ... nsistently, and Melanchthon with ... e hesitation, stood where the Fathers ... d canonists had stood before them. (See the quotations in Herzog, art. *Wucher.*) Bossuet represents Calvin as the first theologian who propounded the modern distinction between interest and usury, and this seems to be true, so far at least as writing goes, though, according to Funk ("Zins und Wucher," p. 104), Eck and Hoogsträten had defended the same distinction at Bologna. Bossuet himself maintains the old doctrine as of faith ("Traité de l'Usure"), and this though he was fully aware of the arguments on the other side. He rejects as sinful the charge of interest on the general ground that the lender could have used the capital he lends in trade, though, very inconsistently, he allows interest to be charged if the lender has forgone a particular and definite gain[1] which he had in prospect. Benedict XIV., in his encyclical to the Italian bishops, "Vix pervenit," A.D. 1745, condemned the doctrine that interest might be taken, merely on the ground of loan, however low the rate of interest, and although the borrower might be ever so rich and have profited by using the money in trade, though he leaves the questions about the accidental or extrinsic reasons for taking interest, the risk, loss of profit, &c., quite unsettled. Further, this Pope, according to Ballerini (*loc. cit.* p. 615), allowed books defending the modern view to be dedicated to him. Keen controversy on the point among Catholics had arisen during that century, and the work of the famous Scipio Maffei (1675-1755) on the laxer side ("dell' impiego del danaro") had attracted great attention. In 1830 the Congregation of the Holy Office, with the approval of Pius VIII., decided that those who regarded the fact that the law fixed a certain rate of interest as in itself a sufficient reason for taking it were "not to be disturbed." This principle is now accepted throughout the Church, though the Holy See has given no positive decision on the matter. Even the laws restraining the clergy from taking interest are entirely obsolete. Gury accepts the position tolerated in the decree of the Sacred Congregation, and argues that the State has power in certain cases to transfer the property of one subject to another. No doubt. But where is there the faintest proof that the State means to exercise this power in the case, and to transfer the interest from the pocket of the borrower to that of the lender? We may add that the Fathers, in the places quoted above, expressly deny that the State-law makes usury lawful. Ballerini, rejecting Gury's explanation, argues that the words "loan" (*mutuum*) &c. imply spontaneous liberality, but that interest may be taken if there has been a previous contract to that effect. It is scarcely necessary to answer that the Fathers and Schoolmen meant much more than a truism like this—viz. that a man must

[1] Because there was no formal loan.

[1] The older theologians—*e.g.* St. Thomas (at least in his work "De Malo") and Scotus—would not admit even this excuse for interest, if the loan was voluntary and repaid at the time agreed upon. (See Ballerini's Gury, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 598.)

not require interest if he professes to lend without it. Later on, Gury (ii. p. 611) seems to give the true reason. The ancient world believed that money was barren, and the Schoolmen inherited this principle from Aristotle. Experience proves that money, far from being barren, "produces fruit and multiplies of itself" ("fructum producit et multiplicatur per se," Gury, *loc. cit.*),[1] and a man may justly take *e.g.* 5 per cent. or more for money which is well worth that to the merchant, bank, railway company, &c., who receive the loan.

(Herzog, "Encycl. für Prot. Theol.," art. *Wucher*, gives useful citations from the Reformers. Smith and Cheetham; Funk's work "Zins und Wucher"; Hefele, "Beiträge"; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." iii. 584–663; and Hefele-Leclercq, i. 604 *sqq.*, have also been used. But for exhaustive learning and clear statements of the points at issue we have seen nothing comparable to Bossuet's "Traité de l'Usure.")

UTRAQUISTS. A section of the Hussites who were so called because they demanded the Holy Communion under both kinds (*sub utraque specie*). [See HUSSITES; COMMUNION (6).]

V

VALDENSES, WALDENSES, or VAUDOIS. It does not fall within the plan of the present work to give even an outline of the long and varied history of this sect; but since it exists now, and has been undoubtedly in being since the twelfth century—since, moreover, it now professes Protestant doctrine, and is regarded with the strongest favour and interest by English Protestants, who commonly believe that it can trace its origin to primitive if not even to Apostolic times—it is necessary to examine with some minuteness the nature of the evidence bearing on two questions: (1) when did it arise? (2) what kind of tenets did it originally profess?

(*a*) At the Council of Verona, held in 1184, Lucius III. condemned those who falsely called themselves the "humbled" or the "poor men of Lyons," with several other heretical sects. The first on the list of errors attributed to the condemned, or some of them, was that they presumed to preach in public without mission or authority from Pope or Bishop.

Writing to the Archbishop of Aix and his suffragans in 1198 (PL, ccxiv.), Innocent III. requests him and them to assist Rainier, the commissioner whom he is sending to Provence, in his efforts to put down the heretics in those parts, "qui Valdenses Catari et Paterini dicuntur," and by other names. This seems to be the earliest occurrence of the name in ecclesiastical history. The common characteristic of all these sects is stated to be, that they "reject the authority of the Roman Church."

Bernard, abbot of Font-Cauld, wrote a special treatise, apparently about 1200, "against the sect of the Valdenses." He says nothing as to their founder, but playing upon their name derives it "a valle densa," from the thicket of errors in which they were entangled. Disobedience to ecclesiastical authority is the first and principal fault imputed to them, but they are also charged with allowing women to preach, with a systematic desertion of the churches, and with rejecting prayers and other ministrations for the dead. (See this tract in Migne, vol. 210.)

Alanus de Insulis, a celebrated theologian, in a work which must have been written before 1202, attacks heretics generally,[1] the Valdenses, the Jews, and the "Pagans or Mahometans." In the book devoted to the Valdenses he says that they are so called "from their heresiarch, who was named Waldus, who, led by his own spirit, not sent by God, invented a new sect, so that he presumed to preach without the authority of any prelate, without divine inspiration, without science, and without learning." "They assert," he says, "that no one is bound to obey anyone but God."

Conrad, elected abbot of Ursperg in 1215, when about to describe in his Chronicle the rise of the Franciscans and Dominicans, contrasts with these orders the "Poor Men of Lyons" and the "Humiliati." Both these sects, he says, arose in Italy. He thinks ("ut puto") that the founder of the Poor Men was one Bernhard, whom, attended by his followers, he had himself seen soliciting approbation for his institute at the Papal court. Bernard alleged that they imitated the life of the Apostles, having no property or fixed abodes, and that all their peculiar practices, among others that of men and women travelling about in company, had "descended from the Apostles." But the Pope, apprehending that some of their customs were superstitious, and others inexpedient, refused to confirm them. Such is Conrad's account. It seems likely that his memory misled him, and that he con

[1] Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act i. scene 3: "*Antonio.* Or is your gold and silver ewes and rams? "*Shylock.* I cannot tell; I make it breed as fast."

[1] See the "Notitia" prefixed to Migne's reprint of the works of Alanus (PL, ccix.).

founded Bernard, the archbishop of Narbonne, an active opponent of the Vaudois in the last years of the twelfth century, with the real founder of the sect.[1]

It cannot be doubted that the "Pauperes de Lugduno" of Conrad of Ursperg and the Council of Verona are identical with the "Valdenses" of Innocent III., Alanus, and Bernard. This identity is expressly stated by Rainier Sacho, a somewhat later authority, and it became the general belief. Thus in a tract by an unknown Carthusian monk (printed by Martène [2]), written about 1440, with the title "De Religionum Origine," this sect is called "Valdensium haeresis, seu pauperum de Lugduno." The early evidence all points to the rise of the sect as having taken place about thirty years before the end of the twelfth century. Their claim to great antiquity is indeed noticed by Conrad, but it seems easy of explanation. If the living authority of the Church was to be resisted, it could only be done by inducing the belief that their tenets were apostolic, "ab apostolis descendisse." The passages Acts ii. 44 and 1 Cor. iv. 11 and ix. 5 probably led to conscious imitation on the part of the Valdenses, and from such imitation to the assertion that their customs had come down from the Apostles the step was not great.

(*b*) Rainier Sacho, a Dominican, who died in 1260, and in his capacity of inquisitor must have had great opportunities for obtaining exact information, gives the following account of the origin of the Vaudois.[3] Peter Valdo, a rich merchant of Lyons, about 1160, shocked and stunned by the sudden death of a friend, resolved to strip himself of his wealth, and both practise and preach an Apostolical poverty. Followers soon gathered round him, and they were variously named "Valdenses," "Pauperes de Lugduno," "Leonists" (from the city), and "Insabatati" (from the *sabots* or wooden sandals which they wore). Valdo caused portions of the Bible to be translated into the vulgar tongue; these he used himself in preaching, and caused others to use; and when the clergy remonstrated he paid no heed to their admonitions. A rapid development of sectarian tenets was the natural consequence of this first resistance. Rainier divides the errors of the Valdenses into three classes—against the Church and the clergy, against the sacraments, against sacramentals. Under the first head they taught that the Church of Rome was not the Church of Christ, but, rather, the harlot mentioned in the Apocalypse; that it had become corrupt in the time of Pope Sylvester, when the poison of temporalities first infected it [1]; that scarce any but themselves held the true Gospel doctrine; that the Pope is the author of all errors; that tithes ought not to be paid, and the Church should not possess property; and that all members of the Church are equal. Under the second head, they found fault with all the sacraments of the Church; as to Baptism, they said that the washing of infants was of no avail to them, and they rejected many of the ceremonies proper to the rite. Confirmation they set aside; as to the Eucharist, they held that priests in mortal sin could not consecrate, and fell into a variety of other errors which we have not space to enumerate. As to Penance, they said that a bad priest could not absolve, but that a good layman could. With regard to Marriage, they set at naught the impediments established by the Church, and acknowledged no affinity as resulting from the sacrament. They disapproved of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, because it was only given to the rich. What respect they would have for the sacrament of Holy Orders is apparent from what has been already said. All laymen, they held, were entitled to preach, and women also.[2] Whatever was not in the Scriptures they held to be fabulous. They believed in no saints but the Apostles. With regard to the third head, that of Sacramentals, they made a clean sweep of all the beautiful and touching ceremonies—all the salutary institutes—with which the Church had surrounded the life of Christians here below. No festivals, no fast-days, no holy water, no lights, no ornaments, no incense, no images, no chanting; to hear a Valdensian ranter at uncertain times seems to have appeared to these poor sectaries the sum of all the support and delectation that the soul could possibly require. They held that it was unlawful to swear. "They condemn all princes and judges, being persuaded that it is not lawful to punish malefactors. Lastly, they condemn the ecclesiastical judgments."

Severe measures of repression were used against the Vaudois from time to time, but failed to extirpate them. A letter from a Franciscan inquisitor to the Council of Basle,[3] dated in 1432, states that although the writer had "made great executions on many heretics" within the past two years, the sect still flourished on both sides of the Alps; that he had several relapsed heretics in prison, both at Yverdun and at Briançon, and that these had revealed to him the existence of more than five hundred

[1] From some similar confusion, Philippe de Comines, describing the visit of St. Francis de Paule to the court of Louis XI., uniformly calls the saint "Robert."

[2] *Ampliss. Coll.* vol. vi. p. 56.

[3] We take his narrative as excerpted by Dupin, *Auteurs Eccles.* sæc. xiii. ch. 9.

[1] The Vaudois evidently believed the figment of the Donation of Constantine. (See STATES OF THE CHURCH.)

[2] From this account it would appear that Milman's statement, that "they rejected the seven sacraments, except Baptism and the Eucharist," which, if true, would assimilate them closely to the Anglicans, is not very accurate.

[3] Martène, *Ampliss. Coll.* viii. 162.

others. At the Reformation some of the Protestant leaders, who perceived the use that might be made in controversy of the alleged existence of a sect which had maintained a "pure" religion and resisted the authority of Rome for many centuries, made overtures to the Vaudois, and in 1530 their deputies, Masson and Morel, met Oecolampadius and Bucer at Basle. According to Dupin, these last engaged the deputies to renounce some of the more extravagant of their tenets—*e.g.* that a Christian might not lawfully swear, that ministers might not hold property, and that the ministrations of wicked pastors were invalid; and, on the other hand, to hold with the Protestants that the Body of Christ was not in the Eucharist, and that confession of sins was unnecessary. But the complete adoption by the Vaudois of Protestant doctrine is said not to have taken place till about 1630.

Such is the view which authentic history presents of the rise of the Vaudois and of their original doctrines. The modern popular view, which represents them as a race of primitive manners and simple piety, dwelling in remote Alpine valleys, and clinging to a Scriptural and Protestant religion, handed down from the first ages, in the teeth of continual persecution, appears to be founded in great part on a falsification. Soon after the Reformation broke out, "their whole history, and a part of their written documents, were subjected to a process of re-casting—just as already some older writings had been re-fashioned in a Hussite sense, owing to contact with the circle of Hussite sects." [1] For particulars of this falsification ("*Fälschung*") we must refer the reader to the Protestant writer just quoted, who states that no existing Vaudois MS. is of date earlier than the fifteenth century, although many were made to appear to have been written in the twelfth.

In 1655 the Duke of Savoy sent troops against the Vaudois, who were said to have spread themselves outside the limits to which they were confined by treaty. Great excesses were reported, and were denounced by the indignant Muse of Milton in the well-known sonnet beginning "Avenge, O Lord, Thy slaughtered saints." Cromwell interposed vigorously, and the Duke was obliged to grant the Vaudois favourable terms. At the present day they are said to number about 30,000; a large place of worship was built for them at Turin, chiefly by English money, in 1853.

(Fleury; Innocent III. "Epist.," PL, cxiv.; Alanus de Insulis, in Migne, vol. 204; Bernardus Abbas Fontis Calidi, PL, cxx.; "Chronicon Urspergense"; Rainerius, "Summa de Catharis et Leonistis"; Martène, "Amplissima Collectio"; Dupin, "Auteurs Ecclésiastiques"; Herzog, "Die romanischen Waldenser," 1853; Jane L. Williams, "Short History of the Waldensian Church," with preface by Dr. Gilby, 1855; Milman, "Latin Christianity," v.; Möhler, "Kirchengeschichte," ii. 627; Weber in "Cath. Enc.")

[1] Herzog, p. 398.

VALENTINE, SAINT. There are at least three saints of this name mentioned in the martyrologies for Feb. 14. The Flaminian gate of Rome (Porta del Popolo) was called in the Middle Ages the gate of St. Valentine, from a church in the neighbourhood dedicated to one of these saints. It is probable that the popular customs connected with St. Valentine's day have nothing to do with the saints themselves, but only with the date of their feast, which occurs about the time when birds are said to begin to mate. In pagan days boys drew the names of girls, in honour of the goddess Februata Juno. (Alban Butler, "Lives of the Saints," Jan. 29, Feb. 14; Thurston in "Cath. Enc."; the notes of the commentators on "Hamlet," act iv. scene 5, "Good morrow, 'tis Saint Valentine's day," &c.). "St. Francis of Sales severely forbade the custom of Valentines, or giving boys, in writing, the names of girls to be admired and attended on by them; and to abolish it he changed it into giving billets with the names of certain saints for them to honour and imitate in a particular manner" (Butler, Jan. 29).

VALENTINIANS. [See GNOSTICISM, p. 382.]

VANNE, ST., CONGREGATION OF. This congregation, of which the famous commentator Calmet was the chief literary ornament, was in a flourishing state at the outbreak of the French Revolution. Its houses were then suppressed, and it has not since been revived. [See BENEDICTINES; MAURISTS.]

VATICAN COUNCIL. This council met on December 8, 1869. No general council had been held for three hundred years, and the author of the article on Trent in Herzog's "Encyclopaedia," writing only about seven years before the bishops met in the Aula of the Vatican, speaks of another general council as a moral impossibility. Yet it is easy enough to see that the events of half a century had been preparing the way for the General Council of 1869. The interference of statesmen with the freedom of the Church had turned into a dead letter the law (Concil. Trid. sess. xxiv. "De Reform." c. 2) which requires Provincial Synods to be held every three years. The same cause would also have proved an obstacle, and probably an insuperable one, to great assemblies of the bishops at Rome. But the revolution which stripped the Church of her wealth certainly left her freer in action. The first Provincial Synod which had been known for long assembled at Tuam in 1817, and its decrees were confirmed at Rome. It was followed by the

National Synod of Hungary, held at Pressburg in 1822. But it was from the United States that the revival of Provincial Councils really came. There were Provincial Synods of Baltimore in 1829, 1833, 1837, 1840, 1843, 1846, and 1849. Pius IX., early in his Pontificate, urged upon the bishops the observance of the Church's law. Soon, no fewer than twenty provincial councils had assembled in France; Austria and Hungary followed the example in 1858 (Synods of Vienna and Grau), Holland in 1865 (Synod of Utrecht), and numerous synods were held in Germany, in England just after the hierarchy had been restored (1850), in Ireland, in Australia, and in South America (Quito and New Granada). Even the Catholics of the Oriental rites were affected by the movement. Syrians, Maronites, Armenians met in council, and the last Council of the Armenians at Constantinople in 1869 deserves special notice. In Italy, on the other hand, political troubles made the number of Provincial Councils very small. Nor was this revival of synodical action the only preparation for a General Council. Pius IX. had three times seen a vast number of bishops gathered round him—viz. at the definition of the Immaculate Conception, at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs, at the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Since the Second Lateran Council of 1139, Rome had never witnessed such an assembly of bishops as this last one. Nor was it simply the fact of these unions which led the way to the General Council in the Vatican. It is evident now that the chief definition of this Council—viz. that of the Papal infallibility—came as the result of forces which had been long at work. The French universities had disappeared in the storms of the Revolution, and Gallican principles were dying out in France itself. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, where, owing to the influence of the Governments, Gallicanism had found, even late in the last century, such representatives as Tamburini, Bishop Solari, Fontani, Palmieri, Degola, Bishop Clement of Barcelona, &c., it was now wholly extinct. Many of the Provincial Councils and the bishops in their assemblies at Rome had held language which showed that a proposal to define the Pope's infallibility would meet with no opposition among the majority. With the German Catholics it was otherwise. There many of the clergy were still educated at "mixed" universities—many of the Catholic professors had already manifested their distrust of the "Roman" theology, and some of them had come into collision with the Roman Congregations. They clung, in the supposed interests of science, to methods different from those which prevailed at Rome. And even in France there was a party, small in numbers, but strong in talent and character, which was attached to liberal principles in politics and distrustful of Roman interference in such matters. They had fought the Church's battle for freedom of instruction, and they were unwilling to admit that the appeal they had made to the principles of freedom and toleration was after all only an *argumentum ad hominem*. Ultramontanism then prevailed throughout the Church, but it was opposed by a small band of Catholic "liberals" in France, and by a number of learned men in Germany. The former advocated the interests of freedom, as they understood it; the latter, those of philosophy, history, and theology, as they understood them. There were, besides, Catholic statesmen in both countries who saw danger to the State in a definition of Papal infallibility.

Pius IX. first imparted his idea of convoking a General Council to the cardinals of the Congregation of Rites in December 1864; and shortly afterwards he consulted all the cardinals who resided in Rome on the matter. They were requested to submit to the Pope their opinions, in writing, on the opportuneness of such a convocation, and the subjects which, supposing the Council opportune, ought to be discussed. Nineteen advised the convocation, two were against it, one was doubtful. In March 1865, five cardinals (Patrizi, Reisach, Panebianco, Bizzarri, Caterini) were appointed to consider the votes sent in, and these, with the addition of some other cardinals and of consultors, were formed into a Congregation of Direction (Cecconi, "Storia del Concil. Vatic." lib. i. cap. 1). In April and May a circular was addressed to thirty-six bishops, begging their opinion on the subjects to be treated (*ib.* Doc. iii.), and letters were also addressed to the Nuncios at the various Courts, asking them to find theologians fit to act as consultors in the preliminary congregations (*ib.* Doc. iv.). Next year, in February and March, certain Oriental bishops and bishops of the Greek rite in the Austrian Empire were also consulted (*ib.* Doc. vi. and vii.). All these consultations were made in the strictest confidence. On June 4, 1867,[1] Cardinal Caterini wrote to all the bishops present for the centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. He added a list of seventeen questions on points of discipline, and invited suggestions on other matters (*ib.* Doc. ix.).

At last, in the same month, the Pope announced in a public Consistory of some 500 bishops his intention of convoking the Council (*ib.* Doc. x.), and by a bull of June 29, 1869 (*ib.* Doc. xxxvi.), the Council was summoned to meet at Rome on December 8, 1869. Meantime, in September of the previous year, "all bishops of the churches of Oriental rite not in communion with the

[1] So Schneemann, *Kanones und Beschlüsse des Vatikan. Concils, Einl.* p. xv. The date in Cecconi—viz. June 6, 1863—must be a slip.

Apostolic See" (*ib.* Doc. xxxvii.) and all "Protestants and non-Catholics" (*ib.* Doc, xxxviii.) were invited to attend. There was some thought of addressing a similar invitation to the Jansenist bishops in Holland, but it was resolved not to do so (*ib.* vol. 1, p. 119 *seq.*). It was intended that these Oriental bishops should be allowed no part in the Council till they professed the Catholic Roman faith whole and entire; and it was explained in a letter to Archbishop, afterwards Cardinal, Manning that the Protestants were only invited to attend that they might be referred to "experienced men," and have their difficulties solved. No effect followed from these letters to Orientals and Protestants except a few protests (Friedrich, "Geschichte des Vatikan-Concils," i. p. 723 *seq.*). Besides the Commission of General Direction, mentioned already, the Pope nominated six special commissions—for Ceremonial, the Relations of Church and State, the Churches and Missions of the East, the Religious Orders, Dogmatic Theology, and Discipline. Each consisted of a cardinal-president and of consultors from all parts of the world. Vercellone, Theiner, Tarquini, Franzelin, Schrader, Peronne, Gibert, Freppel, Hefele, Haneberg, Hergenröther, Alzog, Molitor, Moufang, Hettinger, Feijje, were among the consultors. Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman was asked to be a consultor, but declined on account of bad health. It was the duty of these special congregations to prepare "schemata"—*i.e.* drafts of canons and decrees for the consideration of the Fathers. Their members were bound to absolute secrecy.

Till the Council met nothing was said by anyone in authority of any intention to define Papal infallibility. But attention was roused by statements in the French correspondence of the "Civiltà," February 6, 1869 (reprinted in Cecconi, Doc. cxl.). In this Jesuit organ, published at Rome, and believed by many to possess very high authority in the Roman Court, it was stated that the Council would probably set its seal to the condemnations of the Syllabus; that the bishops would define the Pope's infallibility by acclamation, and that the corporal assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven would be made an article of faith. This was the occasion soon after of the famous articles in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung," which afterwards appeared in the form of a book entitled "Janus." It professed to be written from a Catholic point of view, but was in reality a bitter attack on the Papacy. In April 1869 Prince Hohenlohe, Foreign Minister in Bavaria, sent a circular to the European Governments warning them of the political dangers which the Council might cause (Friedrich, *ib.* i. p. 774), and in September twenty-two of the German bishops assembled at Fulda laid before Pius IX. their fears as to the consequences in Germany should Papal infallibility be defined. This document was undoubtedly despatched to the Pope, but Cecconi, after laborious search, could not find it in the Roman archives (Cecconi, part i. vol. ii. sect. i. p. 479).

The time of convocation was drawing near, and Pius IX. in a brief "Multiplices inter," November 27, 1869 (*ib.* Doc. lii.), arranged the order of business at the Council. The preparatory commissions had done their work, and were to be replaced by new ones. The Pope appointed five cardinal-presidents; viz. Reisach (who died shortly afterwards and was replaced by De Angelis), De Luca, Bizzarri, Bilio, Capalti; a secretary—viz. Bishop Fessler of St. Pölten—and a deputation of members of the Council, who were to examine proposals made by the bishops. Four other deputations, for Dogma, Discipline, Religious Orders, and Oriental Rites, were to be chosen by the Fathers of the Council, but each was to be placed under a cardinal-president nominated by the Pope himself. The schemata drawn up by the preparatory commissions were to be printed and distributed to the Fathers. The bishops might send proposals to be examined by the new directive deputation. These new schemata or proposals, if approved by it, were also to be printed and circulated among the bishops some days before the discussion on them began. Bishops who wished to speak on any subject must notify their intention at least a day before. They were to do so in order of rank, and, after they had ended, others might obtain leave to speak from the presidents. If there was no prospect of agreement, schemata, according to their subject-matter, were to be referred to the special commissions for revisal, and then voted upon in general congregation. Finally, the canon or decree was to be read in the Pope's name in solemn session; the Fathers were to answer "Placet" or "Non placet"; the Pope was to announce the result, and, in case of acceptance by the Council, to confirm its decision by Apostolic authority. The Council opened on December 8, 1869. There were 719 members present and by March of the following year as many as 764. Of these 120 were archbishops or bishops *in partibus infidelium*, now called titular prelates, and 52 were abbots, generals of orders, &c. (From the lists in Schneemann.)

Much time was spent in discussions on discipline, the preparation of a Short Catechism, &c., which have issued as yet in no definite result. The work actually finished consists of two constitutions—one, "De Fide Catholica," made up of chapters and canons on the primary truths of natural religion, on revelation, on faith, and the connection between faith and reason; the other "De Ecclesia Christi," treating chiefly of the primacy of the Roman See, and

defining the Pope's immediate authority over all Christians. The former constitution passed with comparatively little difficulty. It was unanimously accepted by the 667 Fathers present, and confirmed by the Pope in the third public session, April 24, 1870.

Very different was the fate of the second constitution. We have seen that nothing had been said, at least publicly and by authority, before the Council met, of any intention to define the Pope's infallibility, and Cecconi (lib. i. cap. i.) assures us that of the cardinals first consulted by the Pope—*i.e.* in 1864—two only even mentioned the subject. Scarcely, however, had the Council met when a "postulatum" representing the views of the great majority of the Fathers begged that the question should be proposed for decision. On the other hand, in January 1870, forty-five German and Austrian bishops, thirty-two French, joined by three Portuguese and four Orientals, twenty-seven from nations of English speech, seventeen Orientals, and seven Italians, begged the Pope to prevent the discussion. (Original texts in Friedrich, "Documenta ad Illustrandum Concil. Vatic." Abth. i. pp. 250, 251, 254, 256.) At the same time, outside the Council, a protest was made by Döllinger as well as by the French Minister Daru and the Austrian von Beust, supported by the Bavarian, Portuguese, Prussian, and English Cabinets. Archbishops Deschamps of Malines, Manning of Westminster, Spalding of Baltimore, and Bishop Martin of Paderborn were prominent on the side of the majority; while the learned Hefele, who was promoted to the bishopric of Rottenburg in November 1869, Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar in Slavonia, Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, Darboy, archbishop of Paris, Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, Maret, bishop *in partibus*, Kenrick, archbishop of St. Louis in the United States, and Clifford, bishop of Clifton, were strenuous supporters of the opposition.

New complications arose from a document issued by the cardinal-presidents at the wish of the Pope on February 20, 1870. Complaints were made of the way in which the discussions were protracted, and accordingly new arrangements were devised. In the discussion on any amended schema no one was to take part without giving notice beforehand of that particular portion of the said schema on which he meant to address the Council. Further, at the request of any ten Fathers, the presidents might ask the Council if they desired the discussion to proceed, and if a majority said no they might close it there and then. This led more than a hundred prelates to protest, in a document addressed to the presidents, that by these regulations "the freedom of the Council might seem in several respects to be impaired, nay, destroyed" ("minui imo tolli posse videatur"). They implored that nothing should be defined except with the moral unanimity of the Fathers, and appealed to the example of Pius IV. at the Council of Trent. Otherwise they feared that "the character of the Oecumenical Council might be exposed to doubt" ("oecumenici concilii character in dubium vocari possit." Text in Friedrich, Abth. i. p. 258 *seq.*). It must be remembered, however, that the whole discussion was extended over seven weeks. The points at issue must have been perfectly familiar to those with whom the decision lay, and the majority could not be expected to tolerate a protracted discussion which had no real influence on opinion, and only served to obstruct definition.

Early in May the schema "De Ecclesia," with the added clauses on Papal infallibility, was laid before the Council, and the conciliar discussion upon it began. On July 13 it was voted upon in general congregation; of the Fathers present 451 said "Placet," sixty-two "Placet juxta modum"—*i.e.* they were ready to accept the constitution with modifications, but not as it stood; eighty-eight said "Non placet"; seventy did not vote at all. In the last general congregation the Fathers protested against the calumnies of the press, especially against the report that the Council was not free. In a letter to the Pope fifty-five bishops declared that their mind was unaltered, but that they meant to absent themselves from the public session. This was held on July 18. The bull "Pastor Aeternus," containing the constitution "De Ecclesia" and the definition of Papal infallibility, was read. Thereupon 533 answered "Placet," the two others—viz. Bishop Riccio of Ajaccio and Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock—"Non placet." The Pope then confirmed the decree by Apostolic authority. On that same day Napoleon III. declared war against Prussia. On September 20 the Italians possessed themselves of Rome, and by a brief of October 20 the Pope prorogued the Council. It has never been reassembled.

In the articles on FAITH and on the POPE we have said something on the meaning of the Vatican decrees, and in that on OLD CATHOLICS we have spoken of the opposition made to them. No single bishop refused assent, and for that and other reasons a schism of any considerable magnitude was impossible.

(The histories of the Council by Cecconi and Friedrich resemble in more points than one those of the Tridentine Council by Pallavicino and Sarpi, with this notable difference that Sarpi wrote before Pallavicino, while Friedrich takes care to write after Cecconi, and to use his materials. Neither historian has reached the actual assembly of the Council. Cecconi had access to the Vatican archives, so that his work [first part published 1873] will always

be indispensable. But it has already exceeded 3000 pages large octavo; it is filled with much irrelevant matter, is badly written and badly arranged. Friedrich's first volume [1877] is well arranged and interesting, and does not, so far as we can test it, alter the facts; but it is disfigured by a vehement invective against the Roman Court and Ultramontanism in general. For the actual history of the Council Friedrich's collection of documents [1871] was useful but incomplete, and has been replaced by the fuller collections of Bishop Martin [1873] and the Protestant Friedberg [1871]. The Jesuit Father Schneemann [1871] has prefixed a short history of the Council to his edition of its decrees, and there is another brief history by the learned Protestant Frommann [1872].

The most complete collection is by Schneeman and Granderath, "Acta et Decreta S. Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani," 1892. See also Granderath and Kirch, "Geschichte des Vatikanischen Koncils"; Manning, "The True Story of the Vatican Council"; Vacant, "Études Théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican.")

VEIL (*velum*, a covering). Pagan customs in regard to the use of the veil cannot here be considered, but we shall endeavour to give some account of the various kinds of veil recognized in the Catholic ritual for covering either things or persons. Three Eucharistic veils were in use in the ancient Eastern Church: the paten veil for covering the bread before consecration, the chalice veil [*q.v.*], and a very thin transparent veil for covering both paten and chalice. The offertory veil (*offertorium*) was used, according to the ritual of the Church of Sarum,[1] in various parts of the ceremonial of High Mass. It seems to be the same as the humeral veil [*q.v.*] with which the subd acon now covers the chalice at High Mass, and which is also used at Benediction [BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT]. Magri (quoted in Morone) says that in Spanish churches from the first day of Lent a veil is drawn before the high altar while the hours are recited, and during Mass on ferias; it is withdrawn at the Gospel and the elevation of the Host. On Wednesday in Holy Week, when in the "Passion" the words occur "et velum templi scissum est," the veil is withdrawn and no more used. Rock (iv. 257) speaks of the *velum quadragesimale* used in old England during Lent till Holy Thursday. It was drawn aside at the Gospel of the Mass each day, and during the whole day of double feasts.

The nuptial veil or *flammeum*, as is well known, was in use among the Romans. St. Ambrose speaks of a veil (*pallium*) stretched over the heads of the bride and bridegroom during the celebration of marriage, with a mystical significance.[1] This custom was observed in the Sarum Rite. If neither the bride nor the bridegroom had been married before, a pall called the "care-cloth," was held over them by four clerics. Children born before marriage were placed under this cloth as a sign of legitimation according to the canon law. (Rock, iv. 201.)

As the consecration of a virgin to Christ is a sort of spiritual marriage (1 Cor. vii. 34; 2 Cor. xi. 2), the veil was early used at this ceremony. [See NUN.] (Rock, i. 36, 329–334; iii. 81; iv. 50, 218, 225, 257–262.

VENERABLE. [See CANONIZATION.]

VENI, CREATOR. [See HYMNS.]

VENI, SANCTE SPIRITUS. [See HYMNS; also SEQUENCE.]

VENIAL SIN. [See SIN.]

VERONICA. [See CHRIST, PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF.]

VESPERS. [See BREVIARY.]

VESSELS, SACRED. [See CHALICE; PATEN; PYX, &c.]

VESTMENTS. (1) *Their Distinctive Character.*—It was the common belief in the Middle Ages that the vestments used by the Church at Mass and other services were derived from the Jewish temple, though Walafrid Strabo had a better notion of the historical aspect of the question, and affirmed ("De Reb. Eccles." c. 24) that Christian priests in the early ages officiated in the common dress of daily life. Strabo's view (with a modification to be mentioned presently) is confirmed, to use the words of Dr. Rock, "by the concurrent testimony of writers who have bestowed much laborious research upon the investigation of this subject" ("Hierurgia," p. 414). No quotation can be adduced from any author of the first five centuries which so much as alludes to any difference in form between the dress of priests at the altar and of laymen in common life. True, St. John (Polycrat. apud Euseb. "H.E." iii. 31, v. 24; St. Jerome ("Vir Illustr." 45, PL, xxiii. 659) and St. James (Epiphan. "Haer." lxxviii. 14, PG, xlii. 721) are said to have worn the "shining plate" *πέταλον*, *lamina* (ציץ) of the Jewish high priest; but even were we prepared to accept these testimonies as literal statements of fact, they would not affect the question, for no such ornament has ever found a place in the Church, and the mitre, which comes nearest to this "plate," was unknown, as has been already proved, for centuries after the Apostolic age. But the strongest proof will be found in the articles on the particular vestments. There it has been shown that the ecclesiastical vestments had their origin in the ordinary dress of the Roman empire.[2] It was after the fall of

[1] See the Consuetudinary of Sarum, recently edited in the Rolls series with a translation, in the *Register of St. Osmund*, vol. i. p. 150 *seq.*

[1] Morone.

[2] The alb and girdle, which are really most like Jewish vestments, had a purely secular origin; and the alb is first marked as a church dress by enactments which forbid

the empire that the fashion in ordinary attire underwent a revolution, and the garb once common to all became peculiar to the servants of the altar, till at last the very memory of its original use was obscured. This obscuration was, as we should expect, gradual. Walafrid Strabo, as we have said, in the ninth century understood the true state of the case, and another writer of the same age—viz. Anastasius ("In Vit. S. Stephani," cf. Baron. "Annal." ad ann. 260, n. 6)—was not wholly ignorant of it, for he says of Pope Stephen: "He ordained that priests and Levites should not use the consecrated vestments in common life, but only in the church."

Long, however, before the ecclesiastical vestments were distinguished by their form from those in common use, certain garments were reserved for the officiating clergy, and, though these were identical in form with the ordinary garb, they were often no doubt of costlier material. The Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 12) describe the bishop as clothed in a "shining vestment" (λαμπρὰν ἐσθῆτα μετενδὺς), and we may perhaps take this as evidence for the practice at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century. A little earlier Jerome ("In Ezech." xliv. 17, PL, xxv. 436), speaking of the vestments of the Jewish priests, adds: "Thence we learn that we should not enter the holy of holies with common attire or in any sort of dirty dress, such as will do for daily life, but that we should with clean conscience and in clean attire handle the mysteries of the Lord." It is not easy to decide how far this passage is to be taken literally.[1] Anyhow, we learn from Theodoret ("H.E." ii. 23) that Constantine gave Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, "a sacred dress" (ἱερὰν στολὴν) "of gold thread"—*i.e.* a dress of the common form but of very costly material, and intended exclusively for use in church. It is very uncertain when the blessing of ecclesiastical vestments was introduced, but we find a form for that purpose, very like the one now used, in the Gregorian Sacramentary (PL, lxxviii. 157). The Council of Poitiers, A.D. 1100, can. 4 (Mansi, xx. 1123), forbids anyone not a bishop to give this blessing, and Innocent III. ("Altar. Myst." i. 9) lays down the same rule. It is still in force, though bishops constantly delegate the power to simple priests.

At first the vestments were of one colour—viz. white. Thus, when Pelagius alleged that all splendour in dress was irreligious, Jerome ("Adv. Pelag." i. n. 29, PL, xxiii. 524) charges him with exaggeration, and asks what harm there was in wearing "a tunic particularly clean" (*tunicam mundiorem*); what objection could be made "if bishop, priest, and deacon, and the rest of the clergy, appeared at the administration of the sacrifice in white array" (*candida veste processerit*). So Gregory of Tours ("De Gloria Conf." c. 20) describes the band of "priests and Levites in white vestments." Black was sometimes used in sign of mourning (Theodore Lector, lib. 1, excerpt quoted by Hefele). Even Pseudo-Alcuin, in the tenth or eleventh century, knows only of white vestments, except that he speaks of the scarlet stripes on the deacon's dalmatic ("Divin. Offic." c. 40), and of the use of black vestments during the litany and procession on the Feast of the Purification (c. 7). Innocent III. is the first to mention four colours—viz. white, which the Roman Church employs on feasts of confessors, virgins, and on joyful solemnities generally; red, used on the feasts of martyrs, of the cross (though then perhaps white is to be preferred), and on Whit-Sunday, by some also on All Saints, but not by the Curia Romana, in which white is the colour; black, used in penitential seasons and Masses for the dead; green, used on common days, because "midway between black and white." He regards violet, which is now the penitential colour, as a mere variety of black, and says the former was used on Holy Innocents and Laetare Sunday. So scarlet and saffron-yellow (*coccineus et croceus*) are varieties of red and green. Rose-coloured vestments, he says, were sometimes used on feasts of martyrs, and yellow ones on feasts of confessors ("Altar. Myst." i. 65). At present yellow counts as white, and rose-coloured vestments are only used at solemn Mass on the third Sunday in Advent and the fourth in Lent.

Bishops, when they celebrate pontifically, take their vestments from the altar, simple priests put them on in the sacristy. But this distinction is probably not very ancient, for even in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it was the common custom for priests, at least in England, to vest in the sanctuary. (Maskell, "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," p. 219). The present law on the use of vestments at Mass is very strict, and many theologians (see Benedict XIV. "De Miss." iii. 7, 1) believe that no cause whatever will excuse a priest from observing it. (The chief recent authorities are Bock, "Gesch. der Liturg. Gewänder": Hefele, "Beiträge," ii. p. 150 *seq.*; Wharton Marriott, "Vestiarium Christianum"; Braun, "Die Liturgische Gewandung" and in "Cath. Enc."; Montault, "Le Costume Ecclésiastique," "La Construction &c. des Églises," liv. x., Les Ornements.)

VESTMENTS, GREEK AND ORIENTAL. Something has been said on this subject already in the account given of the various vestments used in the Latin Church, but it may be convenient to give a separate article on the vestments of the Greeks and Orientals.

1. *Vestments worn by the Deacon.*—In preparing to officiate at Mass, the first vestment

clerics to use the same alb in common life and in church. Jerome (Ep. 64, PL, xxii. 612) gives Fabiola an elaborate account of the Jewish vestments, but never alludes to the use of analogous vestments in church.

[1] It is clear, however, from the passage quoted further on in this article, that Jerome was familiar with the use of special vestments by the clergy in church.

which he puts on is the στοιχάριον or στιχάριον. It answers to our alb, except that it is not bound by a girdle. It used to be of linen and always white, but now it is often made of silk. It takes its name from the stripes (στίχοι) with which it is adorned. In Lent, except on the Annunciation and Holy Saturday, it is of purple colour. It is used by all the Orientals. The Syrians call it Kûtino (ܟܘܬܝܢܐ = χιτών, and that again is really a Semitic word, cf. כְּתֹנֶת), and the Copts, according to Daniel, *labat* or *touniak*. It is also worn by readers and subdeacons. In form it has come to resemble our dalmatic, though worn, like the alb, immediately over the cassock. Next comes the ὡράριον or stole (see under that word), the distinctive badge of deacons, and lastly the ἐπιμανίκια, (cuffs), a barbarous compound of ἐπὶ and *manus*. They stretch from the wrist to the elbow, leaving the hand free. They are first mentioned by Balsamon in the twelfth century, and have apparently been adopted by the Syrians.

2. *Priest's Vestments.*—The priest puts on the στοιχάριον, then the ἐπιτραχήλιον, which is a stole broader than the deacon's and joined in front, next the ζώνη or girdle, the ἐπιμανίκια, the ὑπογονάτιον or ἐπιγονάτιον, a square piece of cloth which hangs from the girdle and is really proper to bishops, archimandrites, and other dignitaries, such as protosyncelli, protopopes, &c., but is in matter of fact worn by very many priests. Over all he puts the chasuble (φελώνιον, φελώνης, φαινόλιον), in shape much like one of our Gothic chasubles.[1]

3. *Bishop's Vestments.*—Bishops also use the above vestments. But their στοιχάριον is marked with white and red stripes, and they have a picture of Christ on their ἐπιγονάτιον and ἐπιμανίκια. Their chasuble is marked with many crosses and called πολυσταύριον. The σάκκος, which has sleeves, and, to judge from the woodcut in Daniel, resembles a dalmatic in shape, was at first worn by metropolitans only instead of the chasuble, and by them only on the three great festivals. From the time of Alexius Comnenus it became the habitual substitute for the chasuble with metropolitans, and now it is worn in Russia by all bishops. Lastly, the bishop takes the ὠμοφόριον, a sort of pallium made of wool, which is hung on the shoulders and falls over the back. At some of the functions, but not at Mass, bishops wear a monastic cloak called μανδύας. The word, which is said by Hesychius and Eustathius to be of Persian origin, occurs in the LXX (*e.g.* Judges iii. 16), and a MS. Greek lexicon quoted by Schleusner explains it as a "sort of upper garment and the cloak of monks" (εἶδος ἱματίου καὶ τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν πάλλιον). The mitre (κίδαρις) is never worn in the sanctuary except by the Patriarch of Alexandria. Greek bishops have no ring, but they wear a pectoral cross (τὸ πανάγιον) and use a pastoral staff (πατερήσσαν), which, however, is much shorter than those customary in the West and much less ornate.

(Daniel, "Cod. Liturg." tom. iv. p. 375 *seq.*; Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," 405-408; "The Lesser Eastern Churches," 147, 271, 315, 344, 378, 434.)

[1] The Greeks have no change of colours for the feasts. The φελώνιον of the priest and the στοιχάριον of the deacon are black at Masses of the Dead, and purple, as we have seen, is used in Lent. Great feasts are marked by the splendour of the vestments.

VETO. (I forbid.) (1.) The right to exclude a cardinal or other candidate for the Papacy, on the ground that his election would not be pleasing to certain governments which claimed to have the right. These were France, Austria, and Spain. The veto was required to be exercised before the decisive vote was given. It was frequently exercised during the eighteenth century by each of the powers named: in 1721 by Germany (Austria); in 1730 by Spain; in 1758 by France. Exclusion both by Austria and Spain is recorded by Wiseman ("Last Four Popes," Gregory XVI. ch. i.). A recent striking instance was the exclusion of Cardinal Rampolla by Austria in 1903.

The Popes have frequently repudiated this right of interference in the freedom of a conclave, *e.g.* Pius IV., Gregory XV., Clement XII., Pius IX., and finally Pius X. The last-named, in the constitution *Commissum nobis*, imposes upon the cardinals an oath never to accept from any civil power the office of proposing the veto. The origin of this so-called right is obscure. Of course influence exercised by the civil rulers (Roman emperors) in ancient and mediaeval times is well known. This, however, has no direct connection with the right claimed by the different powers in modern times. (Sägmüller, "Die Papstwahlbullen und das staatl. Recht der Exclusive in der Papstwahl," and in "Cath. Enc."; Thurston, "The Intervention of the State in the Papal Elections" in *Month*, October, 1903.)

(2.) The royal veto in the appointment of bishops, especially in England and Ireland. [See EXEQUATUR.] At the time of the proposed union between the parliaments of England and Ireland, Pitt was anxious to make some provision for the support of the Catholic clergy. In return he insisted that no priest whose loyalty the king should have reason to suspect should be appointed to a bishopric. At first a certain number of the Irish hierarchy had no objection to this; but on their action being questioned by the Roman authorities they agreed with the other bishops in rejecting any attempt to interfere with the absolute freedom of election. As is well known, Pitt's promises come to nothing. When the subject of Catholic Relief came up again for discussion, there was

a division of opinion between the Irish and the English bishops, the former being strongly against any veto, the latter, with the exception of Milner, being in favour of it. Appeal was made to Rome, and the secretary of Propaganda, Mgr. Quarantotti, declared that securities for the loyalty of the bishops might be allowed. (Feb. 15, 1814.) It should be remembered that the Pope (Pius VII.) was at this time in captivity. As soon as he recovered his freedom he repudiated Quarantotti's action. Cardinal Litta, prefect of Propaganda, however, admitted that names might be submitted to the king's ministers, who might state whether any of these were obnoxious or suspect (April, 1815). Thus the controversy was not set at rest. It continued until emancipation, pure and simple, without any conditions, was obtained in 1829. (Charles Butler, "Memoirs of the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics"; Milner, "Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics"; Wyse, "Hist. of the Catholic Association in Ireland"; O'Riordan in "Cath. Enc."; B. Ward, "Eve of Cath. Emancipation," vol. ii., a temperate statement of the controversy.)

VIATICUM. Holy Communion given to those in danger of death. Such persons are allowed to receive the Communion even if they are not fasting, and they may do so again and again in the same illness, if circumstances render it expedient. Viaticum is given by the parish priest, or by another priest deputed by him. The priest, wearing surplice and stole, carries the Blessed Sacrament in procession; lights are borne in front, and a bell is rung to excite the devotion of the faithful. In non-Catholic countries it is, of course, impossible to carry out all this ceremonial. A special form is used in administering the Sacrament—viz. "Receive, brother [or sister], the viaticum of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ. May He guard thee from the malignant foe, and lead thee to eternal life!" Afterwards the priest cleanses his fingers in a little water, which the sick person drinks.

(1) *The Origin of the Name.*—The word 'viaticum" came into Church use as a translation of the Greek ἐφόδιον. This latter word means provision for a journey; then, metaphorically, provision for the journey of life (Clem. Rom. Ep. i. 2; Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. "H.E." iv. 23). Next the metaphor was extended to the provision for the last journey—viz. from this world to the next—and so it occurs as an epithet of the Holy Communion given in the Council of Nicæa (can. 13) to the dying. There the Eucharist is said to be the "last and most necessary viaticum" (τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου). Innocent I. ("Ad Exsuper."; Mansi, "Concil." iii. 1039) employs the Latin word "viaticum" in the same sense, and so does the First Council of Orange, A.D. 441 (can. 3; Mansi, vi. 437), with an evident allusion to the canon of Nicæa. Thus it became a technical term for Communion given to the dying. (So Council of Agde, A.D. 506, can. 15; Mansi, viii. 327; Bede, "H. E." iv. 14; Amalar. "Eccl. Offic." iii. 35.) But even late in the Middle Ages the word had not acquired its present fixed and exclusive sense. The Council of Vaison, A.D. 442 (can. 2; Mansi, vi. 453), speaks of the viaticum, meaning, probably, the absolution and Communion of the dying; and in the Council of Gerunda, A.D. 517 (can. 9; Mansi, vii. 550), it certainly includes absolution. Aubespine, indeed, in his note (*ad loc.* 554), takes it to mean simply reconciliation and absolution granted to dying penitents —the "benedictio beatifica," as the Council of Barcelona, A.D. 541 (can. 9; Mansi, ix. 110), calls it. Hence the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage (can. 78; Mansi, iii. 957) has the expression "Viaticum Eucharistiae," to distinguish it from "viaticum" in the other sense. The term was also applied to the Eucharist generally, as our support in our earthly pilgrimage; and we find it so employed not only in the liturgy of St. Mark (ἐφόδιον, Hammond, p. 191), but even in a synod of Durham early in the thirteenth century (Wilkins, "Concil." i. p. 578).

(2) *Viaticum in One or Two Kinds.*—In the third and fourth centuries we have clear instances of Viaticum given under the form of bread only (Dionys. Alex. apud Euseb. "H. E." vi. 44; the contemporary Life of St. Ambrose, by Paulinus, n. 47). There can be no reasonable doubt about these cases, and Bossuet ("Communion sous les deux espèces," P. 1, n. 2) seems to be quite right in taking can. 76 of the Fourth Council of Carthage as evidence that Communion was given in the form of wine to dying persons who were unable to swallow the host ("infundatur ori ejus Eucharistia," Mansi, iii. 957). Still, Chardon (280) considers, and with reason, that the rule was to give Viaticum under both kinds, so long as those in health received Communion in this way. Chrysostom's letter to Innocent (Mansi, iii. 1089) shows that the Eucharist under the form of wine was reserved for the sick. He complains that the soldiers spilt the Precious Blood on Holy Saturday, and this cannot have been in the chalice at Mass; for women, he says, were waiting for baptism, which preceded the Mass of Holy Saturday. The Eleventh Council of Toledo, A.D. 675 (capit. 11), the direction in the Gregorian Sacramentary ("Oratio ad visitandum infirmum"), and three forms for administering Viaticum given from ancient MSS. by Menard in his notes on this Sacramentary, all assume that the dying man will receive under both kinds. The same thing follows from Bede's "Life of St. Cuthbert" (cap. 39).

(3) *The Minister of Viaticum.*—In the early days of persecution it was sometimes

carried to the sick by laymen (Euseb. "H. E." vi. 41). The practice apparently continued long after, when it had become a mere abuse. For Leo IV. (847-55) strictly forbids priests to send it by laymen or women (Mansi, xiv. 891). About the same time, we find Hincmar of Rheims requiring his deans to ask whether the priests gave Communion to the sick with their own hands, and not through anyone they could get to do it for them ("per se, non per quemlibet," Hincmar, Opp. ed. Sirmond, p. 716, PL, cxxv. 779). The Council of Ansa, near Lyons, A.D. 990 (Mansi, xix. 101) permits no one except priests to give Viaticum. Deacons, however—at least, in some places—continued to do so. This is proved, according to Chardon, by the old statutes of the Carthusians; and a Council of Westminster, A.D. 1138 (can. 2; Wilkins, i. p. 415), puts priests and deacons precisely on the same level in this respect ("per sacerdotem aut diaconum, aut necessitate instante per quemlibet").

(4) *Rites and Ceremonies, &c.*—No special legislation, so far as we know, exempted the dying from the rule of fasting before Communion. But history witnesses to the anxiety of the Church in all ages that the dying should communicate, and we may fairly assume that the present rule was in force from the beginning. The ceremonies, much as we have them now—*e.g.* the wearing of the stole, the cross and lights in the procession, the carrying of the pyx, the bell—are prescribed in the Constitutions of St. Edmund of Canterbury, A.D. 1236; in the Council of Durham, to which we have already referred; and in a provincial council of Scotland in the time of the Scotch King Alexander II. (Wilkins, "Concil." i. pp. 579, 615, 637). On the other hand, we doubt if the special form in which Viaticum is now given was usual in the Middle Ages—"Accipe, frater, Viaticum," &c. The Gregorian Sacramentary simply says: "Then let him [the priest] give Communion with the Body and Blood of the Lord;" and the Salisbury Manual—*i.e.* Ritual—of 1543 (reprinted in Maskell, "Monument. Rit." vol. i.) has merely a Rubric to the same effect. The three forms given by Menard from old MSS., and also a fourth from a Soissons Manual printed only eighty years before his time, would be suitable for ordinary Communion. However, a Bangor Pontifical of the thirteenth century contains the form as we now use it—"Accipe, frater, Viaticum corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi," &c. (Maskell, *loc. cit.* p. 81). Viaticum, in the modern Church, is given before Extreme Unction. In the Middle Ages the reverse order obtained, as Menard (*loc. cit.* p. 536) proves by a multitude of authorities, and such was the order followed in the English use till Queen Mary's time. The importance of receiving the Communion while the mind is still clear and calm is the reason given by theologians (Juenin, "De Sacram." p. 588) for the order now laid down in the Roman Ritual. For non-fasting Communion of the sick, see COMMUNION, p. 207. (Chardon, 277 *sqq.*; O'Kane, "Notes on the Rubrics," &c., ch. xiv.)

VICAR-APOSTOLIC. By this was formerly meant either a bishop or archbishop, generally of some remote see, to whom the Roman Pontiff delegated a portion of his jurisdiction; or an ecclesiastic, not necessarily a bishop, who, acting under a Papal brief, or in virtue of instructions received from the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, was commissioned to exercise the episcopal jurisdiction (except in certain special cases) in a diocese where the ordinary, from whatever cause, was incapacitated from its full and efficient discharge. At the present day, vicars-apostolic are nearly always titular bishops [see that article], and are stationed either in countries where episcopal sees have not yet been established, or in those where the succession has been interrupted. On the vicars-apostolic in England, see ENGLISH CHURCH, p. 299. (Taunton.)

VICAR CAPITULAR. [See BISHOP, p. 83.]

VICAR FORANE (*foraneus = qui foris est*; one exercising authority *at a distance* from the place where the bishop resides). A vicar forane is either a dignitary or, at least, if possible, a parish priest, who is appointed by the bishop to exercise a limited jurisdiction in a particular town or district of his diocese. An appeal lies from his decision to the bishop, who can also remove him at pleasure. "The chief part of the office of a vicar forane is to report to the bishop on the lives of the clergy within his district, and to inquire into any charges brought against them; to promote the observance of the synodal constitutions and the decrees of the bishop; to preside at local conferences, in which moral or liturgical questions are treated of; and to give notice to the bishop of anything contrary to faith and good morals, or tending to impair the Divine worship, the reverence due to churches, the observance of holidays, and the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, which may occur within his district; finally, to decide civil causes of slight importance" (Soglia, "Instit. Canon." ii. § 71). The fourteenth decree of the first Council of Westminster, on Vicars Forane, is in general agreement with the above, but adds that it is their duty to "take care of sick priests, to watch over the administration of Church property, and to see that sacred buildings be kept in repair." The council treats the title "Vicar Forane" as equivalent to "Rural Dean." There are vicars forane in many Irish dioceses, but almost their sole function is to grant episcopal dispensations for the non-publica-

tion of banns. (Ferraris, *Vicarius Foraneus*; Taunton, *Rural Dean.*)

VICAR-GENERAL. This official has succeeded to much of the power formerly exercised in a diocese by the archdeacon [ARCHDEACON]. In the canon law he is styled indifferently "officialis" and "vicarius generalis" and the common use of the term in Italy is conformable to this state of the law. In Transalpine countries the name of "official" is commonly given to the ecclesiastic administering the *contentious* jurisdiction of the bishop, and that of "vicar-general" to him who exercises his *voluntary* jurisdiction [JURISDICTION].

The origin of the office is supposed to be traceable in a Papal Constitution, promulgated in the Fourth Lateran Council, by which Innocent III. authorized the appointment by any bishop who was overburdened by the weight of his episcopal duties of an ecclesiastic to assist him in performing them. Yet since no allusion to such an office occurs in the Decretals, compiled some years later under Gregory IX., it would seem that the permission granted at the Lateran Council was not for some time much acted upon. However, before the end of the thirteenth century vicars-general had become common, and the "Sext" of Boniface VIII. minutely regulates their functions.

A bishop is not obliged to appoint a vicar-general if the circumstances of the diocese are such that he is able to discharge all his episcopal duties without assistance. On the other hand, the bishop may, if he pleases, appoint two or more vicars-general, either assigning to each jurisdiction over a certain district, or giving to one the contentious, to another the voluntary jurisdiction, or, thirdly, making over to them joint and full jurisdiction over the whole diocese *in solidum*. The person appointed must be a clerk, not a layman, but the law does not require that he should be in Holy Orders; the modern practice of the Curia, however, obliges him, if possible, to have a doctor's or some other degree in canon law. No regular belonging to a mendicant order can be appointed to the office. A regular canon or a monk may be a vicar-general, if certain conditions be fulfilled. It is held to be desirable that, as far as possible, the office should be committed to an ecclesiastic belonging to another diocese, but in fact this is seldom the case.

In matters of jurisdiction the vicar is regarded as the ordinary, and his tribunal is identical with that of the bishop, so that there is no appeal from the one to the other. But he is bound to keep carefully within the limits of his commission; thus he may not do any of those things which come under the definition of "Pontificalia," and belong to the episcopal order, such as making the holy oils, consecrating churches, altars, chalices, &c. Nor may he decide anything without a special mandate, which it may be reasonably presumed the bishop could not have intended to entrust to him by his general commission. For instance, although his commission warrants him to do all *formal acts* required in the institution of ecclesiastics to benefices, offices, or dignities, it does not authorize him to *confer* any of these; to do so lawfully he must have a special mandate. He cannot summon a synod, nor convoke the chapter, nor visit the diocese; "and generally, in business of an arduous and weighty nature, he cannot act without consulting the bishop."[1] The powers of a vicar-general cease and determine—(1) when his commission is cancelled by the bishop; (2) upon his death or resignation; (3) when, from whatever cause, the bishop's own jurisdiction in the diocese ceases. (Soglia, "Instit. Canon." ii. §§ 69, 70; Ferraris; Taunton.)

VICE-CHANCELLOR. [See CURIA ROMANA.]

VIENNE. The fifteenth General Council was opened by Clement V. at Vienne, in Dauphiné, on October 16, 1311. Great uncertainty prevails as to the number of members present, and the number of bishops and mitred abbots is variously estimated at 114 and 300. The Pope in his address at the opening gives three reasons for the assembling of the Council—viz. the affair of the Templars, the rescue of the Holy Land, the reform of abuses in the Church.

The investigation of the charges against the Templars took a long time, and nearly six months passed between the first and second sessions. The order, as has been already said in a previous article [see TEMPLARS], was suppressed by a Papal bull, but no definite judgment was passed on the crimes laid to the charge of its members. The French king, Philip the Fair, did not succeed in obtaining the condemnation of Pope Boniface VIII., but a decree of Clement in 1307 had annulled the excommunications, interdicts, &c., issued by Boniface against Philip and his supporters, and secured them from any prejudice in the future.

The rest of the decrees of the Council were partly dogmatic, partly disciplinary. John Peter de Oliva, a Franciscan (born in Provence 1247, died 1297), belonged to the "Spiritual" party in his order, was an admirer of the abbot Joachim, the author of the "Eternal Gospel," and himself wrote a fantastical commentary on the Apocalypse. It was with reference to him that the Pope in Council condemned the opinions that the soul is not "in itself and essentially the form of the human body," and that Christ was still living when his body was pierced with the lance, and declared it the more probable view that sanctifying grace and the virtues are infused into the souls of

[1] Soglia

children at baptism. The immoral Quietism of certain of the Beghards and Béguines was also reprobated, particularly their doctrine that man may become absolutely perfect, and attain perfect beatitude in this life; that a perfect man is free from subjection to the ecclesiastical or civil law, and may commit the grossest offences against the moral law without sin.

The following were the chief disciplinary decrees.[1] The "black" monks and nuns were forbidden to indulge in luxurious and worldly habits (*e.g.* hunting, attending the courts of princes, wearing silk or jewellery, being present at balls, &c.). An attempt, not altogether successful, was made to heal the schism in the Franciscan order caused by the "Spirituals." The clerics, who were rectors of hospitals, were reproved for neglecting the poor and enriching themselves from the funds entrusted to them. For the future such institutions were to be placed under good and prudent men, who were to submit their accounts to the Ordinary. This, says Fleury, was the origin of the lay administrators of hospitals, established "to the shame of the clergy." Many secular prelates were anxious that the exemptions, granted to religious orders, should be withdrawn. This was not done, but religious were forbidden under pain of excommunication to give Extreme Unction, Holy Communion, or the nuptial benediction without express leave from the parish priest. They were also forbidden to beguile lay people from attending the services in the parish church. Regulations were made on clerical decorum, and on the age for orders. A subdeacon must be at least in his eighteenth, a deacon in his twentieth, a priest in his twenty-fifth year. The bull of Urban IV. instituting the feast of Corpus Christi was repeated and confirmed. Steps were taken to promote the study of the Oriental languages, a measure which Raymond Lully had desired long before. Chairs of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic were to be established in the Roman Court and in the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. Lastly, a crusade was proclaimed for the recovery of the Holy Land; the Kings of England, France, and Navarre promised to take part in it, and a tithe was to be levied for six years to defray the expense. The third and last session ended on May 6, 1312. (Fleury, "H. E." livr. xci.; Hefele-Leclercq, vi.)

VIGILIUS. [See THREE CHAPTERS.]

VIGIL. Originally the watch kept on the night before a feast, and then, from the eleventh or twelfth century (Probst, "Brevier- und Brevier-Gebet," p. 176), the day and the night preceding a feast.

(1) The practice of spending the night in public prayer is probably older than Christianity, for Eusebius ("H. E." ii. 17) attributes it to the Therapeutae or Alexandrian Essenes. In Acts xx. 7 we have an instance of devotional exercises continued at least till midnight. Vigils are mentioned by Tertullian ("Ad Uxor." lib. ii. 5,[1] PL, i. 1296), and the vigil maintained till "cock-crow" on Holy Saturday is prescribed in the Apostolic Constitutions (v. 19). Chrysostom speaks of the observance of vigils as a proof of piety (Hom. iv. in illud "Vidi Dominum," PG, lvi. 120: *ἴδε πένητας ἐκ μεσονυκτίων μεχρὶ τῆς ἡμέρας παραμένοντας, βλέπε παννυχίδας*); and Socrates ("H. E." vi. 8) refers to the nocturnal hymns and vigils of Catholics and Arians at Constantinople in the saint's time. We learn from Basil (in Ps. cxiv.) that vigils were held before the feasts of martyrs, and it appears from Theodoret ("H. E." ii. 10) and Socrates that such vigils were the usual preludes to Mass on Saturday and on Sunday, or other feasts. Jerome (Ep. cix., PL, xxii. 907, and "Adv. Vigilant." n. 9; cf. Ep. cxlvii.) defends the custom against Vigilantius, admitting, however, the grave immorality by which they were sometimes accompanied. It was probably these and other abuses which led to the discontinuance of the devotion. Gautier, bishop of Poitiers, prohibited vigils within his diocese in 1280, and it seems from the language of the Papal legates at the Council of Valladolid in 1322 that the old use was dying out. St. Charles forbade the keeping of any vigil except that before Christmas, and at present the Matins and Lauds and the midnight Mass before that feast are the only relics of the old custom. (See Thomassin.)

(2) *The Fast on the Vigils.*—The statement in Smith and Cheetham that "the observance of a vigil by fasting came to be usual not later than the ninth century" is inaccurate, or at least misleading. Holy Saturday was kept as a fast from very early times (see "Const. Apost." v. 18; also HOLY WEEK and LENT); and Augustine (Ep. lxv., PL, xxxiii. 234) considered it a crime to break the fast on the vigil of Christmas in those churches where it was observed. But it was in the Middle Ages that the obligation of fasting was extended to vigils generally. Peter Damian (Opusc. lv. "De Vigil." al. Ep. lib. vi. 35) insists that the vigils of the birth of St. John the Baptist, St. Philip and St. James, St. James the Greater, St. Bartholomew, of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and the Assumption, are fasting days. Nay,

[1] A memoir, drawn up at the Pope's request by William Durand, bishop of Mende, gives an appalling picture of the state of the Church. He mentions particularly the want of all observance in monastic orders, the immorality of the monks and clergy, the venality of the Roman Court, the way in which benefices were kept vacant, &c. He pleads for reform in the Curia and among the clergy, and proposes that priests should be allowed to marry.

[1] There is, however, no reason to suppose that he is alluding to vigils in the strict sense—i.e. to public prayer at night.

he even contends that the law of fasting binds on the vigil of the Epiphany, because there is a Mass for the vigil in the Gregorian Sacramentary. Lanfranc, on the other hand, excepts this last vigil ("Decret. pro Ord. S. Benedict." PL, cl. 451), and this is the rule which has actually prevailed. Innocent III., writing to the Archbishop of Braga, says the Roman Church fasted on the vigils of all the Apostles, except on that of St. John the Evangelist (excepted because of Christmas), and St. Philip and St. James, excepted because of Easter. This letter has been incorporated in the canon law ("Decret." lib. v. tit. xlvi. cap. 2, "Consilium nostrum"). Such is the present law of the Church, apart from indult or dispensation, with regard to the vigils of the Apostles. On March 9, 1777, Pius VI. exempted English Catholics from the obligation of fasting on all vigils except those of the Assumption, SS. Peter and Paul, and All Saints, substituting the fast on the Wednesdays and Fridays of Advent. (See the new edition of "The Provincial Councils of Westminster," p. 199.) Fasting is also obligatory by the Church law on the vigils of Christmas and the Assumption, and by custom which has the force of law on the vigils of Pentecost, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, St. Laurence, and All Saints (Meratus, s. 3, c. 7, n. 1).

(3) *The Mass and Office of Vigils; their Translation, &c.*—The Office used to be identical with that of the Feria till Pius V. introduced the Gospel from the Mass of the Vigil with a homily appended (Gavant. s. 3, c. 7, n. 5). Probably Corpus Christi has no vigil because introduced after vigils in the original sense had fallen into disuse. Greater vigils—*i.e.* those of Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost—are celebrated with semi-double, that of Christmas from Lauds onwards with double rite. If a feast with a vigil falls on Monday, the vigil and fast are kept on Saturday.[1] This rule is laid down by Innocent III. (*loc. cit.*), but was evidently not yet established shortly before, under Alexander III. ("Decret." lib. v. tit. xl. cap. 14, "Quaesivit a nobis"). (From various sources, chiefly Thomassin, "Traité des Jeûnes," P. I. ch. xviii.; P. II. ch. xiv.)

(4) The custom of watching the bodies of the dead before burial (wakes) is in itself a most laudable one and is very ancient. We may reasonably presume that the office of the Dead, which until recently consisted of Vespers, Matins, and Lauds, without day hours, grew out of the practice of passing the night in prayer beside the corpse. But such nocturnal watching easily degenerated into feasting and excesses of all kinds. (Thorpe, "Ancient Laws and Institutes of England," 448; Wilkins, "Concil." ii. 706.)

[1] This does not apply to the Mass and Office for the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany.

VINCENT OF PAUL, ST., SOCIETY OF. This society, which exists for the purpose of helping the poor, was founded at Paris in 1833. At that time a number of Catholic students, attending lectures in Paris, were brought into contact with students of various ways of thinking—Materialists, Deists, St.-Simonians, Fourierists, &c.—with whom they discussed subjects of common interest in a "Conférence d'Histoire," or historical club. One of these Catholic students was the well-known writer Frédéric Ozanam. The free-thinkers were wont to allow that Christianity *had* certainly accomplished great things, but they maintained that its ancient spirit had fled, and that great practical enterprises could no longer owe to it either their inspiration or their vitality. "What do you *do*?" they asked of the Catholics. "You are full of talk and theory, but there it ends." The taunt sank into the mind of Ozanam and others; they meditated, prayed, exchanged ideas; at last, at a meeting attended by five or six friends, after much had been said as to the benefit which works of charity would confer both on themselves and on the poor, some one (it was never ascertained who) cried out "Let us found a Conference of Charity." This was in the spring of 1833. But the particular mode of commencing their operations was a matter of difficulty. It was decided to go to Sister Rosalie, who at that time was superior of the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul, and obtain from her the addresses of some poor families whom the members of the new conference could visit. This was done, and M. Bailly, an excellent layman, who was in intimate relations with many of the Paris clergy, was asked to be their president. He accepted the post, and provided the conference with rooms to meet in. Eight young students—Ozanam, Letaillandier, Devaux, Lamache, Lallier, Clavé, and two others—held the first conference in May 1833. The orders for relief to be given to the poor who were visited were in the first place purchased by the members from Sister Rosalie. The conference chose St. Vincent of Paul for its patron. Bailly was a parishioner of the curé of St. Étienne du Mont, M. Faudet, who sanctioned and favoured the new work among the poor of the parish. After a time rules for the conduct of meetings and the administration of relief, with appropriate "considerations" attached to them, were drawn up by M. Bailly and adopted. The objects of the new institute were stated to be—"(1) to encourage its members, by example and counsel in the practice of a Christian life; (2) to visit the poor and assist them when in distress, as far as our means will permit, affording them also religious consolations . . . (3) to apply ourselves, according to our abilities and the time which we can spare, to the elementary and Christian instruction of poor

children, whether free or imprisoned . . .; (4) to distribute moral and religious books; (5) to be willing to undertake any other sort of charitable work to which our resources may be adequate, and which will not oppose the chief end of the society."

In 1835, the conference having been joined by many new members, the question of dividing it into sections, which should serve as new centres whence the work of charity among the swarming poor of Paris might be carried on more effectually than before, came on for discussion. The division was warmly opposed by many; at last, however, it was resolved upon, and thus a step was taken which facilitated and foreshowed the ultimate extension of the labours of the society to other cities and other lands. The new sections themselves were after a time called "Conferences," and the aggregate of the conferences formed the "Society of St. Vincent of Paul."

The movement originated among laymen, and the administration of the society has always been in lay hands, but in union with and subordination to the clergy. Its lay character is said to have much favoured its extension at the particular time when it arose, when it was enough for a society or enterprise of any kind to have an ecclesiastic at its head to be denounced in the press and the *salons* as an "œuvre jésuitique."

The members devote themselves to visiting and relieving the poor, and in order to do this effectually many special works of charity have been organized by it. Among these are libraries, clothing depôts, crèches, boarding out with farmers, visits to prisons and hospitals, and finding work for labourers and women out of employ. On urgent occasions the society will grant extraordinary help; thus it sent money for the relief of the terrible Irish distress in 1847 and 1848.

Soon after the division of the first conference, the presidents of the different conferences began the practice of meeting in council from time to time; thus was formed the "council-general." Other councils—*c. centraux, c. supérieurs*—arose as they were required. In 1853 the members of the Paris conferences were 2,000 in number, having 5,000 families inscribed on their visiting lists. The society had even at that time spread to England, Ireland, Spain, Belgium, America, and Palestine. Indulgences were granted to it by Popes Gregory XVI., Pius IX., and Leo XIII. The last-named Pope speaks of it in terms of the highest praise in his Encyclical "Humanum Genus" on the Labour question.

The society was introduced into England in 1844, mainly through the exertions of Frederick Lucas, Pagliano, and William Amherst (afterwards a Jesuit). The total number of active members is about 100,000, and there are as many honorary members. ("Vie de Frédéric Ozanam," 1879; "Manual of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul," 1896; "The Formation of the Soc. of St. Vincent of Paul in England," by W. J. Amherst, S.J., 1899.)

VINCENTIANS. [See LAZARISTS.]

VINCENTIAN CANON. [See TRADITION, p. 813.]

VIRTUE. The common scholastic definition of virtue, drawn from various passages of St. Augustine's writings, runs thus: "A good quality of the mind whereby a man lives rightly and which no one uses wrongly, which God works in us without our aid." The last clause, however, as St. Thomas observes, does not belong to virtue generally, but serves to distinguish infused from acquired virtue. A shorter definition would be, "A habit of right conduct." Virtue is a habit. A man who restrains himself upon a particular occasion does not necessarily possess the virtue of temperance; a temperate man is one who has the permanent disposition of being moderate. Virtue may, like a habit, be acquired by repeated acts, or may be straightway infused by God. Supernatural virtues can, of course, be only infused. St. Thomas divides the virtues into three great classes: intellectual, moral, and theological. The first class, which includes wisdom, knowledge (scientia), and understanding, need not detain us here. The moral virtues are called "principal" or "cardinal" on account of their generality and importance. These two classes embrace all the natural virtues. The theological virtues are supernatural, and are so styled because they relate immediately to God. [See CARDINAL VIRTUES; THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES.] (St. Thomas, 1ª 2æ, qq. 55–67.)

VISION. In the ecclesiastical sense a vision is the supernatural appearing of the Deity, or angels, or saints, or even of the devils and the damned. It is not a mere subjective imagination of these, but their objective reality. Vision is often used as synonymous with apparition; but it is better to take these words as expressing two different aspects of the same fact: vision being reserved for the subjective aspect, and apparition for the objective. The appearances from the other world in dreams are not properly visions. [See DREAMS.]

Holy Scripture is full of instances of supernatural appearances, from the early chapters of Genesis to the final chapter of the Apocalypse. These Biblical visions will not be dealt with here except for the purpose of illustration; but just as in the case of other miracles, so it is hard to see how a person can readily accept all the visions recorded in Scripture, and yet deny with scorn all recorded in the history of the Church. possibility of such appearances being vouched for by Holy Writ, the belief in ecclesiastical visions is merely a question of evidence. In the processes of Canonization the visions seen by the saints are inquired into with the greatest

care, and none are admitted unless upon the strongest evidence. (Benedict XIV., "De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Canonizatione," iii., c. 50.) The Church, however, does not command us to accept them as matters of faith. To reject them systematically would indeed be rash; but they are still subject to respectful examination according to the rules of historical criticism, like other miraculous incidents. Many examples of this examination are to be found in the present volume. [ROSARY, SCAPULAR, &c.]

On the appearances of the Deity, the so-called Theophanies, see TRINITY (β). On those of the Angels see that article. In the case of our Lord and His Blessed Mother, as their bodies have already been raised to life, these bodies are actually seen when they appear. Thus, the Apostles saw the actual risen body of Christ (Lk. xxiv. 39, &c.); and what St. Paul saw was the same glorified body (1 Cor. xv. 8 &c.). In the case of saints who have appeared, various explanations have been given. (St. Thomas treats of the subject in several parts of his "Summa"; *e.g.* appearances of our Lord, 3^a, q. 54, a. 1, q. 57, a. 6; on the appearances of angels, 1^a, q. 51, a. 2; on the appearances of human beings, 1^a, q. 89, a. 8, $2^a\,2^{ae}$, q. 95, a. 4, q. 174, a. 5, Suppl. q. 69, a. 3. See the theologians in their commentaries on the Angelic Doctor. Also Forget in DThC, *Apparitions*; Kaulen in "Kirchenlex." *Erscheinung*; Sehram, "Theol. Myst." 484 *sqq.*)

VISIT TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. The daily visit to a church in order to engage in silent prayer before the Blessed Sacrament is a practice common in all religious houses, and ascetical writers recommend the custom to persons living in the world. This devotion, natural as it is on Catholic principles, was not familiar to Christians in the early or even the Middle Ages. Fr. Bridgett, in his learned work on the "History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain" (new ed. Thurston, 169), does produce instances—*e.g.* from the earlier part of the Middle Ages—of prayer made before the altar at a time when, evidently, no service was going on; but there is no express reference to the Holy Eucharist.

In the Greek and most of the Oriental churches to this day there is no cultus of the Blessed Sacrament outside the Mass. The Easterns believe in the Real Presence just as we do. The chalice containing the Holy Eucharist is kept in a small tabernacle on the prothesis or on the altar. The priests do not genuflect to it or pray to it. Of course they have no Exposition or processions of the Blessed Sacrament.

Thus it is only in comparatively modern times (and not at all in the East) that the abiding presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist has come to be realized in the Church. In all ages it has been believed that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and a sacrament, and that our Lord is ever present in It. But these different aspects have been prominent in different ages. In patristic days the sacramental aspect (Communion) was to the fore; in the Middle Ages, the sacrificial aspect (the Mass); in modern times, the abiding presence (Visits, Exposition, Processions). Perhaps we should rather say that in these latter days we have a fuller realization of all the treasures of the Eucharist than the Church has ever had before. [See RESERVATION.] The subject has aroused considerable interest of late, owing principally to the researches of Father Thurston. (See "The Month," Apr. and Dec. 1907, and in "Cath. Enc."; Corblet, "Hist. du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie"; Raible, "Das Tabernakel einst und jetzt.")

VISITATIO LIMINUM APOSTOLORUM. That it was a duty incumbent on a Catholic bishop to visit from time to time the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul at Rome, in order to honour the institution of Christ in the person of His Vicar, to strengthen his own communion and that of his flock with the living centre of Christianity, and to report the state of his diocese to the Supreme Pastor and Ruler, was a conviction which had been growing in force for centuries, and had found continuous practical expression in those innumerable visits of bishops to Rome which the annals of the Church record. Leo III. (Ep. i.) ordained that bishops should visit the *limina Apostolorum*, but without prescribing anything as to the time. In the sixteenth century the practice assumed the form of a positive law. Sixtus V., by the Constitution "Romanus Pontifex" (1585), ordained that the bishops of Italy, the islands in the Adriatic, and the neighbouring parts of Greece, should be bound to visit the *limina Apostolorum* once in three years; the bishops of France, Spain, England, Germany, and other countries between the North and Baltic Seas, as also of the islands in the Mediterranean, once in four years; all other bishops in Europe and those of Africa, once in five years; and all Asiatic and American bishops, once in ten years. The visit was to be made either in person, or, if a legitimate hindrance intervened, by a suitable proctor or representative.

What was a visit of duty for a bishop was a pious pilgrimage for a clerk or layman, and so good a work that by the sound Catholic feeling of ancient times it was almost raised to the level of a duty. Benedict Biscop, the founder of the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow in the seventh century, visited Rome six different times. Ordericus Vitalis († about 1142), after describing the martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Paul under Nero, says: "Rome, the capital of the world, glories in having for her patrons such exalted saints, to whose temples the faithful resort from all parts of the world, in order that by

the assistance of these powerful advocates they may be protected from all their adversaries and all hostile influences."[1] (Ferraris, *Limina Apost.*; Soglia, ii. § 63; Taunton.)

VISITATION, EPISCOPAL. To visit his diocese, and ascertain the state and progress of religion in every part of it, is of course one of the main portions of that "oversight" which belongs to the bishop's office. The Council of Trent[2] prescribed that all bishops, either in person or by their vicars-general or visitors, should, if the size of the diocese rendered the annual visitation of the whole of it impossible, at least visit every part at intervals not exceeding two years. The aim of such visitations is described as comprehending the maintenance of sound doctrine, the expulsion of heresy, the reformation of morals, the right arrangement of whatever relates both to persons and things ecclesiastical, and the encouragement of the faithful, by preaching and other means, to lead religious and peaceful lives. The visitor, whether the bishop or his deputy, is counselled to eschew vain pomp and show, and to accept no fees or gratifications for any service connected with the visitation except such as are expressly authorized by law. All that the visitor can claim is board and lodging, or (if such be the local custom) the equivalent thereof in money. But if it be the custom of the place or province to give nothing at all, not even board, to visitors, that custom must be respected.

Bishops may in their own right, and also as delegates of the Apostolic See, visit the chapters of cathedral and collegiate churches within their dioceses, and correct what may be found amiss in them.[3] In the decree on seminaries (sess. xxiii. c. 18, De Ref.) it is assumed that these institutions will be frequently visited by the bishops. Benefices with cure of souls, which are annexed to churches, monasteries, &c., as part of their endowment, should be annually visited by the bishop, who should take care that the vicars administering them be reasonably remunerated out of the revenues.[4] When the members of a regular community (except the monastery of Cluny and the houses in which the heads of orders have their ordinary principal residence) have the care of the souls of secular persons, other than their own servants and dependants, they are so far as regards such control subject to the visitation and control of the bishop of the diocese.[5] As delegates of the Apostolic See, bishops are empowered to visit—(1) monasteries and benefices held *in commendam*; (2) hospitals, colleges, confraternities, schools, *monts-de-piété*, and "pia loca" in general; (3) churches *in nullius dioecesi*, or "peculiar," provided that the cathedral of the bishop so visiting be the nearest to the place; if that is a doubtful point, the right of visit belongs to the bishop who has been elected to it by the prelate of the "peculiar" in a provincial council. The results of an episcopal visitation are to be reported to the Sacred Congregation of the Council. (Soglia, lib. ii. § 63; Ferraris, *Visitatio*; Taunton.)

VISITATION, ORDER OF THE. This order was founded at Annecy in 1610 by the holy widow Jane Frances, Mme. de Chantal (who was canonized in 1767), under the direction of St. Francis de Sales, then bishop of Geneva. It was designed by the bishop to be open to widows and ladies of weak health as well as to the young and robust; hence but few corporal austerities were required by the rule, and at first there was no enclosure, so that the religious could freely visit the sick and needy in their own homes. On the other hand, the employment of time and the regulation of the thoughts were provided for in the rule with great minuteness. St. Francis did not wish the religious to be exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and therefore he would not consent to the appointment of a superior for the whole order. The rule of enclosure was adopted in 1618. Many houses of "Visitandines"—so these nuns are called in France—soon arose, and have ever been conspicuous for the order, harmony, and piety which reigned in them. Some few of their convents—*e.g.* Blois and Troyes—resisted the bull "Unigenitus" [JANSENISM], but the great majority showed an excellent spirit. The Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, so well known in connection with the devotion to the Sacred Heart, belonged to this order. At the time of the third centenary of the order (1910) there were 170 convents in various parts of the world.

VOCATION. In its more restricted and special sense vocation is taken for that disposition of Divine Providence whereby persons are invited to serve God in some special state—*e.g.* as ecclesiastics or religious. The ecclesiastical vocation is manifested by the pious desires of the heart, by innocence of life, by the sincere love of Christ, by pure zeal for God's glory and the salvation of souls. That to the religious state, or the perfect practice of the evangelical counsels, comes to souls with a certain pressing invitation, with a strong desire of self-sacrifice and a clear perception of worldly vanity, with a certain attractiveness for intimacy with Christ and for the exaltation of His holy Name. But it is given differently to different persons, and prepares them "powerfully" though "sweetly" for the practice of solid virtue. "If thou wouldst be perfect," said our Lord, "go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor,

[1] *Eccl. Hist.* ed. Bohn, book ii. ch. 3.
[2] Sess. xxiv. c. 3, De Ref. [3] Sess. vi. c. 4, De Ref.
[4] Sess. vii. c. 7, De Ref.
[5] Sess. xxv. c. 11, De Reg. et Mon.

. . . and come, follow Me." But the vocation to the priesthood or to the religious state by no means consists in the mere desire or aspiration on the part of the candidate, or in some sort of revelation made to him by God. All that is required on his part is that he should have a right intention and should be endowed with the qualities of nature and grace fitting him for the office. But this does not give him any right to ordination until he has been freely called by the bishop. "The burden of this great office is not rashly to be imposed on anyone, but only on those who, by sanctity of life, knowledge, faith, and prudence, can sustain it. 'Neither let anyone take to himself this honour but he that is called by God, as Aaron was' (Heb. v. 4); but *they are said to be called by God who are called by the lawful ministers of the Church*; for those who arrogantly intermeddle with and intrude themselves into this ministry, the Lord, it is to be taught, had in view when He said: 'I did not send prophets, yet they ran'" (Jer. xxiii. 21). ("Cat. of the Council of Trent," part ii., ch. 7.) To speak in the terms of the schools: the fitness of the candidate is the material element of vocation, while the formal element is the calling by the bishop.

The subject of vocation has been warmly discussed in recent years. We have not space to go into it here. Suffice it to say that the strong approval granted by Pius X. to Lahitton's book ("La Vocation Sacerdotale"), in which the above views were formulated, has decided the case against those who maintained that vocation consisted in some interior intimation that the person is called by God. (Besides Lahitton see St. Thomas, Suppl. q. 36; Vermeersch in "Cath. Enc." Some account of the controversy will be found in "Revue Pratique et Apologétique," xii. 558 *sqq.*)

VOTIVE MASS. [See MASS.]

VOTIVE OFFERINGS. Objects vowed or dedicated to God or His saints. As pointed out by Newman ("Development," p. 373), votive offerings on recovery from illness or preservation from danger were common in pagan times. They are mentioned by Virgil, Aen. xii. 766; Horace, Od. i. 5, 13; Juvenal, xii. 27. But this fact does not tell against the lawfulness of the practice; it ceased to be pagan as soon as it was accepted and interpreted by the Church. The eighth book of Theodoret's work "Adversus Gentiles" treats largely on the subject, *e.g.* "That they [pilgrims] obtain what they ask in faith their dedications openly witness, in token of their cure. For some bring likenesses of eyes, others of feet, others of hands; some of gold, others of silver; and their Lord accepts even the small and the cheap, measuring the gift by the offerer's ability" (quoted by Newman). A remarkable instance of the taking over of a pagan object and making it Christian is the Navicella at Rome, which is copied from a votive offering made to Jupiter Redux. The objects hung up in shrines abroad are at once testimonies of favours received and marks of gratitude from the donors. We need not remind our readers of the valuable votive offerings made in pre-Reformation days to the shrines of Canterbury, Walsingham, &c. (Jarrett in "Cath. Enc.")

VOTIVE OFFICE. An office recited at discretion instead of the offices fixed for ferial days. Such substitution (especially of Our Lady's office on Saturdays) for the ferial office may be traced back to the early Middle Ages. By a decree dated July 5, 1883, the office of the Angels could be said on Monday; of the Apostles on Tuesday; of St. Joseph on Wednesday; of the Blessed Sacrament on Thursday; of the Passion on Friday; and of the Immaculate Conception on Saturday. These votive offices were abolished by Pius X. (Constit. "Divino Afflatu," Nov. 1, 1911). [See BREVIARY.]

VOWS. A vow is a deliberate promise made to God in regard to something possessing superior goodness. To be valid it must proceed from the free, deliberate will of one who by age and social position is capable of contracting a solemn obligation. It is to God alone that a vow is made, and because, in a special manner, it belongs immediately to God's service, it is an act of religion, or of divine worship. To vow to a saint means to vow to God in honour of a saint. What is illicit or altogether indifferent, or imperfect, or impossible, cannot be the subject-matter of a vow; in the circumstances in which it is taken it must always turn on "the greater good"—"de bono meliori." The vow gives to the actions which it covers a special merit—a merit which St. Thomas derives from a threefold source. First, since a vow appertains to religion or the order of divine worship, it communicates its character to acts of other virtues practised under its control, or elevates them to the rank, as it were, of sacrifice. Secondly, because the offering made to God by the performance of virtuous actions under the obligation of a vow is a much greater offering than the performance of the same without that obligation. In the latter case the bare action is offered; in the former not only the action but the faculty from which it proceeds. Thirdly, because by a vow the will is bound to a virtuous line of action, receiving stability therein not only for the present but for the future. Thus, by being immovably allied to the good by the force of a vow, the will is strengthened to tend to the perfection of virtue. One *can*, however, break through the obligation of his vow; but he *may* not do so—that is, he has the physical but not the moral power of violating the law which

he has imposed on himself. But it must never be forgotten that an action done without the obligation may be and constantly is more holy and pleasing to God than a corresponding action done under vow, because the former may proceed from a more intense love of God. It is on this that the intrinsic perfection of our deeds depends. And an action which is vowed is more perfect than one not so vowed, only if other things are equal.

It is true that by vows the will is limited in its sphere of action; by its promise to God its scope is bounded by a certain special law. Still, for all that, it is none the less free, since true freedom exists only within the range of the virtuous. "The Blessed" are free, though irrevocably confirmed in glory; God, who by His nature is infinitely just, is free; and man under vows is free "by the freedom with which Christ has made us free." Vows certainly do not exempt those who take them from sinning against them; but to say that on that account they ought not to take them is equivalent to saying that, as a rule, one ought not to undertake what is good in itself, lest though his own fault he should violate his purpose; or, for instance, that he ought not to go to Mass on Sunday, lest some accident might befall him by the way.

From the earliest times vows have been taken. Under the old law they are spoken of, among other passages, in Genesis xxviii., Leviticus xxvii., and Deuteronomy xxiii. Christ could not have bound Himself by vow, according to St. Thomas, because He was God, and because His human will was confirmed in goodness. The Apostles are supposed by many to have vowed whatever belongs to the state of perfection when, after having left all, they followed Christ. It is also said of St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles that he had a vow; and, again, that the four men whom he took into the temple to be purified "had a vow on them." As to the special vows of religious life, or "the evangelical counsels" [*q.v.*], as they are called, their substance or subject-matter was marked out by our Lord Himself. These have been observed, at least partially, by individuals or communities since the Apostolic age, and form the basis and substance of the religious state. Vows are of divine institution, but the forms under which they are to be taken in different religious bodies are determined by the legislation of the Church. She admits vows, temporal or perpetual, conditional or absolute, simple or solemn. Vows are solemn because they have been instituted as such and have been accepted as such by the Church.[1] Their obligations are more stringent and their privileges greater than those of simple vows, and form one of the special characteristics of a religious order. According to the law enacted by Pope Pius IX. in 1857, only simple vows are to be taken after the novitiate in all religious orders, and that for the term of at least three years; after which time, if superiors should sanction it, their subjects are entitled to take solemn vows. In the Society of Jesus, according to its constitutions, the novitiate being ended, simple vows, with the approbation of superiors, are taken by its members, and after trials of many years either three public but simple vows or four solemn vows are to be taken by the same members, as their superiors shall decide. In a few convents of the Visitation order in the United States, nuns, after having lived duly under simple vows during five years, are admitted to the profession of solemn vows. The members of all other religious communities of women in the United States take only simple vows. When the subject-matter of vows, or the reason for which they were taken, or the possibility of fulfilling them ceases to exist, they cease to be binding. Their obligation also is cancelled by a dispensation of the Church. To her has been granted by Christ the power of binding and loosing by the words, "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." To the Pope, therefore, as vicar of Christ, belongs the supreme authority through the whole Church of dispensing from vows for legitimate reasons; and under him bishops and religious superiors having quasi-episcopal jurisdiction have the power of dispensing, on just grounds, from the vows of those who are under their spiritual care. What has been said of the dispensation of vows may, according to due measure, be said also of the commutation of them. For dispensations from solemn vows recourse is to be had to the Pope; for dispensations from simple vows, in religious congregations whose rule has received Papal sanction—from vows of chastity, vows of entering religion, and vows of pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, the *limina Apostolorum*, or St. James of Compostela—application is likewise to be made to the Holy See or to a superior specially delegated by it for that purpose. Vows taken in religious associations which have received only episcopal approbation may be dispensed from by episcopal authority. (Ferraris; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, q. 88;

[1] Theologians are much divided on the essential nature of the distinction between solemn and simple vows. It has, of course, nothing to do with the public or private manner in which the vow is made, or the ceremonies which accompany the making of it. A solemn vow implies an absolute and irrevocable surrender, and the acceptance of it by lawful authority. Whereas a simple vow makes marriage unlawful and deprives the person who has made it of the right to use his property, a solemn vow makes marriage invalid and takes away all dominion over property. The vows which Jesuits make at the end of the novitiate annul marriage, but are not irrevocably accepted by the superiors, and therefore are not solemn.

Suarez, "De Religione," especially tr. 6 and 7; the moral theologians and canonists, *e.g.* St. Alphonsus, lib. iv. tr. ii., cap. 3; Ballerini, vol. ii. p. 436 *sqq.*; Craisson, "Manuale Juris Can." iii. p. 629 *sqq.*)

VULGATE. The name is now commonly given to the Latin version of the Bible, authorized by the Catholic Church. In this version all the books found in the Hebrew Bible were translated by Jerome from the Hebrew and Aramaic originals, except the Psalter, which belongs to an Old Latin version revised by Jerome. Judith and Tobias were freely translated by Jerome from the Aramaic (this Aramaic, however, being merely the version of Hebrew originals now lost; see Neubauer, "Book of Tobias," p. xvi). In the rest of the Old Testament books, and in the deuterocanonical portions of Esther and Daniel, we have the Old Latin translation unaltered; the New Testament consists of the Old Latin text revised by Jerome from the Greek. It was only very slowly that this comp site work supplanted the Old Latin which had preceded it, and became known as the Vulgate or common edition. It was the Old Latin which, till the seventh century, was recognized as the Vulgate; and not till the thirteenth, according to Kaulen ("Geschichte der Vulgata," p. 22), was the present use of the word firmly fixed.[1] Jerome himself employs the term (1) of the LXX in contrast with the Hebrew ("In Is." lxv. 20, xxx. 22; Osee vii. 13); (2) of the LXX in the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις—*i.e.* the corrupt and current text, as opposed to the critical text in Origen's "Hexapla" (Ep. cvi. § 2); sometimes (3) of the Old Latin version as made directly from the LXX ("In Is." xiv. 29); (4) of the New Testament in the Old Latin ("In Matt." xiii. 35).

(I.) *The Old Latin Version, or Versions, the Itala, &c.*—This part of the subject is involved in no little obscurity, and the very fact that the most eminent scholars differ on essential points proves that as yet no certainty has been reached. The critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries believed that several translations of the LXX and New Testament into Latin were made in very early times, and that one of these was known as the "Vulgata" or "Communis," because generally received, and again as the Italian version or Itala, from the place of its origin. (So Simon, "Hist. Crit. V.T." livr. ii. ch. 11, A.D. 1680; Hody, "De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis, et Latina Vulgata," p. 342, A.D. 1705; Mill, "Prolegom. in N.T." p. xli, A.D. 1707.) An epoch was made in the criticism of the history by Wiseman. ("Two Letters on some Parts of the Controversy concerning 1 John v. 7.")[1] He maintained that the Latin Church before Jerome had only one translation of the Bible; that this version arose not in Rome or Italy, but in North Africa; that it underwent many recensions or revisions, of which the best and most famous was called by St. Augustine, from the place where it was made, "Itala"; that the saint became acquainted with it at Milan and used it in his works. Every part of this theory was received with extraordinary favour. It was adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and many others. Westcott (article *Vulgate* in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible") considered its truth demonstrated, and Reinkens ("Hilarius von Poitiers," A.D. 1864) thought some courage was necessary to oppose such a strong consent of scholars. We shall see, however, that the number of dissentient voices has increased of late, and some of those who are best qualified to judge reject the whole of Wiseman's arguments and conclusions. We will take the points one by one.

(*a*) *Were there several Old Latin Versions of the whole Bible current in the early Church?* We say of the whole Bible, for it is, we believe, admitted that there was more than one version of Tobias, Maccabees 1 and 2, and of Baruch. A recent authority—viz. Fritzsche (Plitt und Herzog, "Encycl. für Prot. Theol." art. *Latein. Bibelübersetz.*)—follows Wiseman and Westcott,[2] and answers in the negative. Reinkens (*op. cit.* p. 343) believes in several independent versions; so does a very eminent authority—viz. Ziegler ("Lateinische Bibelübersetzungen von Hieron." A.D. 1879, pp. 4–18); so do Rönsch ("Itala und Vulgata" ad init. A.D. 1875) and Kaulen ("Einleit. in die H. Schrift," A.D. 1876), while the tone in Westcott and Hort's New Testament ("Introd." p. 79, A.D. 1881) is much less confident than that of Dr. Westcott in Smith's Dictionary.

This divergence of opinion among scholars is quite intelligible considering the uncertainty of the tradition. Tertullian ("Monog." 11, PL, ii. 946) mentions and censures a rendering of 1 Cor. vii. 39 "si dormierit vir ejus," as current in his time ("in usum exiit"), and again he rejects ("Adv. Prax." 5, PL, ii. 160) the customary translation ("in usu est nostrorum") of the Greek λόγος by "sermo," for which he substitutes "ratio." This seems to show that the African Church about 200 A.D. had one received text, though the possible existence of several translations is not excluded. He speaks ("Adv. Marc." ii. 9, PL, ii. 294) of a translation of the word πνοὴν (Gen. ii.) as given by some ("quidam

[1] Kaulen is no doubt right. Roger Bacon (d. 1284) uses "Vulgata" for the Old Latin. (See the long extract from a MS. of Roger Bacon in Hody, *De Bibl. Text.* lib. iii. P. ii. ch. 11.)

[1] The edition before us is that of Rome, 1835. But the letters had appeared previously in the *Catholic Magazine*. They are reprinted in the Cardinal's Essays, vol. i.

[2] Add Vercellone (*Dissertazioni Accademiche*, p. 19, Roma, 1864), who at least believes in one version "ricevuta e sanzionata per l'uso pubblico della Chiesa" "nei primi tempi della Chiesa."

enim de Graeco interpretantes"; cf. v. 4, "duae ostensiones, sicut invenimus interpretatum"); but this need not carry us further than the fact that one Latin version was in various places emended from the Greek, which is admitted on all hands. Jerome clearly believed in many types of text, many revisions of the same version ("tot exemplaria quot codices," Praef. in Jos., and so Praef. in iv. Evang. ad Damas.), but not in many independent versions. His commentary on Jonas ii. 5 (PL, xxv. 1134) is decisive on this point ("Hoc quod in Graeco dicitur ἄρα et habet vulgata editio *putas* interpretari potest *igitur*"), considering that nothing can be produced from him on the other side.[1] Cassiodorus ("De Inst. Div. Lit." 14) is explicit. "This text [of the New Testament], varied by the translation of many .... was left emended and arranged by the diligent care of the Father Jerome." This can only mean that there was one text which appeared in many recensions, because so many tried their hand at retranslating particular passages from the Greek, while they left the version, as a whole, in its original state. On the other hand, there seems to be no reasonable doubt that St. Augustine attributed the variety of texts to the effect of independent translations. Thus, he says ("Doctr. Christ." ii. 11, PL, xxxiv. 43): "Those who turned the Bible from Hebrew into Greek can be counted, but the Latin translators are innumerable, for in the earliest days of the faith everyone who got a Greek MS. into his hands, and thought he had some little acquaintance with each tongue, ventured to translate." The force of this testimony is broken if we accept Wiseman's explanation of "interpretari," "interpres," as meaning "revise," "reviser," of the same version. But the contrast between the Greek translators and the Latin "interpretes" is fatal to Wiseman's view. Besides, Augustine ("Doctr. Christ." ii. 14, 15, PL, xxxiv. 45, 46) expressly distinguishes between translation and mere emendation. "The skill of those who desire to know the divine Scriptures must be on the watch, that MSS. not emended may give place to such as are emended, provided they come from one class of translation" ("emendatis non emendati cedant, ex uno duntaxat interpretationis genere venientes"; so "Retract." i. 7, 2 and 3, PL, xxxii. 592: "ejusdem interpretationis alii codices," "codices ejusdem interpretationis"). For a more complete discussion we must refer to Ziegler (p. 6).

In ancient then, as in modern times, we find authority ranged against authority, and the proper appeal is to the MSS. of the Old Latin. Here it is only specialists versed in the examination of MSS. and their texts who can claim to be heard. But probably Fritzsche, with whom Westcott and Hort are in accord, is right in the account he gives. In spite, he says, of differences which can only be explained by independent translation of single verses, nay, of "smaller and greater sections," still the fact that the most discordant MSS. fall back again into unity justifies the belief in one single "Vetus Latina," which is the common basis of all the recensions. The differences he noticed may well have led Augustine, who was no critic, to think there had been many independent versions; and, in fact, the instances of difference which he gives are mere variants quite consistent with fundamental unity. (See August. "Doctr. Christ." ii. 12, PL, xxxiv. 43; "Quaest. in Heptateuch." iii. 25.)

(β) *Where did the Old Latin Version* (supposing that there was one only or one commonly received) *arise?* Here, too, no certain answer can be given. Wiseman tried to establish a theory suggested by Eichhorn ("Einleit. N.T." vol. iv. p. 355 *seq.*)—viz. that the "Vetus Latina" arose in North Africa. Westcott and Hort (ii. p. 78), Rönsch ("Itala u. Vulgat." ad init.), Fritzsche still maintain this position, but it has been abandoned by Gams ("Kirchengeschichte von Spanien," i. p. 86 *seq.*), Reinkens ("Hilarius von Poitiers," 335), and Kaulen ("Geschichte der Vulgat." 109 *seq.*). Greek, no doubt, was the official language of the early Roman Church. Clement, Caius (*circ.* 210), Hippolytus, wrote in that tongue; and Pope Victor and the Senator Apollonius are the only Latin authors prior to Tertullian whom Jerome ("Vir. Illustr." 53, PL, xxiii. 661) names. This supplies a probable argument for African origin, since in Africa Greek certainly had not the same currency as in Rome. But it is quite another question whether Greek, even at Rome, was the popular language, and whether the poor to whom the Gospel was preached would not require a Latin version as much as the Christians at Carthage. The inscriptions even at Pompeii and Herculaneum are almost without exception in Latin, and De Rossi's collection of Christian inscriptions in the Lateran Museum leads to the same conclusion (Ziegler, p. 23). Wiseman tried to show that the Old Latin and the Vulgate of the New Testament—*i.e.* the Old Latin or an Old Latin version revised by Jerome—is full of "Africanisms," and this, if true, would settle the question. But Gams (p. 86–100) has simply annihilated this argument. He has shown that every supposed Africanism can be met with parallels from Christian and heathen writers who had nothing to do with Africa. To accept Wiseman's instances, we must suppose that the Latin version of Irenaeus, the Muratorian

[1] We say this advisedly, after careful consideration of Ziegler's references and arguments to establish Jerome's belief in a multiplicity of versions.

fragment, the Latin version of Hermas, were made in Africa; and even this gratuitous assumption would not suffice. The linguistic peculiarities of the Old Latin and Vulgate belong partly to the decadence of Latin, partly to the "lingua rustica," or vulgar language. Even Ronsch, who still appeals to this theory of Africanisms, admits that these "Africanisms" were common to the language of South Italy, and this amounts to a surrender of the argument.

(γ) As to the *date* and *authorship* of the earliest Latin version, we can only say that most of the New Testament books must have existed at the close of the second century, and that the version came from many authors. The latter point was established long ago by Mill ("Proleg." 2 *seq.*).

(δ) *What is meant by the Itala?*—The word as a technical term occurs once only in Patristic literature—viz. in August. "Doctr. Christ." ii. 14, 15, PL, xxxiv. 46. "Among translations let the Italian be preferred to the rest, for it sticks closer to the words and gives a clear sense." St. Augustine must mean some version of Italian origin, for we cannot think Ott's suggestion that "Itala" means simply *the* Latin version in the use of the African Church, or that of Rönsch —viz. that it was written in "the popular provincial dialect of Italy; therefore the name 'Itala'"—even plausible. "Itala" then must mean either a translation or the revision of a translation made in North Italy, and most likely St. Augustine made acquaintance with it at Milan, took it to Africa, and used it in his works. Scholars believe it a translation or a recension, according to the views they take on the previous questions. Fritzsche and (with some hesitation) Westcott and Hort hold it to have been a recension of the original African work. The last two, indeed, regard it as a revision of a revision, for they distinguish between the Old Latin of African origin, a revision of this current in Europe, and a revision of this European text made from Greek MSS. and also with a desire to improve the style. This last, current from about 350, they call the Itala. They think it survives in *f* (Cod. Brixian., vi. Saec., Gospels) and *q* (Cod. Monacens., Saec. vi., Fragments of Gospels), and in St. Augustine's quotations. Ziegler, on the other hand, distinguishes between the version of Tertullian (for the divergence of this author from all known authorities see Hilgenfeld, "Einleit. Nov. Test." p. 798), that of most African writers—viz. Cyprian, Lactantius (educated in Africa), Commodian, Firmicus, Maternus, Primasius; that represented by Augustine, the Italian Fathers, and the Friesingen Fragments of the Pauline Epistles.

(II.) *The Vulgate in the Modern Sense.*—1. *Jerome's Labours:* (a) *In revising the Old Latin.*—Pope Damasus requested Jerome to revise the Latin version of the New Testament, then in terrible confusion, and in A.D. 383 the Gospels, so revised, made their appearance. He tells us ("Praef. ad Dam.") that he corrected the errors of scribes, false emendations, and false translations; that he used for this purpose Old Greek MSS., but left the faults of the old version untouched if they did not affect the sense. To the rest of his revision of the New Testament he has left no preface, probably because so much revision was not needed (see Westcott in Smith). In the same year he made a cursory revision of the Psalter from the LXX. This revision is known as the Roman Psalter, because used in the Roman Church till the time of St. Pius V. It is still retained at St. Peter's and in the Ambrosian rite, in the invitatory Psalm at matins in our own Breviary, and very generally in the Missal.[1] Soon after retiring to Bethlehem in 387, Jerome made a more careful revision of the Psalter from the Hexaplar text (the Roman had been made from the κοινή. See Jerome's "Praef. in Psalm." with Vallarsi's note). This revision is the one in present use. It is known as the Gallican Psalter, because, as it is said, introduced into Gaul by Gregory of Tours (Walafr. Strabo, "De Reb. Eccles." i. 25). He then proceeded to revise all the books of the Old Testament which he recognized as canonical (*i.e.* all except the deutero-canonical ones. See "Praef. ad. Salom. Libr."). It is certain that this revision was completed (in Tit. ii. Ep. lxxi. 5, PL. xxii. 671, cli. 19; "Adv. Ruf." ii. 25, PL, xxiii. 448), but great part of it seems to have been lost in Jerome's own time (Ep. cxxxiv. 2, PL, xxii. 1162), and besides the two revisions of the Psalter the book of Job alone is extant. But we have also the prefaces to Job, Prov., Cant., Paralip., Eccles. (Kaulen, p. 163), and much may be restored from Jerome's commentaries on the Prophets, particularly on the Minor Prophets and on Ecclesiastes (Hody, p. 354 *seq.*).

(β) *Translation from the Hebrew.*—Jerome began to learn Hebrew when forty-five, under a converted Jew, as a remedy against sensual temptation (Ep. cxxv. 12, PL, xxii. 1079). He speaks ("Praef. ad Job" and "In Habac." ii. 15) of a Jew of Lydda whom he hired at great cost, and (Ep. lxxxiv. 3, PL, ib. 745) of a certain Baraninas who came to him by night for fear of his brother Jews. It is this Baraninas who in the silly joke of Rufinus ("Apol." ii. 12), appears as Barabbas. Thus prepared, Jerome began to translate from the Hebrew. The four books of Kings were published first. Then followed the book of Job, the Prophets, and the version of the Psalter from the "Hebrew truth." This last, of which the best edition

[1] It was used till 1808 at Venice in the chapel of the Doge (Kaulen, *Vulg.* p. 160).

is the recent one by Lagarde, has never been admitted to public use. Illness interrupted Jerome's labour, but in 393 he resumed it again, and translated the three books of Solomon. Esdras, Paralipomena, and Genesis appeared between 394 and 396; early in 404 the rest of the Pentateuch had been published; in 404 and 405 Josue, Judges, Ruth, Esther, with the deuterocanonical portions of Daniel and Esther, and the books of Tobias and Judith.[1] No attempt was made to translate or even to revise Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, or Maccabees (Kaulen, p. 168 *seq.*; but see also Westcott in the "Bible Dictionary").

2. *Reception of the Vulgate in the Church.*—Jerome at first met with little gratitude. He had his own reward, for he had lived "to pluck sweet fruit from the bitter root" of Hebrew study, which he again and again had given up in despair and begun afresh "in eagerness to learn" (Ep. cxxv. 12, PL, xxii. 1079). But that for a time was all. He was attacked by those who mistake ignorance for piety—nay, a letter was forged in his name to the effect that he had been induced to pervert the Scriptures by the Jews ("Adv. Rufin." ii. 25, PL, xxxiii. 448). Even Augustine objected to Jerome's translating from the Hebrew, because it was impossible to improve on the LXX (August. Ep. xxviii. 2, PL, xxxiii. 112), and because of the discord a new translation would cause (Ep. lxxi., PL, xxxiii. 242). He admits that the Jews (who were the only persons capable of judging) testified to Jerome's accuracy, but adds that he himself keeps to the prevailing belief in the inspiration of the LXX ("De Civ. Dei," xviii. 43, PL, xli. 603). But gradually scholarship prevailed against prejudice. Cassian ("Collat." xxiii. 9) quotes the Vulgate of Job as the "emendatior translatio," and in the fifth century it was adopted by Eucherius of Lyons, Vincent of Lerins, Sedulius, Claudianus Mamertus, and Faustus Rhegensis (Hody, p. 397 *seq.*), though the Old Latin held its ground in Africa and Britain (Hody, *ib.*). In the sixth century the Vulgate was coming into general use. Cassiodorus ("Inst. Div. Lit." 12) strongly prefers it to the old version, though at a later date St. Gregory the Great ("Praef. ad Job" 5, PL, lxxv. 516) speaks of "the Apostolic see" as using both. In the seventh century St. Isidore of Seville ("Eccles. Offic." i. 12) says "all the churches" used the Vulgate, which must have been true at least of Spain. Early in the ninth century Rabanus Maurus ("Cler. Inst." ii. 54) says the same thing, almost in the words of Isidore; and Walafrid Strabo, the disciple of Rabanus, writes ("Praef. in Gloss. ordinar.") "the whole Roman Church now everywhere uses this translation" (*i.e.* Jerome's). The Council of Trent, in a decree which we shall have to examine further on, declar d the Vulgate to be the authentic version of the Church, and in doing so appealed with good right to the long use of ages.

3. *History of the Text.*—The text of this composite work which we call the Vulgate was exposed to special danger of corruption. Side by side with it stood the Old Latin used for a long time after Jerome's death in many churches, familiar to the scribes, and standing in the most curious relations to our Vulgate—in some books identical with it; in others differing to a slight extent; in others offering an independent translation. Hence "mixed texts" arose in which the Vulgate and Old Latin were confused, when they should have been kept distinct. In 802 Alcuin revised the text with marked success from ancient Vulgate MSS., but without consulting the Greek (Porson to Travis, p. 145). Subsequent revisions were made by Theodulf of Orleans (787–821); Lanfranc, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1089); the Cistercian abbot Stephen II. (1109), and Cardinal Nicolaus (1150). After that, different corporations issued "Correctoria," in which various readings were mentioned and discussed. Such were the "Correctorium Parisiense" (also called "Senonense," because approved by the Archbishop of Sens), the Correctorium of the Dominicans drawn up by Hugo a S. Caro about 1240, and shortly after replaced by another, and that of the Franciscans.

The first printed book was a copy of the Vulgate (Mayence, about 1450), and after 1470 a number of editions appeared, professing to be emended from the original texts (Kaulen, p. 311). In 1516 Erasmus revised the Vulgate New Testament, which he altered partly to bring the text into harmony with his own Greek text, which was of little value, and partly from a desire to improve the style. The really critical work of giving a purer Vulgate text from old MSS. was undertaken by Gumelli (Paris, 1504), the Dominican Castellaer (Venice, 1511), and Laridius (Cologne, 1530). None of these editions is of much account, but valuable contributions to the restoration of a critical text were made by Cardinal Ximenes in the Complutensian Polyglot (1502–1517), and by R. Stephen (1528, many subsequent editions). The Theological Faculty of Louvain entrusted the task of a new critical revision to Henten, of Malines, and his first edition, based on that of Stephen in 1540 and a collation of Latin MSS., was published in 1547. After Henten's death, in 1566, the Louvain theologians resolved to issue a correct edition of the Vulgate, answering to the requirements of the Council of Trent ("Vulgata editio quam emendatissima imprimatur"). With

[1] We take these conjectural dates from Westcott, with whom, however, neither Kaulen nor Fritzsche entirely agrees.

the help of the Antwerp printer Plantinus, and under the guidance of one of their own members, Lucas Brugensis (*i.e.* of Bruges), a great number of MSS. were collated; but their text of 1574 is identical with that of Henten (1547) except that they had added to the number of marginal readings. We must also mention a Lyons Vulgate of 1545, which gives valuable and ancient, readings though without naming the sources.

Meantime, commissions had set to work in Rome at the preparation of an official text, and in 1590 Sixtus V. issued an edition, prefixing to it the constitution "Aeternus ille," in which he ordered it to be used in all discussions, public and private, and to be received as "true, lawful, authentic and unquestioned." Unfortunately, the Pope revised the work of the commission with his own hand, and on principles different from theirs; he called needless attention to typographical errors, by pasting them over with pieces of paper; and nobody was satisfied with the result.[1] In 1592 the definitive edition known as the Clementine (Clement VIII.) saw the light. The printer's work in the first edition of the Clementine was worse done than in the Sixtine Bible, but it had this merit, that it returned to the text fixed by the Roman commissions (Kaulen, "Einleit." p. 126). It was not a perfect text of the Vulgate. The preface disclaims any such exaggerated praise—nay, admits that imperfections had been left "of set purpose," lest offence should be given to the people, as well as for other reasons. But the Clementine editors rightly claim to have supplied a purer text than any hitherto known, and Vercellone ("Dissertaz." iv.) has shown that it is the fruit of long and well-directed toil and of great opportunities. The work of correction was continued for about forty years with few interruptions. The most eminent men from all countries were summoned to take part in the revision: among them Sirlet, Carafa, Bellarmine, Morinus (a critic who has had few equals), Allen, Turrianus, Toletus, Sà (the famous Portuguese commentator), Agellius, whose commentary on the Psalms is still esteemed, especially for its critical remarks on the Alexandrine and Vulgate texts. They used the Codex Amiatinus (A), written about 541 (?); the Codex Paullinus (C), a ninth-century copy of Alcuin's recension; the Vallicellianus (D), a MS. of the same type, but rather older; the Ottobonianus (E, Saec. viii., imperfect at the beginning, and ending with Judges xiii. 20); besides a number of Vatican MSS. Further, they had collations of the Toletanus (B, Saec. viii. according to Westcott, later according to Vercellone) and of another Spanish MS. from Leon. They had the benefit of French readings in the Stephanic edition of 1540 and collations of sixty Belgian MSS. made by Plantinus; and they understood the weight due to ancient authorities. Vercellone tells us they "preferred to every codex" that known as the "Amiatinus," the Queen of Vulgate MSS.[1] Still there were precious MSS., like the Fuldensis of the New Testament (A.D. 546), unknown to them; and textual criticism has advanced a long way since their time. Valuable contributions to the formation of a better text have been made by Vercellone ("Variae Lectiones"), and a distinguished scholar, Bishop Wordsworth, has published a new critical edition of the Vulgate New Testament in collaboration with Dr. White (1889–1905; ed. Minor 1911).

4. *The Critical Value of the Vulgate and its Merits as a Translation.*—The latter point is of course quite distinct from the former. The LXX is a very imperfect translation, but its critical value is very great (Swete, "Introd. to the O.T. in Greek," 440 *sqq.*). We have no Hebrew MSS. older than the ninth century, and those we have represent one single type of text, fixed by the Masorets, or "holders of tradition," who did not finish their work till eight centuries after Christ, and preserved with superstitious care ever since. Again, the earlier Hebrew writing simply gave the consonants of each word, and the vowel points are an invention not completed till the seventh century of our era. We have, indeed, a collection of various readings in our Hebrew Bibles, but as a rule they are of little interest, and the diligent labours of Kennicott and De Rossi at the end of the last and the beginning of this century prove how scanty is the harvest which can be reaped from the most exhaustive collation of existing Hebrew MSS. Most welcome, then, is the light which comes to us from times far before the fixing of the Masoretic text. We find important variations in that Hebrew Pentateuch which the Samaritans received from the Jews about 430, while the Book of Jubilees, a Hebrew work written shortly before the final destruction of Jerusalem, agrees in some of the numbers assigned to the age of the Patriarchs, and in other readings with the Samaritan edition of the Pentateuch. But the LXX offers the fullest and most valuable evidence now accessible on the early state of the Hebrew text. The Pentateuch was translated about 280, and the rest of the version some time before 133 B.C., and we find ourselves carried back at once to a text differing in important respects from that of our Hebrew Bibles. It is not only that we meet with various

[1] Sixtus was himself a scholar, and a more favourable judgment of his edition will be found in a masterly treatise by Mr. Law, prefixed to the last edition of Haydock's Bible.

[1] Mr. Law draws attention to the verdict of Ranke (*Codex Fuldens.* p. 862), one of the highest authorities on the Latin Bible, and himself a Protestant. Ranke rejects as undoubtedly erroneous the opinion of those who think the authorized revision of the Vulgate uncritical.

readings, often strongly commended by internal evidence, but we find certain sections present in the Greek and wanting in the Hebrew, or *vice versa*. These differences are most striking in the books of Samuel and Kings, in Proverbs and in Jeremias, in the last of which no less than 2,700 words of the Hebrew have nothing answering to them in the Greek. The Vulgate of the Old Testament, so far as it is Jerome's work, possesses no such interest as this. His text is far nearer that of the Masoretic, and many scholars have denied it any independent value. It is as close to the Masoretic text, says Eichhorn, as any Spanish MS. from a modern synagogue; and Wellhausen, in his edition of Bleek's Introduction, says much the same thing, in a more guarded way. The true state of the case seems to be put by Nowack ("Bedeutung des Hieron. für die A.T. Kritik," 1875), and the following is a summary of his judgment. Jerome had before him a text with the words divided much as in our modern Hebrew Bibles; it was, however, destitute of vowel points or diacritic marks. His vocalization, compared with that of other versions, was the nearest of all to the Masoretic, and his consonant text very near to it on the whole; for it presents no great omissions or additions like those of the LXX. Still, many of his readings are "indispensable for a correct understanding of the text," especially those which are peculiar to him, or only common to the Chaldee and Syriac versions. The case stands very differently with the Vulgate text of the New Testament. Here we have to deal with two distinct elements: the Old Latin, which forms the substratum, and the corrections due to Jerome. The latter carry us back to the fourth century, when Jerome lived, and beyond that, since he consulted MSS. which were old even then.[1] Hence, as we have no MS. of the New Testament prior to the fourth century, and only two at most which belong to it, the value of the Vulgate for critical purposes may be easily seen. "It represents," says Dr. Westcott, "the received Greek text of the fourth century, and so far claims a respect (speaking roughly) due to a first-class Greek MS." Jerome supplements "the original testimony of Greek MSS. by an independent witness." When identical with the Old Latin, the Vulgate, says the same scholar, has "a more venerable authority," for this translation was "fixed and current more than a century before the transcription of the oldest Greek MS. Thus it is a witness to a text more ancient and *caeteris paribus* more valuable than is represented by any other authority, unless the Peshito in its present form be excepted." This value is much increased by the fact that the extremely literal character of the Old Latin enables us as a rule to restore with confidence the Greek text which the translators read, and though the Old Latin was marred by interpolations, the corruptions proceeded according to a different law from those of Greek MSS., so that "the two authorities mutually correct each other."

We turn next to the merits of the Vulgate as a translation. It is admitted on all hands that Jerome's version from the Hebrew is a masterly work, and that there is nothing like it or near it in antiquity. A perfect work it could not be, and this for the very reasons which may well increase admiration of the measure of success which Jerome actually reached. Few advantages were open to him which are denied to modern scholars. Hebrew had ceased for centuries to be a living tongue, and Jerome, moreover, had to learn it orally: there was no such thing as a Hebrew grammar, or a dictionary, or a concordance. The comparative philology of the Semitic languages, often the only key to the meaning of Hebrew words, is the creation of modern times; and Jerome knew no other Semitic language except Chaldee (Aramaic), and that very imperfectly ("Praef. ad Job"). He made many mistakes now impossible to a tyro of average intelligence who has learnt the elements in a good grammar. For instance, he believed Hebrew to be the mother of all languages (Ep. xviii.; PL, xxii. 366), whereas it is generally agreed that Arabic on the whole comes nearer the primitive form even of the Semitic tongues; that the guttural ע was a vowel (in Osee ii. 16, 17); that the noun צֶדֶק was an adjective meaning "just" (in Is. i. 21); he confuses עָפָר, "dust," with אֵפֶר, "ashes" ("Quaest. in Gen." ii. 14); חֶרֶב, a "sword," with עֹרֵב a "raven" in Zeph. ii. 14). His version tells the same tale as his commentaries. He had no idea of the elementary rules on the construct state (Jer. xxxii. 4; Ezech. xl. 14; Osee x. 4, xiv. 3; Ezech. xxi. 77); he makes a plur. masc. agree with a sing. fem. (Jer. xi. 15), breaks other simple laws of concord and construction (Ezech. xlviii. 10; Is. xii. 7; Zach. iv. 12; Zeph. i. 2); misunderstands the force of tenses (Jer. xliv. 25; Ezech. xi. 16; Joel iv. 4); shows his ignorance of syntax (Jud. viii. 5; Eccles. ii. 3). As a natural consequence of all this, he very often misses the sense in difficult places. We have no room for instances, which would need explanation to those who have no acquaintance with Hebrew; while those who are Hebrew scholars will find them easily enough if they turn, *e.g.*, to Job or the harder parts of the Prophets. We can only explain the excellence of the Vulgate from the fidelity of Jewish exegetical tradition, and the honest industry with which Jerome used it,

[1] It has been often said that Jerome consulted by preference Greek MSS. with a text resembling that of the Old Latin. Mr. Law has shown that this statement is groundless.

No admiration can be too great for Jerome's courage and independence, his thirst for learning, his outspoken candour, his contempt for the ignorant bigotry which he fought and conquered; but they know little of his spirit who, blind to the progress of Hebrew learning, use the very arguments against modern philology which were employed against Jerome by the advocates of the LXX. Little need be said on the translation of the New Testament. It is close and literal, and executed when Greek was a living tongue; and even its faults arise "most commonly from a servile adherence to the exact words of the original" (Westcott).

5. *The Authority of the Vulgate in the Church.*—The Council of Trent, "considering that no small profit would accrue to the Church of God if it be made known which of all the Latin editions of the sacred books in actual circulation is to be esteemed authentic, ordains and declares that the same (*haec ipsa*) old and Vulgate edition which has been approved by the long use of so many ages in the Church itself, is to be held for authentic in public readings, discourses and disputes, and that nobody may dare or presume to reject it on any pretence." A little earlier it had anathematized those who knowingly refuse to accept the canonical books "with all their parts, as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the old Latin Vulgate" (Concil. Trid. sess. iv., Decret, de Canon. Script., Decret. de Edit. et Us. Sacr. Libr.). We shall begin by explaining what the council does not mean, and we shall distinguish points in our interpretation now at least universally admitted from those on which there is still difference of opinion.

First, then, no particular edition of the Vulgate is declared to be authentic; and as a matter of fact neither the Sixtine nor Clementine, nor any other authoritative edition, existed at the time of the decree. The Sixtine edition by implication, and the Clementine expressly, admit that they are not perfect; and if, says Franzelin ("De Traditione et Scriptura," p. 535), we can show that a text of whatever kind, though found in the Clementine edition, is no part of the old Vulgate, that text is not declared authentic by the council. Hence a Catholic is perfectly free to reject the text of the "three witnesses" (1 John v. 7) on this among other grounds, that it formed no part of the primitive Vulgate. "In fact," says Kaulen, an author of unquestioned orthodoxy, "the passage occurs neither in the oldest MSS. of the original, nor in the old versions, nor in the Fathers before the end of the fifth century, and is only to be regarded as commentary on v. 8, venerable on account of its diffusion in the Church" ("Einleit." p. 36). Vercellone, as we shall see presently, goes much further than Kaulen-Franzelin ("De Deo Trino," Thes. iv.) and Scheeben ("Dogmatik," i. p. 757) insist on the necessity of accepting the text, because in any case it is part of the Vulgate as received for many centuries in the Church.[1] We reply that the council does not require us to acknowledge as authentic any text simply because received for many centuries. The Fathers of Trent only bid us receive the Vulgate version which in matter of fact, and with substantial identity of form, has been approved by the long use of the Church.[2] Besides, Pallavicino ("Istoria del Concil. di Trento," vi. 17, n. 5) takes the "long use of ages" to mean from St. Gregory's time; and we have good ground for thinking that the text in question was no part of the Vulgate even then, for it is wanting in the two oldest MSS. (Amiatinus and Fuldensis), written about 545, and in Alcuin's reputed copies at Rome (*prima manu*), and at London (Scrivener, p. 562), as well as in some other MSS. (Wordsworth and White, *in loc.*).

Next, no comparison is made between the Vulgate and versions in other languages—*e.g.* the Peshito—much less between the Vulgate and the originals. The council compares the Vulgate with other Latin versions, and pronounces the former authentic.

Thirdly, the Vulgate even in its purest form is not declared to be perfect. Such perfection was, indeed, attributed to it by some Post-Tridentine theologians, but was utterly denied by many Catholic scholars at the time (Hody, p. 509 *seq.*), and now probably would be affirmed by nobody. Franzelin sets this exaggerated view aside as little better than fanatical.[3]

Fourthly, Franzelin admits the lawfulness of holding that texts directly intended to teach dogmatic truth may have been omitted in the Vulgate; and again that even when such texts are given, considerable alterations may have been made in their form. For example, he grants that we are at liberty in Gen. iii. 15 to reject the Vulgate (or supposed Vulgate) reading, "she shall crush thy head," as an error for "he shall crush thy head"; and similarly, that we may deny the correctness of the rendering "ante luciferum" (Ps. cix. 3), "fundetur" (Lk. xxii. 20), "in quo omnes peccaverunt" (Rom. v. 12), "omnes quidem resurgemus" (1 Cor. xv. 21).

[1] The S. Congregation of the Inquisition decided that the authenticity of 1 John v. 7 "could not safely (tuto) be called in doubt" (Jan. 13, 1897). But afterwards this was explained to mean that only the theological value of the passage was in question. See the *Guardian*, June 9, 1897.

[2] The council regarded the version as the species of which particular copies were the individuals, and approved the former only (Letter of the Cardinal di S. Croce, *apud* Vercellone, p. 85); and desired that the Vulgate should be corrected from the most ancient texts (*ib.* p. 80). This settles the question of 1 John v. 7.

[3] He shows (*De Tradit. et Script.* p. 568) that a decree of the Congregation of the Council (Jan. 17, 1576), which misled many theologians, is of no authority.

Here, however, Franzelin (as also Scheeben and others) makes two reservations. He argues that the decree of Trent requires us to believe that the Vulgate is accurate substantially (*quoad substantiam*) in texts "which are in themselves (*i.e.* directly and in their primary intention) testimonies concerning matters of faith and morals." We confess that we are quite unable to see any sufficient ground for this part of his thesis. No such distinction is made by the council. It is not even hinted at in the important correspondence on the sense of the decree between the Papal legates and the Congregation at Rome, printed by Vercellone ("Dissertaz." p. 79 *seq.*). We can find no trace of it in the elaborate collection of Catholic theological opinions in Hody;[1] while Vercellone's opinion is supported by Vega and Didacus, both of whom were at the council, as well as by Ruggerius and Natalis Alexander (Hody, pp. 511, 520, 522, 545). The distinction which allows us to reject such a reading as, *e.g.*, "she shall bruise thy head," and binds us to accept such a verse as, *e.g.*, "This kind goeth not forth save by prayer and fasting" (Mk. ix. 29), is surely a very subtle one. To determine what texts are directly and primarily dogmatic, and then what changes will affect only the mode in which the doctrine is presented, leaves immense scope for private judgment. Had the council meant to limit criticism, it would surely have expressed itself more clearly. Be this as it may, it is certain that the question is an open one. Vercellone, who was probably the greatest of all authorities on the Vulgate, published his treatise "On the Authenticity of the Single Parts of the Vulgate Bible" ("Sulla Autenticità delle Singole Parti della Bibbia Volgata") at Rome in 1866. This dissertation appeared with the imprimatur of the Master of the Sacred Palace, and in no way lessened the high reputation of its author. He holds that there may be an error of translation even in passages which the Fathers and the Church herself have regarded as dogmatic, and he rejects by anticipation the whole of Franzelin's distinction. Besides the reasons given, he urges that it would need a series of miracles to preserve a text pure in the hands of copyists from all error in dogmatic texts, and the very same reasons which plead for an immaculate translation also plead for a perfect preservation of the text; he points out that we have no right to expect such a miracle, since the versions received for centuries in the East and West contain many variations in passages considered to be dogmatic, with some faults of omission and addition; while all theologians admit that councils may err in the texts they allege in pr of of their definitions, although the definitions themselves are exempt from error.

Franzelin's second reservation concerns sections like Mk. xvi. 9–20; Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11; Jn. v. 4. Many Protestant critics have rejected them as interpolations, but Franzelin is of opinion that they must be accepted by Catholics on the authority of the council which sets its seal to the books of the Bible, as contained in the Vulgate, "with all their parts." The judgment of Vercellone is diametrically opposite. He believes that the words "cum omnibus suis partibus" refer simply "to those deuterocanonical portions which were disputed by the heretics of that age, such as the additions to Daniel and Esther." If criticism showed such sections as Mk. xvi. 9–20, &c., to be apocryphal, he "would have no difficulty in accepting its conclusions," and "would not believe them contrary to the decree of Trent" (p. 46).

What, then, is the meaning of the council? It teaches that the Vulgate contains nothing contrary to true faith and sound morals. This was the great point present to the mind of the Fathers. They were unwilling, the legates write, to abstain from a formal approval of the Vulgate, "which was never suspected of heresy, that being the chief thing in the sacred books" (Vercellone, *loc. cit.* p. 16). But this is not all. The Vulgate is "authentic": in other words, the council assures us that the books in that version "are in substance entire and incorrupt, and therefore to be received by us as divine" (*ib.* p. 37). We may admit in the Vulgate all defects which may exist "in any book whatever without destroying its substantial integrity" (p. 36). To be more precise: the Church has never in any age or in any place mistaken a counterfeit for the written Word of God. "Therefore, all those innumerable variations which occur between the modern Latin Vulgate and the old Latin version lawfully employed for so many centuries in the Western Church do not destroy the substantial integrity of the Bible. Nor is this integrity destroyed by all those variations which are found if we confront our copies of the modern Vulgate with the ancient copies of the Greek Church, or with those of the Syrians, Armenians, Copts, or other Catholics in any part of the Church. . . . From a theological point of view (*dogmaticamente*), all the versions employed by lawful authority in the Church are equal" (p. 33). If we take the decree in this, as we believe, its true sense, no defence of it is so much as needed. A Catholic is not at liberty to say with Calvin (Hody, p. 551) that there are scarcely three verses

[1] *I.e.* none of the theologians makes Franzelin's distinction between the substance of a dogmatic text and the mode of its presentation. Hody divides Catholic theologians into two classes: (1) those who "contend for the translation against the original"; (2) those who hold that the Vulgate was declared authentic "quia nullum continet in fide et moribus perniciosum errorem" (pp. 510, 511).

in the Vulgate without some striking blunder, but a statement of this kind is contrary to sober criticism as well as to the Tridentine decree. "An authorised edition," says Westcott (p. 1705), "became a necessity for the Roman Church, and however gravely later theologians may have erred in explaining the policy or intentions of the Tridentine Fathers on this point, there can be no doubt that . . . the principle of their decision—the preference, that is, of the oldest Latin text to any later Latin version—was substantially right." (See also Scrivener, p. 311.)

Little need be said on the public use of the Vulgate, which is of course a mere matter of discipline. Catholic scholars may, and often do, translate from the original, and Vercellone has made valuable collections of various readings in the Vulgate text. But it is not lawful to use any except the Clementine edition in church, or to print any other text of the Vulgate, or even to insert various readings in the margin (Preface to the Clementine edition, *ad fin.*); though there is no objection to placing them at the foot of the page.

The revision of the Vulgate ordered by Pius X in 1907, and entrusted to a commission presided over by Cardinal Gasquet, is not intended to produce a Latin Bible to be proposed as an official text for the approbation of the Church. It is merely a preliminary step towards that official version. It is the aim of the Commission to determine St. Jerome's Latin text, and not to bring out any new version of the Latin Scriptures. How far St. Jerome himself was correct in his translation may be the work of some future commission. (See Card. Gasquet in "Cath. Enc." *Vulgate.*)

(The chief authorities have been named in the course of the article, except Van Ess, "Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata," Tübingen, 1824; Brunati, "De Nomine, Auctore, Emendatoribus et Authentia Vulgatae," Vienna, 1837. Chapman, "Early History of the Vulgate Gospels." General readers will find the best account of the Vulgate in Mr. Law's treatise quoted above.)

W

WAKES. [See VIGILS.]

WALDENSES. [See VALDENSES.]

WAR. The resort to force on the part of two or more nations which cannot settle their difference by peaceful methods. The word "nation" implies that war must be carried on by the people of a country regarded as a whole, and represented by its government, not by any section of the population acting for itself. That concentrated and organized force of political society which is behind the tribunal of the magistrate, and executes the sentence of the judge, in war is turned outward, and applied to the overcoming of the corresponding force exerted by the hostile nation.

There have been sects, notably the Quakers, which have denied altogether the lawfulness of war, partly because they believed it to be prohibited by Christ (Mt. v. 39, &c.), partly on humanitarian grounds. On the Scriptural ground they are easily refuted; the case of the soldiers instructed in their duties by St. John the Baptist, and that of the military men whom Christ and His Apostles loved and familiarly conversed with, without a word to imply that their calling was unlawful, sufficiently prove the point. They are on stronger ground when they point to the frightful evils of every kind which war unchains upon a community, and the more so in proportion to its civilization; and when they urge that war should be put an end to by a general agreement among nations to resort to arbitration it is impossible not to go a long way with them. There have been, however, and there probably will be again, many disputes between nations which they would under no circumstances submit to arbitration; and in these cases, if negotiation has failed, and there be, on one side or on both, great exasperation, war must inevitably ensue. But the voice of morality, enlightened by religion, is not thereby silenced; it claims to define both what wars may be justly undertaken and how they should be conducted. On these subjects there is a tolerably general consensus of opinion as to a number of important points among theologians, canonists, and publicists.

(*a*) The question what wars are just resolves itself into two inquiries—what is just for the State, and what is just for the individual. A State may justly declare war in order to recover territory of which it has been unjustly deprived, or to reassert its authority over subjects who have declared themselves independent, or to punish gross and wanton insults to its citizens while invested with a public capacity, and for several other causes. The canonists hold that a State may lawfully make war upon a heretic people, which is actively spreading heresy, and stirring up dissension and rebellion within its own subject provinces; or upon a pagan people, which prevents the preaching of the Gospel, and refuses free

passage to missioners who desire to carry the light of faith to countries beyond. When the justice of a war is doubtful, Grotius ("De Jure Belli et Pacis," c. 23, cited in Ferraris) urges that, considering the evils which war entails, particularly upon innocent persons, governments ought to prefer to remain at peace; and this is probably now the general opinion. It is no just cause of war that a State desires to rule over its neighbour, or to enlarge its dominions, or add to its wealth or power, or to preserve a certain balance of force and prevent another nation from becoming dangerously powerful, unless the aggrandizement feared tend manifestly and indisputably to the subjugation of other nations.

The subjects and citizens of a government declaring war are safe in obeying it, and taking up arms in its behalf, unless they are certain that its cause is unjust. "In doubtful matters we ought always to obey, . . . because, though the ruler may sin in commanding, the subject does not sin in obeying" (Glossa on St. Augustine, quoted by Ferraris). But a foreign auxiliary, enlisting himself voluntarily in the service of a nation at war, is bound to satisfy himself beforehand that its cause is just. If a soldier is certain that the cause in which his government is fighting is unjust, he ought to obtain his discharge as soon as he can, and in the meantime to abstain, so far as possible, from acts of hostility.

(β) As to the *manner* of conducting war, opinion formerly tended to harsher conclusions than those now commonly received. All movable property used to be looked upon as the lawful spoil of the soldiers of an invading force. "Quae ab hostibus capimus, jure gentium statim nostra fiunt"—"The things which we take from our enemies, by the law of nations immediately become our own" (Ferraris, art. iii. § 34, quoting Justinian, "Instit." ii. tit. 1). Animals used for ploughing, and seed corn, were excepted from this right of spoil enjoyed by conquerors. At the present day, among civilized nations, private property on land is held to be exempt from spoliation in time of war. The invading general requisitions the authorities of the towns and villages which he occupies for such supplies as he may require, with or without payment; and, if these requisitions be complied with, it is held to be his duty to restrain his soldiers from every species of plunder. Private property at sea is still subject to be seized, and converted to the use of the captors.

The duties of a soldier in war towards the State which he serves and the general who commands him comprehend faithful service, courage, and prompt obedience. Hence desertion, cowardice, and breaches of discipline are in a soldier grievous sins.

Ambush, stratagem, and deceit are lawful in time of war, for those whose lives are in continual peril cannot be expected to abstain from any practice against their enemies which might tend to lessen that peril. In practice, the resort to such means is limited in some degree by the code of military honour. The use of poisoned weapons and explosive bullets is generally condemned, as causing a great increase of suffering to those wounded by them, without any corresponding military advantage. (Ferraris, *Bellum*; St. Thomas, 2^a 2^{ae}, *q.v.* 40–42 and 108; Ballerini, "Theol. Mor." ii. p. 661 *sqq.*)

WASHING OF FEET. [See HOLY WEEK.]

WASHING OF HANDS BEFORE AND AFTER MASS. A rubric of the Roman Missal directs the celebrating priest to wash his hands in the sacristy before he puts on his vestments. The Jewish priests used to wash their hands and feet before they officiated at the altar (Ex. xxx. 18–21; 2 Paralip. iv. 2, 6), and in such passages as Ps. xxvi. 6 and lxxiii. 13 there is an allusion to the ethical meaning of this rite. The early Christians adopted a similar usage; only with them the preliminary lustration before prayer was common to all the laity. Many of the Fathers testify to the prevalence of this custom. (See, *e.g.*, Euseb. "H.E." x. 4; Chrysost. Hom. iii. "In Epist. ad Ephes.," PG, lxii. 28; and Caesar. Serm. 51, numbered 229 in Appendix iv. to St. Augustine.) In later times this preliminary ablution was prescribed for priests only. It is also usual for priests to wash their fingers in the sacristy after Mass when they have taken off their vestments.

Quite distinct from either of these washings is the washing of the priest's hands after the offertory, and again after Communion. [See LAVABO; ABLUTION; PURIFICATION.]

WATER, HOLY. [See HOLY WATER.]

WAY OF THE CROSS. [See STATIONS OF THE CROSS.]

WEEK, HOLY. [See HOLY WEEK.]

WHITE FATHERS. (Missionaries of Our Lady of Africa.) They are not, strictly speaking, a religious order, though the members (priests and lay-brothers) bind themselves by oath to labour for the conversion of Africa. They were founded by Cardinal Lavigerie, archbishop of Algiers, in 1868. [See SLAVERY; "Life of Card. Lavigerie," by Clarke.]

WHITE FRIARS. [See CARMELITES.]

WHITE GARMENT. [See BAPTISM, and LOW SUNDAY.]

WHIT-SUNDAY. The common name in England for Pentecost [*q.v.*]. Skeat ("Etymological Dictionary," *sub voc.*) shows that the derivation is plain and certain. It descends from the Anglo-Saxon "hwita Sunnandæg," and means "White Sunday."

It is difficult to say why the name was given, but probably the author just quoted is right in his suggestion that it refers to the white robe of baptism. Easter and Pentecost were for many ages the times at which baptism was administered, and in cold climates, like our own, Pentecost would be preferred to Easter for the reception of baptism, which, in those days, was given by immersion. If this explanation is correct, our name for Pentecost would resemble the Latin title for Low Sunday, viz. "Dominica in Albis," but in the latter case it is the day on which the white robes are put off.

WILL. The ancient definition of a will or testament by the Roman jurists was "the lawful sentence of our will concerning that which a person wishes to be done after his death." Many writers hold that the words "with the institution of an heir" should be added to the definition, because such institution is "of the essence of the testament" (Ferraris). The business of will-making, in England at least, is now regulated in all its parts by the statute-law; and those desiring information respecting it can find what they seek in the ordinary law-books, or, which is the safer course, obtain it from their lawyer. All that will be here attempted is (1) to point out some special circumstances about the wills of Christians which the history of primitive times brings to our knowledge; (2) to advert generally to the manner in which the subject was regarded in the Middle Ages; (3) to specify some of the principal features of the modern canon law in regard to testamentary disposition.

(1) After the conversion of Constantine the imperial law (Cod. Theod. 16, 2, 4) sanctioned and facilitated the bequest of property of all kinds to the Church. Such property became the patrimony of the Church and the poor, and could not thereafter be the subject of a will, except so far as a man might desire, and be entitled, to point out its future dispensers.[1] Clerics, therefore, of all grades, could not dispose by will of any property, movable or immovable, of which they had become possessed in virtue of their office. Justinian, in the Code, allowed bishops to bequeath property which they possessed before, or which they had inherited since, their consecration; everything else they could only leave to the Church. This law was enforced by Gregory the Great in several remarkable instances. Justinian, also, while allowing secular priests to make wills (Nov. 76, 1), withheld the right altogether from monks. The power of testamentary disposition was frequently taken from and restored to heretics in the imperial legislation. A constitution of Valentinian (370) forbade women to bequeath property to ecclesiastical persons.

[1] Thomassin, *Vet. et Nova Disc.* iii. 2, 38.

A remarkable anecdote is told by Possidius of St. Augustine. A certain Januarius, who had joined the congregation of clerks which the saint had instituted in his house at Hippo, bequeathed his money to the Church, disinheriting his two children. St. Augustine refused the bequest; first, because his religious had renounced the power of willing when they joined the congregation; secondly, because of the wrong done to the children. He sent for the heirs, and arranged for the division of the money between them. Satyrus left all his property to his brother, St. Ambrose, with a verbal request that he would give to the poor as much of it as he thought right. St. Ambrose gave it all to the poor. The saint made no will, having stripped himself of everything at the time of his ordination, when he made over his lands to the Church, reserving the *usufruct*, or annual profits of them, to his sister for her life.

(2) During the Middle Ages, the practice of devising land and other property for religious purposes (*ad pias causas*) was still largely resorted to. In countries where the society was feudal, the kings and superior lords, finding that the accumulation of lands held by the Church deprived them of various incidental advantages (such as reliefs, wardships, and escheats) which they derived from the same lands while in lay tenure, commenced to legislate against such accumulation, whether effected by grant or will. Hence arose the laws of mortmain, forbidding any further conveyance of lands to the Church. These laws, however, in England could be evaded by means of a licence in mortmain granted by the Crown. A practice also arose of bequeathing lands to certain persons as the legal owners, to the use of certain other persons—a religious community, for instance; and in these cases the Court of Chancery regarded the beneficial ownership as belonging to those to whom the use was devised. This practice—long before uses were turned into possession—was prevented from being of any benefit to the Church by the statute of 1392, which enacted that uses should be subject to the statutes of mortmain, and liable to be forfeited on any infringement thereof, equally with the lands themselves.[1] Licences in mortmain ceased to be given after the Reformation, and the statute of 23 Henry VIII. (1532) declared that all grants of lands, on trust for parish churches or other institutions "erected and made of devotion," if for more than twenty years, should be deemed null and void. This statute was held to cut off grants to *superstitious* uses; those to *charitable* uses were still valid. But the Mortmain Act of 1736 (9 George II. c. 36) enacted that any grant to a charitable use should be by a deed executed at least twelve months before the

[1] Stephen's *Commentaries*, Part I. ch. xv.

donor's death, enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six months after execution, and taking effect immediately upon enrolment.

(3) With regard to wills in modern times, the general rule has been (Ferraris, *Test.* art. i. § 40) to follow the prescriptions of the civil law, in ecclesiastical no less than in secular courts, in all countries belonging to the Holy Roman Empire; in countries subject to the Roman Pontiff the canon law was followed. The (Roman) civil law requires that a will be attested by seven witnesses, all males. If the testator is unable to sign it, an eighth witness is required, who signs in his name. The canon law only requires attestation by two good witnesses (*idonei testes*) and the parish priest. In the absence of the parish priest, there must be four witnesses. According to the rigour of the law, clerks without the consent of the bishops, and religious without the consent of their superior, cannot witness wills. But custom has sanctioned their acting without consent, and they frequently do so.

If executed without the required formalities, and not afterwards validated in one of the ways pointed out by the imperial legislation, a will *ad causas profanas*, according both to the civil and the canon law, is null; and a celebrated question has arisen, whether, if the intention of the testator be clear, the nullity of the will for want of form should be extended to the *forum conscientiae* as well as the *forum externum*. Much has been written on both sides; an abstract of the arguments may be seen in Ferraris (art. i. 44–57).

Privileged wills (*testamenta privilegiata*) are those which are held in canon law to be valid although the forms required by the civil law have not been complied with. Such are those *ad pias causas*, those of soldiers made on a campaign, those of peasants, &c. A *testamentum ad pias causas* is a will in which a religious purpose or destination is substituted for the heir—such as the support of a church or convent, an almshouse, a school, &c. This is held to be valid, even without witnesses, if written and signed in the known hand of the testator; otherwise, it requires two witnesses.

Professed regulars cannot make a will, because they cannot, as individuals, own property [PROFESSION, RELIGIOUS]; nevertheless they can interpret and declare a testamentary disposition made previously to profession. Secular clerks of all grades can devise their patrimonial and quasi-patrimonial or individual property as freely as laymen.[1]

All regulars (except Franciscans) can, with the licence of their superior, act as testamentary executors. Even if they have not such licence, their executorial acts, though not licit, are valid. They are bound to render an account of their administration to the bishop of the diocese.

A will is said to be "ambulatory," because it can at any time be revoked or changed down to the last day of life.

(Ferraris, *Testamentum*; Soglia, lib. iii. § 50; Smith and Cheetham; Stephen's "Commentaries.")

WITCHCRAFT, WITCH (Anglo-Saxon, *wiccancræft, wicce*; probably connected with Old High German *wihan*, German *weihen*). Witchcraft has been defined (Bergier, "Dict. Théol.") as "the art of doing things wonderful, and apparently supernatural, without the intervention of God." Perhaps a more exact definition would be "a power, real or supposed, of producing, in concert with an evil spirit, effects beyond the reach of natural means and operations."

Those who deny the existence of evil spirits, and maintain that all the cases of demoniacal possession mentioned in the Bible and recorded elsewhere are merely cases of disease, are of course still less inclined to admit the reality of witchcraft. Imagination, morbid fancy, terror of the unknown, private spite, knavery, credulity, and hallucination sufficiently account, in their eyes, for all of which witches have ever been accused, or have accused themselves. The former opinion—namely, that any commerce between human beings and evil spirits is imaginary and impossible—is repugnant to Scripture and the, at least implicit, teaching of the Church, and cannot be held by Catholics. But it does not follow that because we believe that *obsession* is a fact, and that human beings can and do come under the influence of evil spirits, we should therefore admit the reality of any such leagues or compacts with the devil as the records of witchcraft assume. Perrone, indeed, describes as "rash" the denial of the common opinion that dealings and compacts with the devil actually take place.[1] But other Catholic theologians (see the article *Zauberei* in "Kirchenlex.") take a different view, and argue that, just as the belief in the Sabbaths or nightly meetings of the witches, though once universally held, has been so dissipated by reflection and experience that Perrone himself does not admit it, so the tendency of sound opinion is to the extirpation of the view that the phenomena of witchcraft imply, or ever implied, an actual diabolic compact.

Without troubling ourselves with the *sagae* and *lamiae* of Roman antiquity, let us consider the popular notions about witches and their power which prevailed in Europe till quite recent times, and still are harboured in many weak and ill-taught minds. It used to be believed that witches were of three kinds—black, white, and grey: the

[1] Ferraris, art. iii. 26.

[1] *Praelectiones*, iv. 60.

first could only hurt; the second only help; the third could both help and hurt. Their power came to them in virtue of a compact with the devil, by which they bartered their souls for some earthly object of desire. The witch was thought to be usually "a decrepit, superannuated old woman, who is tempted by a man in black to sign a contract to become his, both soul and body." He gives her a piece of money, and she delivers to him a slip of parchment, on which her name is signed with her blood. An imp or familiar, often in the form of a cat, is given to her, and the bargain is concluded. From this time the witch bore the devil's mark on some part of her body.[1] Whether the witch were the devil's instrument, or the devil hers, was a point not quite settled; but in either case she deserved to be burnt.

Reginald Scot, who lived at a time when there were as many as seventeen or eighteen reputed witches in many an English village, describes the way in which the character of witch came to be assigned to a woman. A morose old woman, who has lost her children and friends, lives alone in a hut; she begs food and other things of her neighbours; sometimes she meets with a refusal, resenting which she uses bad language, and wishes some harm may come to the refuser. After a time, some altercation of this kind has taken place between her and many families in the parish. To some members of these mishaps are sure to happen—sudden seizures of illness, murrain among the cattle, failure of crops, &c. The cause is unknown; one must therefore be invented; the curses of the old woman are remembered, and the whole thing is clear—she has bewitched them. Even the doctors, says Scot, if they find a case defy their art, often encourage the superstitious belief, for *inscitiae pallium veneficium et incantatio* ("witchcraft and enchantment are the cloak of ignorance").

True religion supports the mind under misfortune, ascribing every event to the will or the permission of God, who does nothing except in love. But when the Christianity professed is but skin-deep, and temporal gain or loss is the engrossing object of our hope or fear, an ignorant age resorts to witchcraft, whether to explain ill-luck, or to find a short cut to prosperity. "If any adversitie, greefe, sicknesse, losse of children, corne, cattell, or libertie, happen unto them, by and by they exclaime upon witches." So writes Reginald Scot, and illustrates what he says by relating what had happened within his own knowledge. The Rev. J. Ferrall, vicar of Brenchley in Kent, charged Margaret Symons, one of his parishioners, with having bewitched his son, and caused him to fall seriously ill. The woman's dog had barked at the boy as he was passing her house; about this a quarrel had arisen, and angry words been exchanged. When his son, soon afterwards, fell ill, the reverend gentleman, *confirmed in his opinion by the other witches living in the village*, thought Margaret Symons must have cast a spell upon him. The words printed in italics illustrate a fact which witch-trials abundantly teach—viz. that the belief in witchcraft tends to establish and extend itself in proportion to the number of the reputed witches. The boy was said to have been cured of his illness by another Brenchley witch! and Margaret Symons, we may hope, escaped.

As by degrees the theory of witchcraft, arranging itself round two principal points—the league with the devil and the nightly meetings or Sabbaths—became more definite, the catalogue of mischiefs, rogueries, and portentous events of all kinds, which the witches were believed capable of causing, was continually on the increase. If a German jurisconsult, in a "dissertatio juridica," were at the present day to write as the learned Walburger of Anhalt wrote in 1670, he would be set down as insane. But, at the time, Walburger was considered to write on the conservative, safe, and orthodox side. In his belief, witches can and do cause disease (p. 30), and lay snares to kill unbaptized infants (p. 35) for the gratification of their master the devil; they kill their own children and offer them to the devil in sacrifice (p. 36); cause wet-nurses and nursing-mothers to lose their milk (*ib.*); and kill great numbers of children, after bringing them into the world as midwives, by running long needles into their heads. In the previous century a German count had "dedicated to the flames" (*Vulcano consecravit*) eight witches, who had killed, between them, one hundred and forty infants. Two witches were detected, one summer night, boiling an infant in a cauldron; had they not been interrupted, they said, a strong frost would have been caused by the mighty spell they were brewing, which would have destroyed all the crops. One of the abominations of which, in Walburger's opinion, witches were most frequently guilty, was that of "nodatio"; the coarse and grotesque details in connection with this charge may be seen in Ghirlandus, Bodin, and Delrio, as well as in his own treatise. Witches are in the habit of killing animals, usually by poison; of drying up cows, causing abortion, preventing butter from coming and beer from working, and diverting, with the aid of the devil, the milk from cows belonging to other women into their own milk-pails. The Satanic Sabbaths, Walburger tells us, are organized

[1] Margaret Flower, executed at Lincoln in 1618 for bewitching Lord Rosse, son of the Earl of Rutland, and other persons, confessed that she had two familiar spirits sucking on her—the one white, the other black spotted. When she first entertained them she promised them her soul, and they covenanted to do all things which she commanded them. (Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, ii. 387.)

by the devil with peculiar care. The judge Remigius, he says, condemned 800 persons to death in Lorraine for the crime of attending these meetings, all of whom testified that they really took place. The witches ride to them on broomsticks, reeds, goats, bulls, horses, or dogs—the transporting power being supplied by the devil. In Germany the Blocksberg is a favourite place of meeting.

Great though the power of the witch was believed to be, the popular imagination imposed limits upon it, and invented antidotes against their spells. At Christmastide the Babe of Bethlehem restrained the powers of hell:—

> "then no planet strikes,
> No fairy takes, *nor witch hath power to charm*,
> So hallow'd and so gracious is the time."
> (*Hamlet*, Act I. Sc. 1.)

If one could succeed in drawing the witch's blood, her spells were defeated (Brand, ii. 378). Herb Paris was thought an excellent preservative; vervain and dill were also recommended; people used to hang up these things at their doors. It was also believed that there were infallible means of proving witchcraft against a witch who declared herself innocent. Of these the one first resorted to was to search for the devil's mark; this being found, according to Scot,[1] the judge might sentence her to death at once. A mole, or wart, or birth-mark found on the unhappy woman must often have sealed her doom. Another method was to weigh the witch against the church Bible; if the latter were the heavier, she was guilty. Another was to make her say the Lord's Prayer, it being believed that no witch could repeat it to the end without a mistake. Another was to cross-tie her (right thumb to left toe, left thumb to right toe) and throw her into a pond or river: if guilty she could not sink; if she did sink, this proof of her innocence unluckily came too late. A notorious witch-finder in the seventeenth century, Matthew Hopkins, was famous for applying all these tests; he "hanged, in one year, no less than sixty reputed witches in his own county of Essex."[2]

What are we to say to all this? That confessions of being in league with the devil, and of attendance at the Sabbaths, were sometimes extorted by torture is undoubted; and such confessions few persons would now hesitate to pronounce worthless. But it is no less certain that in numberless instances the witches voluntarily accused themselves of the greatest monstrosities and crimes imaginable. Shall we believe, on their own word, that they went where they said they went, made the covenants which they said they made, saw what they said they saw? To resist belief in their asseverations must have been for a long time extremely difficult, especially when judges and advocates cam to the investigation with a fixed conviction that witchcraft was a real crime. But experience must have kept continually adding to the mass of disproved assertions and detected impostures; so that at last it seemed more reasonable to trace the enormities with which these miserable creatures charged themselves to their own crazy and turbid imagination than to suppose them to have an objective existence. To say this is not to deny that the evil spirit has anything to do with witchcraft. Many recorded cases are apparently inexplicable, unless we suppose a demoniacal agency to have been at work. The *fact* of obsession, and the *remedy* of exorcism, remain unshaken; but the *crime* of witchcraft, consisting in a distinct and conscious bargain with the evil one in order to obtain unlawful power, would appear to rest on no secure foundation.[1]

The history of juridical and theological opinion is very curious, and was admirably traced by Tartarotti in the last century. From the introduction to his work, "Del Congresso Notturno," most of the details in the following sketch are taken. The first among mediaeval writers to notice the witches' Sabbath was Regino, abbot of Prume, at the beginning of the tenth century; he speaks of "wicked women," who say that they attend great meetings by night "with Diana, the goddess of the pagans," and do her bidding. Diana (Hecate, Trivia) was the goddess of the ways (*viarum dea*), and therefore supposed to preside at a meeting of her votaries gathered from every quarter.[2] A century later, Burchard, bishop of Worms, speaks of women who believed themselves to ride to the meetings on different beasts. A Council of Treves (1310) forbade any woman to pretend that she rode by night with Diana or with Herodiana—"haec enim daemoniaca illusio est." By Herodiana was meant the daughter of Herodias, whose skill in dancing was supposed to be displayed at these Satanical assemblies. From the fifteenth century date the systematic severities of the Inquisition for witchcraft (*processus de crimine magiae, Hexenprozess*). Dominican writers of that age—Nider, Jaquerio, Sprenger, Institor, &c.—defended the process, and asserted the reality of what the witches confessed; but the Franciscans Cassini and Spina took the opposite view. Cassini wrote a treatisé to prove that the witches did not really ride to the Sabbata, but in ecstasy believed that they did so. Sprenger and Institor were the joint authors of the celebrated work "Malleus

[1] Quoted in Brand, ii. 381. [2] Brand, ii. 385.

[1] Scot wrote of the supposed covenant, three centuries ago: "Let any wise or honest man tell me that either he hath beene a partie or a witnesse, and I will believe him." (*Disc. of Witchcraft*, p. 45.)

[2] Hecate is introduced by Shakespeare in the Fourth Act of *Macbeth*.

Maleficarum," which is full of the most startling and horrible stories. After the middle of the sixteenth century the number of those who opposed the popular belief grew rapidly. The work of Wierus, a Cleves physician, on the "Pseudomonarchia Daemonum," which appeared about that time, made a great sensation. Against Wierus —besides several Catholic writers, as Tanner and Layman—the Protestants Daneus, Hemming, T. Erastus, and Bodin appeared. Bodin, author of "Daemonomania," was a French jurisconsult. Wierus declared that the Protestants believed in the Sabbata more firmly than the Catholics themselves. Reginald Scot, evidently a humane and enlightened man, published his "Discoverie of Witchcraft," in which he takes the same line as Wierus, in 1584; but, being in English, the work appears to have been unknown on the Continent. Nicholas Remigio, the Lorraine judge mentioned above, published his "Daemonolatria" in 1595. Towards 1600 appeared the ponderous work of Martin Delrio, a Jesuit, "Disquisitiones Magicae," in which the revelations of the witches are still treated seriously. This became everywhere a work of authority in the courts, so that Thomasius says that Protestant jurisconsults "all but copy him out word for word." James I., in his "Denonology," took the same side. The first great shock to the received system came through the publication of a work by the Jesuit Frederic Spee, "Cautio Criminalis circa Processus contra Sagas," 1631. Father Spee had attended the execution of many persons condemned for witchcraft in the dioceses of Würzburg and Bamberg, and had come to the conclusion that many of them were entirely innocent. Yet so strong at that time was the general opinion on the other side that Father Spee did not attach his name to his work, nor did he express disbelief in the Sabbata or midnight meetings, nor propose to abandon the process; he simply pleaded for more caution and circumspection.[1] Leibnitz[2] tells us that this work produced a strong impression on the mind of Schönborn, afterwards Elector of Mayence, and through him on other German princes.

Yet, in spite of Father Spee, a crowd of writers all through the seventeenth century, both Protestants and Catholics, defended the process, and the assumptions on which it rested. Among these were Carpzovius, Crusius, Ghirlandus, Méric Casaubon, and Glanvile. The Lutheran Thomasius published an able tract (1701), "Theses de Crimine Magiae," on the other side. In the eighteenth century the mistrust of the process grew stronger and stronger. In England the Act 9 Geo. II. (1736) abolished all prosecutions for witchcraft and sorcery; pretensions of the kind were from that time treated as *charlatanerie* and imposture, and, if attended by attempts to gain money, were punished. Maria Theresa abolished witch-trials in Austria in 1766. The last execution of witches in Great Britain appears to have been in Scotland in 1727, when a woman was burnt on the charge of having ridden her own daughter to the meetings, the said daughter having been transformed into a pony and shod by the devil![1] At Tring in Hertfordshire, in 1751, an old man and his wife, being suspected of witchcraft, were beaten, ducked, and otherwise ill-used by a mob until they expired. The latest instances of witch-burning in Europe appear to have been at Glarus in 1782, and Posen in 1793.

(Scot, "Discoverie of Witchcraft," 1584; Chambers' Encyclop. vol. x.; Brand, "On Popular Antiquities," 1813; Bergier, "Dict. Théol." (Migne); Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte"; Perrone, "De Deo Creatore"; Tartarotti, "Del Congresso Notturno delle Lamie," 1749; Thomasius, "De Crimine Magiae," 1701; Walburger, "De Lamiis," 1670; Thurston in "Cath. Enc.")

WORSHIP. [See CULTUS; LATRIA; DULIA; IMAGES, &c.]

WREATH. [See MARRIAGE.]

WYCLIFFITES. John Wyclif (Wycliffe, Wiclif), a native of Yorkshire, born about 1324, studied in the University of Oxford, and afterwards became master of Balliol College and warden of Canterbury Hall. He was a proficient in the scholastic divinity of his day, and also betook himself zealously to the study of the Scriptures. The Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians, all had at this time flourishing houses at Oxford, and were the object of considerable ill-will to a large body of masters and doctors belonging to the secular clergy, chiefly because they were said to attract promising students from the colleges, and induce them by various means to enter one of their convents. The Franciscans were accustomed to lecture on the excellence of poverty, and to dwell in their sermons on the fact that Christ and His Apostles lived chiefly by alms. Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, maintained that the poverty of Christ was not, like that of the friars, *voluntary*. On all the controverted matters he took a decided part against the friars, and Wyclif and others joined him. In 1366 Wyclif wrote a tract to justify the king (Edward III.) in refusing to pay, on the demand of Urban V., the arrears of the tribute granted by King John to the Holy See. Some years after this, being made

[1] He mentions an accusation brought by several witches against a certain regular of having been present at their meeting at a particular hour; but at that hour the regular was in choir singing the divine office, as all his brother monks attested.

[2] *Theodicea*, 1739, p. 724.

[1] Chambers' *Dom. Ann. of Scotland*, iii. 541.

doctor in theology, he began pertinaciously to attack the friars, declaring that their multiplication impoverished the realm, that their letters of fraternity were a delusion, that they introduced many superstitious practices, estranged the laity from their parochial clergy, were avaricious, abetted wars, &c.; also that they taught novel doctrines on the sacrament of the Altar. Wyclif developed about the same time opinions similar to those which had been put forward earlier in the century by Marsilius of Padua, to the effect that the clergy ought to have no coercive jurisdiction, and that no temporal penalty of any kind ought to be inflicted except with the sanction of the civil power. To these he added that lay lords had full power to take away temporal possessions from the clergy if they judged that a bad use was made of them, and that no one was bound to pay tithes or offerings to parish priests whose lives were not edifying. The Pope (Gregory XI.) heard of this teaching and addressed letters (1376) to Edward III., the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the University of Oxford, urging that Wyclif should be arrested and put on his trial. Some cause of delay arose, and it was not till February 1378 that Wyclif appeared to answer for his doctrine before Bishop Courtenay in St. Paul's Cathedral. An immense crowd thronged the cathedral and its approaches. The Duke of Lancaster, who was present, was at this time rather favourably inclined towards Wyclif; high words passed between him and the bishop; the people, imagining that an outrage was being offered to their bishop in his own cathedral, became angry and clamorous; and the assembly was broken up in confusion. Soon afterwards another assembly was held at Lambeth before the archbishop, to which Wyclif was cited. He handed in a paper in Latin, explaining his teaching on the connection between dominion (or ownership) and grace, on the jurisdiction in temporals claimed for the Church, on the effects of excommunication, and similar questions.[1] This paper is full of scholastic subtleties and distinctions, so that it is difficult in many places to catch Wyclif's real meaning. The judges decided that it was not satisfactory, and the archbishop inhibited him from lecturing or publishing any more on the subjects in dispute. Wyclif then (April 1378) presented a paper in English—or a paper was presented for him—to the Parliament, which is palpably more anti-Papal and insurgent in tone than the statement presented to the archbishop, though it follows generally the same line. About this time Gregory XI. died, and the proceedings against Wyclif were dropped.

In 1378–9 Wyclif appears to have been actively engaged on the translation of the Vulgate Bible into English. It is not known what proportion of either of the two versions which have been printed (Oxford University Press, 1850) actually came from his pen, but there seems no reason to doubt that the first impulse came from him, and that he had an important share in the actual execution. Cardinal Gasquet has disputed the genuineness of this authorship ("The Old English Bible"). It is certain that the Bible was familiar even to laymen in the fourteenth century, and that the whole of the N.T. at least could be read in translations. Blessed Thomas More distinctly says: "The whole Bible was long before (Wycliffe's) days by virtuous and well-learned men translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read" ("Dialogue," Works, p. 233). And again he says: "Myself have seen and can show you Bibles fair and old written in English, which have been known and seen by the bishop of the diocese and left in laymen's hands and women's, to such as he knew for good and Catholic folk that used it with devotion and discretion" (*ib.* p. 234). "Some exaggeration indeed of what Wycliffe did," says Gairdner, "appears to have prevailed even from an early period. It has been a common belief that he was the first to translate the Bible into English, and also that it was the whole Bible that he himself translated. Both these ideas must be considered questionable; the latter extremely so. . . What 'Master Wycliffe' translated and vulgarised, Knighton tells us, was 'the Gospel that Christ committed to the clergy and the doctors of the Church'; and the 'Gospel' here cannot be understood as more than the four Gospels at the utmost. It may, in fact, be less." ("Lollardy and the Reformation in England," i. 102.)

In 1381 Wyclif lectured on the Eucharist, and was led on by his bitter antagonism to the theologians of the mendicant orders to the enunciation of views which scandalized the Church and the university, and were formally condemned by both. In brief, he propounded the tenet of consubstantiation. "Right as hit is heresye," he said, "to trowe that Crist is a spiryt and no body, so hit is heresye to trowe that this sacrament is God's body and no bred; for hit is bothe togedir."[1] So again, in the "Trialogus,"[2] written probably in 1383, to quote one among many similar passages, he says that the whole Church militant, "since the time of the promulgation of the Gospel, has rightly believed that this sacrament or consecrated host is naturally real bread" (*verus panis*), "and sacramentally the body of Christ." The chancellor, William de Berton, convened

[1] This tract begins "Protestor publice." (See Lewis's *Life of Wyclif*, p. 59.)

[1] *Select English Works*, iii. 502.
[2] Book IV. c. 27, ed. Lechler.

a court of twelve doctors in the schools of the Augustinian friary, who adopted a definition in which, Wyclif not being named, the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is formally asserted. Wyclif, who was present, put in a document known as his "Confession," [1] in which, under cover of a cloud of words and copious extracts from the Fathers, he tried to vindicate the soundness of his Eucharistic teaching. Soon after this, the terrible rising of the Commons (in the summer of 1381) turned away men's thoughts for a time from every other subject. Sudbury, the archbishop of Canterbury, was murdered. The new archbishop (Courtenay) lost no time in following up the proceedings against Wyclif. He convened a council at Black Friars in London, which met in May 1382, and condemned twenty-four propositions extracted from the reformer's writings. Of these ten were declared to be heretical, and fourteen erroneous. The first of the ten was, "That the substance of material bread and wine remains after consecration in the sacrament of the Altar." The fourteen erroneous conclusions belonged either to the peculiar politico-ecclesiastical system which Wyclif, following the Valdenses [*q.v.*], had built up in various treatises, or were strong opinions suggested by his animosity towards the friars. The Pope's confirmation of the proceedings of the council was soon obtained, and the archbishop then took very energetic steps to repress the teaching of the condemned opinions both in the university and the country. Wyclif was obliged to leave Oxford and retire to his living of Lutterworth. That no other severity was used towards him seems to have been owing to the state of his health, for about the end of 1382 he was stricken with paralysis. During the two remaining years of his life his literary activity must have been prodigious; the great bulk of his English works (of which the three volumes printed by the Clarendon Press, edited by T. Arnold, with the supplementary volume edited by Matthew, are far from exhausting the list) was produced in this period. According to Gascoyne (Lewis, p. 336), he had another paralytic stroke on December 28, 1384, and died on the last day of the year.

It is not known in what part of his career Wyclif founded the institution of the "Poor Priests," whom he sent to various parts of the country to propagate what he conceived to be the Gospel, and declaim against ecclesiastical abuses. Among these men, Herford, Repyngdon, Patrington, Swinderby, and Purvey were conspicuous. They and their followers were called Lollards, and that they were numerous might be inferred, even if there were not abundant direct evidence, from the chance allusion to them in Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales." [1] To Courtenay Arundel succeeded, and to Arundel Chicheley; and all three—but especially Chicheley, who established in 1416 a regular inquisition of heresy for the purpose of exterminating the sect—used strenuous measures of repression against the Wycliffites. In this the princes of the House of Lancaster, the weakness of whose title to the crown disposed them to court the good will of the hierarchy, zealously aided them. In 1396 twelve delegates appointed by the university picked out two hundred and ninety-eight propositions from Wyclif's works as deserving of censure. In 1411 a council held at London by Archbishop Arundel, attended by thirteen bishops and thirty doctors, condemned forty-five Wycliffite errors. The Council of Constance, among the theologians attending which was the great Carmelite Thomas of Walden, enumerated the forty-five propositions just mentioned, and declared that many of them were notoriously heretical, others erroneous, others scandalous and blasphemous, some offensive to pious ears, and some rash and seditious. At the same time Wyclif's "Dialogus" and "Trialogus" were condemned by name; others of his writings were reprobated in general terms.

(The best book on the subject is "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," by James Gairdner; Rashdall in "Dict. Nat. Biogr." gives a list of contemporary authorities; Stevenson, "The Truth about John Wyclif"; Urquhart in "Cath. Enc."; Bellesheim in "Kirchenlex."; Trevelyan, "England in the Age of Wyclif.")

[1] It begins "Saepe confessus sum," and may be read in Lewis's Life, p. 323; *Fascic. Zizan.* p. 115; and Vaughan's Life, ii. 245.

X

XAVERIAN BROTHERS. This teaching institute was commenced at Bruges in 1839, and definitely established in 1846, by Theodore James Ryken, a native of Elshout, in the Catholic province of North Brabant, Holland. His object was to "found a congregation of men who would sacrifice their lives to the Christian education of youth." The first professions were those of himself and twelve young brothers, made on October 22, 1846. Ryken took the name of Brother Francis Xavier, after the Apostle of the Indies, who was chosen patron of the congre-

[1] "'I smell a loller in the wind,' quoth he" (Prol. to *Shipman's Tale*).

gation. Soon afterwards he opened St. Francis Xavier's College at Bruges for day scholars and boarders: this is said to have become "the most flourishing school in the city." The Brothers came to England in 1846; they have a number of houses up and down the country. Archbishop Spalding introduced them into the United States in 1854. The bishops and the Catholic communities of the States and Canada have eagerly welcomed the new institute, and desired to entrust to it the education of children. "They have applications from nearly every State in the Union, which for the present cannot be [complied with] for want of members." (Br. Isidore in "Cath. Enc.")

XEROPHAGY (*ξηροφαγία*, the eating of dry food; fasting, abstinence.) [See MONTANISTS.]

Z

ZWINGLI. [See EUCHARIST, p. 323.]

AT THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE AND CO. LTD.
COLCHESTER, LONDON AND ETON, ENGLAND

00067497

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 27 November, 2018